

The TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND LEADERSHIP: SELF,
SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY

by

Thad Dugan

Copyright © Thad Dugan 2015

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES AND PRACTICE

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Thad Dugan, titled *The Transformative Power of Social Justice and Leadership: Self, School, and Community*, and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/9/2015
Rose Ylimaki, Chair

Date:

4/9/2015
Nolan Cabrera

Date:

4/9/2015
Jeffrey Bennett

Date:

4/9/2015
Lynnette Brunderman

Date:

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Dissertation Director: Rose Ylimaki

Date: 4/9/2015

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that an accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Thad Dugan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... 5

PROLOGUE.....6

INTRODUCTION TO THREE ARTICLES..... 9

OVERVIEW OF ARTICLES..... 12

 Article 1.....12

 Article 2.....13

 Article 3.....13

SUMMARY..... 15

REFERENCES..... 17

APPENDIX A: *NARRATIONS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE PROFESSORS:
 INVESTIGATING IMPLICATIONS FOR CRITICAL
 CONSCIOUSNESS DEVELOPMENT AND PRAXIS* 19

 References.....62

APPENDIX B: *DAVIS K-8 SCHOOL: UTILIZING TRANSFORMATIONAL
 LEADERSHIP TO DRIVE INCLUSIVE PRACTICE*.....66

 References..... 89

APPENDIX C: *UTILIZING MASLOW’S THEORY OF MOTIVATION
 AND SOCIALLY JUST LEADERSHIP FOR COMMUNITY
 TRANSFORMATION: A CASE STUDY*.....91

 References.....127

ABSTRACT

Operating from Burrell and Morgan's (1979) Radical Humanist Paradigm and using Foster's (1986) conception of moral, transformative leadership as a theoretical framework, this dissertation presents three empirical studies that demonstrate the potential for social justice efforts and leadership. Guided by a critical grounded theory approach, the first study represents transformation of self in its analysis of critical consciousness development and praxis in White, privileged individuals. The second study provides an example of school transformation and presents a re-conceptualization of transformational leadership and professional learning communities as a guide for inclusive practices. The final study demonstrates the mutually beneficial components of community/school transformation and responds to critiques of social justice recently presented by the author (2014) and Capper and Young (2014) that social justice efforts in schools have not included transformation of community and the greater society. Furthermore, the article demonstrates the use of motivational theory (Maslow, 1943), originally aimed in educational leadership to increase efficiency, as a guiding principle for social justice and community transformation.

PROLOGUE

“It’s not about you”. There are few moments in the course of one’s life that make a tremendous impact, yet these simple words resonate with me today and have a much deeper meaning than the nascent understanding they brought to me at the time. These words were the beginning of an ongoing journey to developing my own critical consciousness and understanding of my role as an educator and a person of the world.

It was my first year as a teacher and I attended Glenn Singleton’s *Beyond Diversity* training. While participating in the training, I remember thinking that the situations presented in the training were coincidental and I could not believe that people interact with the world, moment-to-moment, and day-to-day, according to race. I had never been asked to think about race in this way in any of my preparation and the concept of racial privilege was beyond my level of understanding at the time. I remember feelings of uneasiness, and that it was simple, at first, to rationalize and explain my feelings away as other’s issues. I excused my own bias and placed blame upon others who felt that there were structures and practices that led to oppressive situations.

To say I was not conscious would be an understatement. In fact, Freire (2009) referred to my state of consciousness as naïve consciousness, a state of awareness based in belief that success and failures are rooted solely in family values and culture. I believed that hard work and individual choices were the only factors in success. I also believed that everyone faced the same struggles. It was then, that I met with my principal, and African American male, who listened to me, summarized what I said, and proceeded to tell me why I was wrong. As I began to rationalize the training, I felt various emotions such as frustration and anger. I talked about my own upbringing, having moved every couple of years when my military father was re-stationed,

not living in the United States for a large portion of my childhood, and the fact that I had been a second language learner at an Italian school. He began with four simple words: “It’s not about you”. Although I do not remember much of the conversation, these words opened my eyes to something that had eluded my understanding for much of my life, my White privilege, and its intersection with other privileges (e.g. Male, heterosexual, middle-class). These words still resonate with me to this day and I am forever grateful for that conversation and my (un)willingness at first to see the world in its true nature.

I am not embarrassed to admit that I have been extremely naïve at various points in my life. To me, these missteps in understanding early in my life and career have been a guidepost for the work that I do. My life as a scholar and as a practitioner of educational leadership have been impacted by my growth and understanding of my own consciousness from these missteps, and it is the desire to better understand concepts such as critical consciousness development, praxis, inclusion, social justice, and barriers to learning (e.g. marginalization/privilege) that drives the research presented in this dissertation. My own experience and the possibility to add to the knowledge base in the aforementioned areas provided the impetus for these research projects.

The three articles presented in the dissertation build upon my engagement in developing a broad, yet deeper understanding of marginalization and injustice present in schooling practices in the United States, and are framed in Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) Critical Humanist paradigm. This paradigm emphasizes not only deep understanding a phenomenon, but also removing constraints limiting the potential of human beings. My work in this paradigm not only provides exemplars of transformation, demonstrating how individuals, schools, and communities have mitigated social structures and practices often leading to the marginalization, but also, pushes on and expands the paradigm in the way it is viewed. The research presented in this dissertation

expands critical humanist paradigm by demonstrating that, in schools, critical consciousness development and leadership praxis is often driven by allies of privilege, rather than marginalized masses rising up to disrupt inequitable practices. In my research, privilege pertains to Whiteness and position. By position, I refer to the legitimization of privilege inherent to those working in leadership roles.

Working within and beyond the critical humanist paradigm, I have drawn from a variety of research areas (e.g. critical pedagogy; critical curriculum studies; leadership for social justice) and methodologies (e.g. mixed-methods; case study; critical grounded theory). While scholarship in these various areas emphasize different foci in terms of standpoint (e.g. marginalized students, oppressive structures; school leaders; federal education policy), this scholarship finds intersection in framing the need for transformative educational practices to engage students, teachers, parents, and the community in order to change society.

INTRODUCTION TO THE THREE ARTICLES

Discourse regarding schooling in the United States has moved from an emphasis on democracy to a hegemonic dialogue in education regarding accountability and global competitiveness. Neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies guiding education policies (e.g. No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, Common Core Standards) have increased accountability for schools and school leaders (see Apple, 2004; Ylimaki, 2011). Student achievement is directly related to test scores based on a set of standards developed by individual states (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009), and students and school leaders are rated based upon these outcomes. Student achievement for all students has been highlighted as schools strive to meet the requirements of these mandates; however, structures and practices that often lead to marginalization go unmentioned and unnoticed (e.g. Ladson Billings & Tate, 1995; Marshall & Oliva, 2006).

Policies such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) have masked structural deficiencies in schools that perpetuate inequities in the education of minority students. Policies and practices in schools, guided by neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies, overlook factors such as race, culture, gender, and socioeconomic status leading to a curriculum that perpetuates the status quo rather than resolving the structures that lead to failure for many students (Apple, 2004; Foster, 1986). Neoliberal (market driven, pro-business) and neoconservative (back-to-basics ideologies) have had serious adverse consequences for marginalized students in America such as a widening achievement gap, large gaps in graduation rates and college attendance, and discipline practices that push students out of school (Orfield & Lee, 2005). An emphasis on accountability has disguised structural inequalities and exploitation of specific groups of students (Apple, 1999, 2004; McLaren & Kincheloe, 2007).

Critical educational scholars have identified structural inequalities in the system of education that build upon and advance the cultural capital of the dominant group while discouraging the capital of subordinate groups (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Bourdieu & Passerson, 1977). Meritocratic practices born out of a neoliberal ideology promote individualism, academic achievement, and the earning of credentials based on dominant ideological concerns, forcing students to assimilate the dominant culture (Lee, 2005; Ogbu, 2003). At the same time, these practices discount funds of knowledge, the strengths of social networks, and social and cultural capital brought forth by students of color (Bourdieu & Passerson, 1977; Moll et.al, 2001). By emphasizing individualism and discounting the cultural and social capital of students of color and their families, schooling provides a structure that is more likely to result in jail than college for marginalized populations (Giroux & Giroux, 2004)

Values promoted by neoliberalism and neoconservatism legitimize social inequities based upon individual merit, leading to subtractive schooling (Valenzuela, 1999). Subtractive schooling views students of color from a deficit viewpoint that fails to consider students' cultural values and language as assets. Therefore, students are encouraged to assimilate to dominant values in order to be successful and subtractive schooling forces students to negotiate identities. Often these students choose to maintain their own individual identities at the expense of educational attainment (see Ogbu, 2003; Lee, 2005).

Understanding the calls of critical scholars and the need for transformative practices, educational leadership scholars emphasizing social justice have demonstrated the importance of leadership for change in schooling practices and the transformation of society through schools. Specifically, scholars have called for leadership that draws attention to inequitable structures and practices and confronts the challenges of neoliberalism and neoconservatives (e.g. Foster, 1986;

Marshall & Oliva, 2006). These scholars have emphasized leadership models that are inclusive (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008; Doyle, 2004), advocate for marginalized students (Anderson, 2009), are democratically accountable (Mullen et al., 2008), and socially just (Marshall & Oliva, 2006, McKenzie et al., 2008). While relatively new to the field of educational leadership, scholarship promoting socially just leadership practices draw attention to and provide examples of efforts to transform marginalizing situations for students.

Not unlike most of the literature regarding social justice and leadership, the conceptual frameworks utilized across the three article draws upon the seminal work of William Foster. In *Paradigms and Promises*, Foster (1986) critiqued and challenged traditional theories of leadership (e.g. theories promoted in Hoy & Miskel, 2008) that emphasize efficiency and management. Utilizing a critical theoretical perspective, Foster challenged traditional leadership viewpoints and promoted a critical theory of administration, outlining the possibilities of a transformative role leadership could play in the transformation of individuals, schools, communities, and society. According to Foster (1986), a critical theory of administration develops morally transformative leaders that “attempt to link practice to social and cultural issues...[the] foundational assumption is that administration, particularly educational administration, involves people in an educative and transformative fashion” (p.10). Foster believed that an educational leader’s first role must be that of transformative human being, a critical humanist not satisfied with the status quo. Rather, he posited, leaders should be change agents whose aim is to “change individuals to better and improve social conditions for all” (p. 18). In sum, Foster highlighted the importance of school leadership beyond the traditional models of administration and into the political spectrum as change agents who transform inequitable circumstances for individuals, schools, communities, and society.

OVERVIEW OF ARTICLES

The articles presented in this dissertation empirically represent three possibilities presented by Foster (1986). These articles provide insight into the transformative role of leaders regarding self, school, and community:

Article 1

Foster (1986) noted that administration exists within various contexts: the managerial context concerned with running the organization, the political context concerned with the acquisition of resources, the leadership context concerned with the development and change of the institution, and the social and cultural context concerned with the role of the institution within larger social and cultural systems. Often neglected in traditional theories of administration, understanding the social and cultural context is critical for understanding the role of administration in societal change. To understand and implement administrative tasks aimed at transformation, leaders must be critically aware, conscious beings (critical consciousness) that guide transformative action (praxis) through theory and reflection (see Foster, 1986; Freire, 2009).

In the first article, *Narrations of Social Justice Professors: Investigating Implications for Critical Consciousness Development and Praxis*, I explored the critical consciousness development of professors promoting socially just leadership through their scholarship and university teaching practices. Additionally, I explored ways in which these professors have bridged their consciousness into praxis. The exploration of consciousness development and praxis presented in the article varied from previous work in the field because it diverged from previous scholarship (e.g. Freire, 2009) that focused on critical consciousness development for

marginalized and oppressed populations. Rather, this article focused on the development of critical consciousness and praxis in White, privileged individuals.

Utilizing a critical grounded theory approach, I developed a working theory of consciousness development and praxis in White allies for social justice. This study, identified four key characteristics to developing critical consciousness, and bridging consciousness and praxis: a) critical interrogation, b) understanding privilege as a moral imperative, c) ongoing critical reflection, and d) understanding and working through barriers.

Article 2

The second article presented in this dissertation responds to Foster's (1986) calling that leadership "is the process of transforming and empowering". The case of Davis, previously published in Boske and Diem's (2012) *Global Leadership for Social Justice: Taking it from the Field to Practice*, re-conceptualizes traditional leadership approaches (e.g. transformational leadership; professional learning communities [PLCs]) to demonstrate how these traditional approaches can be leveraged for socially just ends.

As part of a larger research project, the International Successful School Principalship (ISSPP), the Davis case represents school social justice efforts toward inclusive practices that reframe inclusion to represent transformation that makes the culture of the school's deaf and hard of hearing students the dominant school culture. The case presents an alternative viewpoint for inclusive practices, and demonstrates leadership that transforms school practices and empowers staff and students in transformative efforts.

Article 3

In the third article, *Using Maslow's Theory of Motivation and Socially Just Leadership for Community Transformation: A Case Study*, I sought evidence of social justice leadership that

transformed community. Responding to findings from my previous research (Dugan, 2014) and extant literature (e.g. Capper & Young, 2014; Normore, 2008) that noted that social justice leadership at a school level has not led to, or engaged, in community transformation, I researched leadership practices at Jefferson School and the implications of leadership regarding the development of an inclusive and innovative culture, and the Jefferson Park community transformation.

Findings from the Jefferson School case demonstrated that school and community transformation are not mutually exclusive. Rather, school and community efforts should be bridged to transform both the school and greater community. Additionally, the Jefferson case presents a re-conceptualization of Maslow's (1943) theory of motivation from a traditional leadership approach (efficiency) to a framework for meeting the needs of students, families, and communities to achieve socially just ends.

SUMMARY

In sum, the three articles in this dissertation frame my research agenda. The three articles represent socially just leadership in terms of transformation and extend beyond conceptions previously described in extant literature. The three articles represent possibilities outlined by Foster (1986) and push on conceptions of the Radical Humanist paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) to include the critical consciousness and praxis in privileged leaders.

Article one describes critical consciousness development and praxis in privileged individuals and extends understanding of critical consciousness beyond marginalized populations (e.g. Freire, 2009) to include a working theory of critical consciousness for White, privileged individuals. Implications of this work include the preparation of White leaders to engage in social justice efforts and a deeper understanding of the motivation White allies participating in social justice efforts.

Davis school represents transformative efforts through a guiding vision of inclusion, while leveraging traditional school models. The Davis case, article two, provides evidence that an inclusive transformational leadership vision coupled with utilizing PLCs as a tool for change, provide the necessary process for development of an inclusive culture.

Furthermore, the Davis case re-conceptualizes the term inclusion to extend beyond current definitions (e.g. Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008) of including disabled students into mainstreamed classrooms to the transformation of a school culture based in the culture on disabled students.

Lastly, article three, responds to Foster's (1986) challenge of community transformation. Scholars (e.g. Dugan, 2014; Capper & Young, 2014) highlight Foster's proposition that social

and cultural contexts are often neglected and noted that community transformation is a missing component of social justice efforts.

The case of James Jefferson School provides insight into aspects of the school leadership and school practices that have worked with and through the community to transform both the school and greater community. Building upon inclusion defined by the Davis case, the Jefferson case provides evidence that inclusion should be more broadly viewed to include, at a school level, students and teachers. Furthermore, inclusion should be defined from a community view that includes parents and community members who traditionally are not given a space or voice. Additionally, the Jefferson case demonstrates that principals can draw inspiration from theories of motivation traditionally utilized by school administrators to increase efficiency (e.g. Hoy & Miskel, 2008) to create an additive perspective on education leading to high outcomes for all students.

Thus, the three articles presented in this dissertation highlight Foster's (1986) moral transformative leadership and transformation in terms of individual, school, and community. While the articles do not provide evidence of social justice on a societal scale, they do provide a "jumping-off point" for future research efforts regarding socially just leadership and transformative education.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. London: Routledge.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979) *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Capper, C. & Young, M. (2014). Ironies and limitations of educational leadership for social justice: A call to social justice educators. *Theory into practice*, 53, 158-164.
- Doyle, L. (2004). Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14(4), 352-377.
- Dugan, T. (2014). Professor narrations of critical consciousness and praxis: Implications for preparing socially just leaders. A paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Conference in Washington D.C.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed.)*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Glatthorn, A. & Jallal, J. (2009). *The principal as a curriculum leader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Giroux, H. & Giroux, S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (8th Ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97 (1), 47-68.
- Lee, S. (2008). *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review* 50 (4) 370–96.
- McKenzie et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2001). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 2.
- Mullen, C., Harris, S., Pryor, C., & Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: Tensions, actions, and principals in action. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18, 224-248.
- NCLB (2002) No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- Normore, A. (2008). Leadership for social justice and morality: Collaborative partnerships, school-linked services, and the plight of the poor. In A. Normore (ed.) *Leadership for social justice: Promoting equity and excellence through inquiry and reflective practice*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

- Ogbu, J. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. London: Erlbaum.
- Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (2005). Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality. *The Civil Rights Project*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 228-251.
- Theoharis, G. & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing school leaders. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ylimaki, R., & S. Jacobson. Editors (2011). U.S. and cross-national policies practices and preparation: Implications for successful instructional leadership, organizational learning, and culturally responsive practices. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer-Kluwer.

APPENDIX A**NARRATIONS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE PROFESSORS: INVESTIGATING
IMPLICATIONS FOR CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS DEVELOPMENT AND PRAXIS**

**Thad Dugan
University of Arizona**

Abstract

Critical consciousness development provides a theoretical framework to address marginalizing structures promoting transformative practice (Boske, 2011; McKenzie et al., 2008); however, little has been examined regarding specific ways that educational leaders, many of whom are White and privileged, develop critical consciousness and what bridges critical consciousness with praxis. Utilizing the tenets of critical inquiry (Merriam, 2009) and grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), ten White professors engaged in Leadership for Social Justice and consciousness development narrated their development of critical consciousness and their bridging critical consciousness to praxis. This study develops a working theory of critical consciousness development and bridging consciousness into the praxis of White, privileged individuals, identifying four key characteristics to bridging consciousness and praxis: a) critical interrogation, b) understanding privilege as a moral imperative, c) ongoing critical reflection, and d) understanding and working through barriers

Introduction

There is a growing interest in leadership for social justice, both in terms of research and leadership development. Specifically, scholars who study social justice have drawn attention to inequitable educational structures and practices present in our current political context in education (e.g. Foster, 1986; Marshall & Olivas, 2006; McKenzie, et al., 2008; Theoharis, 2008). While these scholars vary in terms of their definitions of social justice, they all advocate for the development of school leaders' critical consciousness in order to foster radical social change through education.

A few empirical studies have examined ways in which a principal's critical consciousness contributes to various social justice practices in education (e.g. Cochran-Smith et al., 1999; Theoharis, 2007; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008) or disparate leadership preparation activities that report development of critical consciousness and identity (Boske, 2011; Bruner, 2008; Brunner, Hammel & Miller, 2010; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008); however, these studies have not explicitly linked the development of critical consciousness with leader practice/praxis (Furman, 2012). Further, scholars have not examined specific ways that educational leaders, many of whom are White/middle class, people of privilege, develop the critical consciousness necessary to push forward a social justice agenda. Furthermore, I have found no studies that have examined the ways in which White professors preparing leaders to practice social justice narrate and operationalize their own development of critical consciousness and how this development of critical consciousness informs their praxis and approaches to teaching educational leadership students. This is important because knowledge of self is imperative to lead (Houle & Gimas, 2006) and professors teaching for social justice are leaders within their classrooms and through their research. For the purpose of this study, critical consciousness is defined as critical analysis of oppressive structures that lead to the objectification of non-dominant groups (Freire, 2009). Praxis is defined as the interplay between theory (critical understanding) and reflective action (Freire, 1974, 2009).

Critical consciousness development is necessary to provide leaders with a theoretical framework with which to address marginalizing structures and programs and to promote social justice through transformative practice (Boske, 2011; Johnson et al., 2011; McKenzie et al., 2008); however, scholars have not examined specific ways that educational leaders, many of whom are White/middle class, people of privilege, develop the critical consciousness necessary

to push forward a social justice agenda. Recommendations for leadership preparation programs emphasizing social justice have largely remained theoretical or conceptual (e.g. Jean-Marie et al., 2009; McKenzie et al., 2008) with no empirical studies that address *how* leaders, many of whom are White, narrate their development of critical consciousness as a part of social justice leadership and how having a critical consciousness leads to praxis. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to develop a working theory of how White, privileged individuals develop critical consciousness and what factors bridge consciousness into praxis.

Framing the Need: Sociopolitical Economy and Whiteness

This study is framed in a conception that professors engaging in social justice work must be aware of the marginalizing contexts that create inequity in schools and society. This study frames marginalization in two contextual arenas, the political economy of education and White privilege. To lead for social justice, it is imperative that White scholars leading social justice efforts in the United States must have a criticality of the sociopolitical dynamics of our education system and an understanding of their own privilege.

Political Economy of Education

Critical educational scholars (Apple, 1994; Foster, 1986) whose research utilizes a politico-economic framework highlight the fact that, currently, neoliberal¹ and neoconservative² ideologies guide educational policies and practices. Policies and practices are driven by a political economy designed around the individual as an essentialized worker with the appropriate requisites to participate in a global economy. Critical educational scholars (e.g. Apple, 1994, Foster, 1986, Ylimaki, 2011) argue that these ideologies overlook factors such as race, culture,

¹ Neoliberalism is a market-driven political ideology whereas people are seen as self-interested consumers in a competitive market place (Apple, 1996; Ylimaki, 2011)

² Neoconservatism is a political ideology emphasizing accountability, traditional “American” values, back-to-basics education and conservative moral values (Apple, 1996; Ylimaki, 2011)

gender, and socioeconomic status; leading to a curriculum that perpetuates the status quo rather than one which resolves the structures that lead to failure for many students (Apple, 2004; Foster, 1986). Disregarding the factors that lead to unequal learning and opportunities creates an oppressive, unjust situation that marginalizes some while learning standards become the neutral language of education and mask inequities that lead to differential outcomes for groups of students. Standards become a focal point for policy makers and the general public in their discussions of school quality and school (in)effectiveness, and ignore race, sexuality, gender, language, and other causes of inequity (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009).

Neoliberal (market driven, pro-business) and neoconservative (back-to-basics) ideologies have dominated the discourse and have had serious adverse consequences for marginalized students in America; such as a widening achievement gap, large gaps in graduation rates and college attendance between White and minority students, and discipline practices that push students out of school (Orfield & Lee, 2005). These dominant ideologies legitimize inequality based on a conception of individual student merit and lead to “subtractive schooling” (Valenzuela, 1999), an education that views non-dominant culture students through a deficit viewpoint and is devoid of students’ cultural values and language. Students are encouraged to assimilate to dominant values in order to be successful and are forced to negotiate their identities. Often these students choose to maintain their own individual identities at the expense of educational attainment (see Ogbu, 2003; Lee, 2005). Thus, school practices driven by neoliberal and neoconservative sources define success through one’s belonging to the dominant class or, conversely, as being classified as a marginalized “other”. Therefore, it is imperative that leaders for social justice engage in praxis built upon their critical analysis of oppressive structures that lead to the objectification of non-dominant groups. It is also imperative that leaders for social

justice engage in the interrogation of their own privilege and how this privilege may be consciously/unconsciously complicit in the maintenance of the dominant neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies.

White Privilege

According to Harris (1995), Whiteness is both an individual form of identity and an institutionalized structure of dominance that serves as a “property”. This property allows its owners (Whites) to have psychic and material benefits. Whiteness brings about an advantage for Whites that defines the social norm, benefits those that are in the privileged group, and allows Whites have power and avoid marginalization without thought. McIntosh (2001) referred to the ignorance of those with White privilege as an invisible backpack, an invisible package of unearned assets that can be cashed in every day. This backpack of White privilege is meant to “remain oblivious” and leads Whites to believe their lives are neutral, normal, and average (McIntosh, 2001). Anderson, Taylor, and Logio (2011) defined White privilege as the ability for Whites to maintain an elevated status in society that masks racial inequity. White privilege determines the terms of success and failure because Whiteness is the norm. Members of the privileged (White) group are viewed as successful as the result of individual effort, not their privilege (Lund, 2010). Conversely, members of non-privileged, marginalized groups are viewed through a deficit viewpoint without regard to institutionalized and structural barriers, defining lack of success as an individual lack of effort and hard work.

In the United States, Whiteness marks the dominant culture and denotes what is considered normal and desired (Leonardo & Zembylas, 2013). Masked much like the political economy of education is the privilege that Whiteness brings to both educators and students. This privilege must be problematized and addressed to create a more just educational system and

society. Missing from the extant literature in educational leadership for social justice is the concept of White privilege and the need for those, Whites, involved in social justice work to problematize their privilege. White leaders have the option of “opting out” of racialized situations and “making the choice to do nothing when a problem arises has major implications for social justice” (Marshall & Parker, 2010, p. 237).

Thus, it is imperative that both those teaching and those learning about social justice have a critical consciousness about White privilege, as well as the political economy of education. White privilege coupled with the political economy of education frame the hegemonic conditions in the United States that promote racially neutral discourse, standards-driven educational reforms, and a meritocracy that stresses competition based upon unequal conditions for all involved. Thus, there is a need to better understand critical consciousness development in privileged individuals and what bridges this critical consciousness into praxis.

Methods

This study, situated in Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) Radical Humanist paradigm, seeks not only to understand a phenomenon, but also to remove social constraints that limit the potential of human beings. Work in this paradigm seeks social change and the mitigation of domination from structures and practices in the political and social spheres of life. While grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was utilized as the analytical methodology for this study, critical inquiry was central to the purpose of the study. As Charmaz (2006, 2011) advocated, qualitative researchers should combine a critical stance toward social justice with the analytical tools of grounded theory. Therefore this study utilized a critical grounded theory approach to qualitative research. Critical grounded theory is particularly applicable in this study because extant literature provides an assumption that the context of educational leadership

requires educational leaders to develop a critical consciousness. What is unknown and requires the analytical tools of grounded theory is how professors researching and teaching educational leaders for social justice developed their own critical consciousness and informs the preparation of leaders for social justice work. Furthermore, critical pedagogical recommendations for developing critical consciousness have focused on how marginalized/oppressed populations develop critical consciousness and praxis (Freire, 1974; Freire, 2009), with little focus on the context of those that are in dominant, privileged positions.

Critical Inquiry

A component of social justice inquiry is taking a critical stance toward social structures and processes that affect individual and collective life. Critical inquiry seeks not just to study and understand, but also to critique and change (Patton, 2002). It critiques and challenges, transforms and empowers (Merriam, 2009). Critical inquiry positions this study in the Radical Humanist paradigm because critical inquiry assumes: a) people unconsciously accept things the way they are, and in doing so, reinforce the status quo, b) power, in combination with hegemonic social structures result in the marginalization and oppression of those without power, and c) marginalization and oppression require a focus on context. While the conceptual framework for this study is congruent with these beliefs, the context of this study (educational leaders- specifically White leaders for social justice in the United States) causes dilemmas importing the aforementioned theories (e.g. Freire, 2009) and deductively analyzing data derived from the study. Therefore, a grounded theory approach was pertinent. Grounded theory methods offer the tools necessary for innovative analyses and provide a theoretical lens to work toward the development of a substantive theory of consciousness development and praxis in educational leaders.

Sampling

This study employed purposive snowball sampling to identify professors who have demonstrated research agendas regarding social justice issues and critical consciousness/identity development. Three criteria were developed for sampling professors: a) current professor of educational leadership at an UCEA institution (University Council for Educational Administration), b) program courses include social justice as an emphasis, and c) current research agenda is focused on leadership for social justice, preparation of leaders for social justice, or identification of activities that develop identity or critical consciousness in students. Ten professors were identified and were willing to participate utilizing the purposive criteria and snowball sampling. Sampling also considered location of the professors' current position and public/private nature of the university to provide a geographical overview of the United States.

Data Collection and Analysis

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the ten professors of educational leadership who demonstrate a social justice agenda, with most interviews lasting one hour. Interviews considered professors' personal backgrounds and experiences as well as their narrations regarding critical consciousness development. Questions were open-ended and focused on allowing participants to narrate their experiences. Data were coded using methods consistent with the framework for grounded theory analysis: grounded theory is generated from the data through the use of comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In other words, through the use of grounded theory, theory is built from the data and ideas were developed through analytic writing to develop substantive theory from the beginning of the research.

Data analysis was concurrent with data collection, using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The constant comparative method began with initial line-by-line

coding to identify similarities in the data to conceptualize ideas. Initial coding was followed by focused coding where larger amounts of data were sorted and synthesized and conceptual categories and their properties arose. The strength of the constant comparative method is that as data is inductively coded and themes to develop theory emerge (Charmaz, 2006).

Participants

Ten White professors participated in the study. Participants represent various demographic areas in the United States who worked extensively in research regarding social justice, social justice leadership preparation, consciousness raising, multi-cultural education, and identity development. Reviews of curriculum vitas demonstrated professors met the criterion set forth for participation in the study and participants represent book and journal editors, regular conference presenters regarding social justice issues (e.g. AERA, UCEA), and leading White scholars in the sub-field of educational leadership for social justice. To protect anonymity, participants have been given pseudonyms. Further details regarding participants will be discussed in the background/critical consciousness narrations sections of the findings.

Table 1. Participant Demographics

Participant	Gender	University Type	Location
Paul	Male	Public	East Coast
John	Male	Private/Catholic	East Coast
Dustin	Male	Public	South East
Albert	Male	Public	Northwest
Anne	Female	Public	Midwest
Becky	Female	public	Midwest
Lauren	Female	Private/Catholic	East Coast
Leah	Female	Public	Midwest

George	Male	Public	West Coast
Meg	Female	Public	South

Note: All participants are White Professors at UCEA institutions in the United States

Findings

Participants narrated various experiences that initiated and furthered their consciousness development. For some, specific experiences instilled an understanding of marginalizing structures in our society. For others, a combination of accumulated experiences, ongoing dialogue, and reading, were critical factors in their development. Some reported family as a positive influence in their development while others described barriers from family and mentors. The findings section is divided into two main parts: participants' narrations or stories and then a cross-case discussion of relationships among critical consciousness development, the role of privilege, and social justice praxis.

Participant Narrations of Critical Consciousness Development

In order to honor the participants' stories, the Professors' words were used as much as possible, with some context provided by the author. These are their stories, in their own words when asked to recall their development of critical consciousness.

Professor Becky

Professor Becky grew up in the Midwest where she was indoctrinated into the Catholic Church, and her family's "religion" had a lot to bear on how her family interacted with her in relation to "others". According to Becky, it was the church where she began to understand that there were differences in the way that people were treated. She narrated several instances where

her awareness of the world grew through her experiences, despite negative feedback from family members.

According to Becky, her inquisitive nature got her into trouble because she always asked a lot of questions and her responses to questions did not match the teachings of the church or her parents:

Well according to my parents, I've been like this since I was very little. I used to get in trouble for asking lots of questions. I started getting trouble in second grade, my CCD classes, because we didn't go to the private schools but I started to question the notion of religion. The way we were taught in CCD classes was that you needed to marry a Catholic, you needed to have friends who were catholic, and if you weren't catholic you were going to hell. As an eight year old, I couldn't wrap my head around it. How could this God, quote unquote, who doesn't cast judgment and loves everyone have judgment and send you to this fiery place if you weren't catholic, if you were born in India or if you were Muslim.

Her inquisitive nature led her into first identifying racism when she was in elementary school and later in middle school. Becky discussed two specific situations where she was able to identify sensing racism. The first instance occurred when a boy asked her out in forth grade:

In forth grade, a boy who I didn't know... his name was Tyrone and he asked me to go steady. I asked my mom permission to go steady with him and [mother's response] it was that those people are like animals. You have to date, you marry people, who look just like you. And, that was supposedly in the Bible, and I was very saddened by that, and I knew then that there was something that just wasn't right.

Later, in high school, Becky was once again reminded of the difference between who she was supposed to be and "others". This time, Becky came to experience prejudice due to sexual identity:

Then, in high school I learned about sexual identity. I knew people who were called dike or fags and I didn't even know what those words meant. But I realized that was considered a bad thing and if you hung out with those people you were a fag or a dyke too. My mom and dad caught wind of it and I was told I wasn't allowed to be friends with

those people, or people of color, or people who were Jewish, because they weren't like us.

While understanding that the various 'isms she was exposed to in her childhood were wrong and that questioning experiences were a good thing, Becky continuously struggled with the tensions of family and doing what she knew was right.

Becky reported that one of the main tenets of her program was that working with others requires a deep understanding of self and that this tenet is present in her current work with educational leadership students.

My training as a social worker, one thing that is instilled in you is it begins with you. If you do not understand who you are and what experiences you had and how those experiences shape the decisions you make, the beliefs that you uphold or the values you adhere to, that you could do the people you serve more damage than good.

Becky was also quick to point out that her experience in her educational preparation program did little to build upon her critical consciousness and actually perpetuated socially unjust practices, stating "The very different conversation in education is more about, you're the expert, you're going to instill this in those that you teach, and you have all the power".

Professor Paul

For Professor Paul, critical consciousness development was defined as understanding the need for political and social responsibility. Paul narrated growing up in a political family where activism was promoted from a young age. His family instilled in him a moral imperative to "make the world a better place" and political action meant "we have a social responsibility" toward social justice. While activism was promoted, Paul's family differentiated between conceptions of charity and justice. Paul noted:

There is a big difference between charity and justice. My parents were clear in multiple ways that there are community organizations that are basically charities, but we were not

about that. We were about making the world better. I have become aware of different levels of privilege and what that means, how that plays out.

While Professor Paul identified his critical consciousness as an ongoing process throughout his childhood that continues in his current work, he was able to recall a moment where he felt that his consciousness regarding social activism was too much. He recalled:

I have this memory of being a kid, 8 or 10, something like that, and we had been doing a variety of activist things and we went to this talk about refugees from Nicaragua and I had this feeling that I can't know one more thing. It's too much. I mean I was little; but, I still remember that. That kind of overwhelming feeling, this sucks, right. It is too much to be responsible for.

Paul highlighted that his consciousness development has continued to grow and that this growth is embedded in the need for ongoing reflection. For Paul, this reflection leads to praxis through two “contradictory things”. “One is you have to feel a responsibility to do something, and you have to feel like you are able to do something”. He reiterated that these feelings often are overwhelming and lead to a mental struggle that requires prioritization and timing:

It might be small initially. One part of sort of making peace with it is that doing things that make you feel better, it makes the world better.... Sometimes doing little things has to be enough and sometimes you have to realize that the time is not right for this fight. So it is contradictory because you have to feel responsible and do something but there are times when you can't do everything and it requires ongoing struggle.

Professor Albert

Professor Albert grew up the son of a newspaper reporter in a family that he described as the “guy's family in that movie, *My Big Fat Greek Wedding*”. He recounted that there were likely subtle messages about racism, but issues were never discussed as a family:

My father was a newspaperman and developed a strong sense of equity and a strong sense of exposing things through the newspaper, bringing the truth to people.... But, we never talked about any of that stuff- ever. So there were photos all over his office from doing work in Memphis. He had been engaged in Civil Rights era journalism, but we never really talked about it until much later... If anything, I grew up around subtle messages but not overt messages about that kind of work.

Recalling his experience graduate school, Albert described his work as “traditional” and “neutral”. It was not until his dissertation that his study led him to read critical pedagogical work (e.g. Freire, Giroux, McLaren) that he started thinking about consciousness. Despite his burgeoning interest in critical pedagogy, Albert reported that he was consciously pushed away from critical work while working on his dissertation:

I got into the field, and I was interested in what was going on because I read a lot of value neutral stuff in my program in graduate school and then I sort of came across some of the usual suspects, such as Freire, Peter McLaren, and Henry Giroux ...and started reading them. I said there is something to this critical consciousness and taking a critical perspective on things and then I found Harry Wilcox work which is not something someone would think is critical or social justice oriented, but it awoke in me a passion for ethnography and really trying to more capture people’s stories. [My study] wasn’t really a critical stance, social justice kind of study. Folks on my committee were really urging me not to do that work and one of the two reasons was you must study traditional leadership things like professional development and teacher leadership, stuff like that. I was being told that was the way to get a job and have a career... but at the same time, I was reading these other works and thinking there are other kinds of research out there that are powerful.

It was not until Albert attained a faculty position that his consciousness was developed while working on a study, referred to as his “second dissertation”, that put him at a critical crossroad in his development:

I started doing what I fondly think of as my second dissertation, my second big study, and I was there for about two to three weeks when I was faced with the fact that really the most important thing going on at the school, socially speaking, was racism. So then, I was sort of at this crossroads. I was at a crossroads of continuing down a path of doing this difference neutral, non-activist, non-critical kind of research and knowing that I could have a fine little career in that, or, looking at it and saying you know what, this demands something different. This demands a little more critical interrogation, more of an activist stance toward the research, really more of a social justice orientation towards the whole work in general. I did a little bit of soul searching and a lot of reading during that time and committed whole-heartedly to going down the path of taking a more critical and social justice stance toward the research and went from there to there and developed as a scholar anyway. And, it really developed my thinking about how we engage with different things in schools and also just the way that equity and equality play out in schools.

For Albert, his soul searching led him to a realization that, regardless of the decision to remain value neutral or be critical, he was making a decision to engage in race:

Where I came to when I was at that crossroads, my own critical incident... was doing that research and I said okay, and I talked to people I knew who did critical kinds of work, and people pushed me to ask what is your motive for doing this? What are you trying to do? And I think for me, there were a couple of things... I asked myself, what are my choices? My choices are to, as a social scientist, ignore some of the most important social dynamics of what is happening. To me, that was just bad science. That was intellectually, even if you were able to separate that from the ethical dimension, that is just bad research to ignore that kind of thing or give it just lip service. So I said, as a social scientist, I felt a compelling need to study the issues that were most important and taking it a step beyond that. I said what is it about these issues, and finally came to the realization that whether I engage them or disengage them, whether it becomes a focal point of my research or tangential, what I came to feel is that either by commission or omission, I am engaging issues of race. So what I mean by that is if I am silent on it, then my silence contributes to the opposite perception. My silence contributes to the hegemony of social injustice that we have had in schools and higher education institutions for a long time.

Professor John

Professor John grew up as a child of the 60s. For John, exposure to social movements awoke in him a curiosity and feelings that he needed to do something to help. He explained that his conception of critical consciousness was understanding the world to become a better human being, and that this conception has been born out of a combination of experiences and moral struggle:

For me , my awareness goes back to high school. It was the late 60s, early 70s when I was in high school, so there were a lot of social movements. I can remember being in high school and just feeling bad about the poverty in America, the inner city, thinking that I should drop out of high school and just help people. I had that burning feeling. So, I guess I have always had that feeling .

That feeling of wanting to help led him to a university program in social work, where after a brief time he transferred programs to become an educator because it would allow him to

make an impact quicker, without the need for an advanced degree. It was his work in education that allowed him to “make a difference”, working with inner-city youth. During this time, John became aware of the subtleties of racism:

The school districts where I happened to land, the most obvious, kind of blatant problematic policies were dealt with to a degree. So, it was more kind of a subtle, attitude issues that I think I struggled with and you know you don't always recognize, especially as a young person. You feel that something is wrong but you don't really recognize it.

It was not until he entered his graduate program that John was able to put labels to his feelings around certain inequities. Other marginalizing situations would elude his understanding until later in his life:

I really do think graduate school is what made me become a little more refined, more aware of things. It was a combination of the assigned stuff and those you seek out... Things like race, I was fairly quick to put a label on it. Socioeconomics, I was fairly quick. I guess things like sexual orientation, I did not understand that prejudice. So, I guess it was in graduate school, I started studying things and you hear about White privilege. You don't know, but there are some subtleties even in socioeconomics, the subtleties are there and you don't realize how evasive the dominant group is and how it keeps certain things down.

While John's experiences teaching inner-city youth and graduate school were able to help him identify privilege regarding racial and socioeconomic inequities, his Catholic upbringing continued to cause struggle with understanding sexual identity as a marginalizing structure until a specific incident occurred at a university where he was employed. John recalled this moment as an aha moment in his life:

My aha moment. The President put out a paper that basically said that I'm not going to deal with any of that doctrine stuff. The main point of the teachings is that every human being, you have to respect the sanctity of every human being, and if you are going to do that (oppress LGBT) you can't worry about it. Every human being is sacred.

He wrote this whole paper focusing on the sacredness of every human being and how can you oppress or do these things to individuals that are human beings, so that was my aha moment on that issue. My views on that were shaped, prior to that, on the traditional teachings of the church, teachings that are still very prominent in a lot of places.

John stated that this moment transformed his approach to the world and his focus/struggle has been to become a better human being through togetherness:

If we work together, your struggles entwined in mine, let's pursue that together. That is the only way it is if we are to grow as human beings and expand who we are and move ourselves to a better place. The only way to do that is by understanding those who we have been privileged against, and so the struggle is not about me helping them; the struggle is me helping myself become a more human and a complete part of the human race.

Professor Lauren

A multicultural educator for twenty years, Lauren narrated her development of consciousness as a product of her middle and high school years in the 1960's. According to Lauren her understandings of inequity developed as a result of the Civil rights Movement and the Vietnam War and had little to do with her educator preparation, stating that her memories of leadership preparation were "virtually nothing". What did have an impact on her development of consciousness was her early work in her youth church group and activism in high school:

I actually think I was encouraged by my church ... My family was involved in the United Church of Christ which was a more progressive Protestant denomination and my church was involved in some civil rights work so, I had some emergent experiences early on where our church youth group went and spent three or four days in St. Louis at a black church in which we were exposed to civil rights issues, civil rights struggles that were happening in St. Louis. I also worked with Vista. I was a tutor when I was 13 or 14 with the Vista program – which meant, they would incorporate youth to tutor young people in the downtown area. I also worked with the anti-war group in my high school years, in particular, and sort of headed up that committee in my school and was what would be considered a high school activist. So, I did a lot of activist work like marching and was exposed to worked with the university anti-war committee at the [university] which was in my town. So, I was exposed to a lot of folks who were working around issues of injustice at the time

Later, working in New York City, Lauren's awareness continued to grow through her work developing "professional development and a curriculum development program designed to create awareness around diversity. The program, focused on race and gender, was "spurred on by not just the changing demographics ...but also racial incidents at the time". For Lauren, her experiences during this time were invaluable to her growth: "The 80s and early 90s were a time period in which race equality work was happening globally, not just in NYC and so that continued to create my consciousness around those issues."

Lauren's personal experiences in activism and her understanding of multicultural education framed her consciousness. Her consciousness was also aided through her marriage and children: "My husband is African American and my kids are bi-racial, so my children are now 24 and 30; so, that personally contributed to my awareness as well...living in a predominantly African American neighborhood in New York City".

Professor Dustin

Professor Dustin grew up in a low-income family where he developed a "working class kind of background that always rooted for the underdog". This, and other life experiences led him to his current stance on the need for social justice:

The inequities began really early in my life. It's really about life experiences, not school experiences. Growing up in a ghetto area, and then when my family moved to the projects. That was considered a step up. My parents never got out of the projects.

Dustin explained that his critical consciousness has guided his work as a social justice researcher/educator. In discussing his consciousness, Dustin expressed frustration about the current educational system regarding social justice. With social justice being more prominent in

educational leadership discussions, his frustration comes from seeing little change since the term emerged in educational leadership literature, yet he feels optimistic at the possibilities:

I am probably one of the older people in your interviews so you know the fact that I am more frustrated is because I saw this 15 years ago... It's like I am a bit stressed... I don't lapse into cynicism. Certainly in my writing I am remaining forever idealistic, and even a bit romantic. I think that's important.

Despite his optimism, Dustin remained a realist in our discussion. He emphasized the need for change; however, he highlighted an example of “institutional injustice” that exemplified the current state of education, a situation where the well intentioned are stymied in a system that displaces goals:

Where I live, all the West schools are the White schools and upper middle class, and all the East schools [predominantly minority, lower class] are under zero tolerance policies, uniforms, no electives. The state has taken over so there is not freedom, everything is scripted. I mean we've created a Plessy vs. Ferguson situation in this post brown era. It's just, people who work for the system are stymied. So their kind of frustration, their hearts are in the right place, but their frustration is different from the social justice frustration. Social justice frustration would lead to some kind of action. While everyone else expresses the frustration in terms of NCLB, or Race to the Top, or standardized testing, we know that this is just another way to keep the voices and actions of educators from actually making a difference.

Dustin was wary of the “system” and narrated his experience with the “system” when he was a young man as the catalyst for his own development of critical consciousness. He explained that his consciousness grew out of anger from a system that hinders the goals of individuals living in its confines:

I had gotten into law school, was enrolled in law school, and that's when I received the letter from the draft board. And, I had to make the decision to leave the country or to join the National Guard. I had to figure out what to do to oppose the war. I just wanted to go to law school; but instead, I got politicized by a government policy, and so that's what transformation took place. As an angry young man and then figuring out in my 30s, 40s, and 50s, I had really make peace with my anger and to be successful enough so that I could actually do the work I wanted to do, in terms of political work... I never understood how a U.S. Government could constrain an individual's goals. So from age 22

to age 26- at age 26 you were free- you were not subject to any military action. So for a 4 or 5 year period I was unhappy and feeling oppressed, and then left the country, so I didn't think I wanted to come back. But, then there was graduate school. There were just too many opportunities still in the U.S. that other countries didn't offer.

Dustin's consciousness grew from reflections on his anger. He reevaluated his experiences and used his consciousness to become politically engaged:

It's not just the 60's, but it was Civil Rights, Vietnam, women's rights, that whole compliment of things. If you grew up in those times, it was exciting and if you chose, it was political. I decided its good and I ended up working migrant farm workers. I ended up working with Native Americans. I just was able to take jobs that I always thought I was doing the right thing.

Besides his life experiences, Dustin also referenced the courage that he witnessed as a young professor as a key factor in his development, a factor that has led his work:

I came out of a very traditional doctoral program and I had no idea what critical theory was; and, a colleague and others mentored me in this....It was during those early experiences, and then women faculty who would stand up to injustices. I think Feminism actually preceded social justice as a leadership construct. I would watch the courage of women. And, I would ask myself, how come I don't have that courage to speak out the way these women speak out?

While Dustin's doctoral program did little to enhance his consciousness, life experiences and his reflective nature had an impact on his development of critical consciousness. However, it was the courage of "others", feminist women that modeled for him reflective action.

Professor Meg

Professor Meg grew up in the south and described her critical consciousness development as the desire to understand stratification. For Meg, understanding stratification gives the necessary perspective for doing socially just work. She described her life experiences as the major contributing factors to her development of critical consciousness and her mission of social justice in her work; a mission defined as equity, "teaching to understand that the [educational]

system s not designed or meant to be equitable. It's really about stratification". Confronting this stratification has been at the forefront of her work with students.

According to Meg, her work confronting stratification often led to her being "called in front of the board" in her work as a principal in her district. She discussed fondly, her experiences confronting the educational policies of her district and recounted that her reflections on what social justice is and why she was a social justice leader was what allowed her to do the work:

If I were to say what social justice is, in practice, not so much what it is but how you can live it is to find who you are, start looking and really reflecting on life experiences and seeing the system of social reproduction.

For Meg, reflecting on her practice always led her back to her childhood, a childhood where many of her classmates were marginalized by school policies, teacher practices in her classes, and her awareness that a large part of the historical record was not reported:

It was through my life experience as a child in K-12. As a child, I did not cause problems. I just sat in the back of the room and I knew things just were not right for my classmates. There were a few classmates, particularly minority classmates, classmates that did not speak English. I saw them treated horribly and I was just a child. Reflecting, that is how I've come to realize why I view things the way I do. Why are you a social justice leader? I know that it is because of what I saw happening to my classmates, at what I saw in the textbooks. Look at the high school history books. I mean, part of the story is not being told.

Meg's consciousness arose as she witnessed the marginalizing of others. Her witnessing oppression of so many of her classmates led her to questioning the system of oppression and her seeking to better understand stratification. Her critical consciousness led her to confront this stratification in her work as a principal, and later in her work, as a professor.

Professor Leah

Professor Leah described the process of critical consciousness as identity development. She stated that people's identities "are settled in what we are, or think we are" when "we do not have anyone challenge " the way we present ourselves. The conception of identity development centers Leah's work places where she sees her role as "working with people to defeat them in terms of their identity".

Leah, reflecting upon her role as a professor, expressed her understanding of identity development, noting that people make assumptions about others immediately until being confronted with an alternative experience:

The frustration came for me and was clearly evident for me that when people walked in the door and make judgments within less than a tenth of a second. And, our assertions and assumptions are correct enough of the time that we gain these beliefs around our own intuitions that we are right about other people so we not only reveal ourselves in the first tenth of a second by our skin and other things but also our clothing. All kinds of markers-what it is we think we are or what we want to be.

She noted that, in her experiences, a lack of understanding of privilege is especially problematic for White men and goes on to explain how privilege works:

White men have a harder time with this than most do because they have experience and privilege that is unusual from most. So, they don't know that. You can't tell whether you're being privileged or not. You just make assumptions that people are that way around you, period....One begins to believe that their jokes are funny when they are not, or that their ideas are great; but, maybe other people don't agree. Because they were in a position of privilege, maybe role wise, people deferred to them and they don't know, so they end up with a nonrealistic picture of your worth. You don't know that your jokes aren't funny or that your ideas are no better than anyone else.

Leah demonstrated a deep understanding of White privilege and what Peggy McIntosh (2001) referred to as the "invisible knapsack". White male students, especially, display the

benefits of their White “property”, an advantage that gives power and avoids marginalization of beliefs. For Leah, confrontation of this identity is necessary.

Assumptions and privilege were something that Leah was used to through her experiences growing up, where she was constantly placed in an outsider role:

My parents moved me 27 times in 25 years, so my overarching experience was that of outsider. I moved as much as 3-4 schools in a year. And when that happens, even your records don't follow you. The teachers don't know who you are, don't have records on you and you go and take a seat and you are a quiet girl. I only remember the name of one of my teachers. What happens is the kids that are open to you are those that are outsiders: disabled children, the ones that are made fun of, the ones no one wants to hang out with. They were my friends because they don't have friends.

It was not until her senior year that Leah was able to identify her outsider status juxtaposed with the insider status of other students that she realized privilege:

I did not catch onto the idea of cliques until I was in high school. I think I was a senior. I did not understand the privilege that was going on. I knew what an outsider was, but I did not understand what it meant to be an insider.

Leah's work in identity development is driven by her consciousness of White privilege and her varied experiences as an insider/outsider, brought about by her moving frequently, and her observations and friendships with those often left on the margins. Her identity work further guides her consciousness of the impact that White privilege has on the structures and practices that promote privilege and othering.

Professor George

Professor George grew up in an affluent family in a small community in Canada marked by “lots of poverty”. George's family was one of the wealthiest families in the community, but his parents emphasized that George and his siblings “were never to feel that we were any better than anybody else in the community”.

In our discussion, George defined critical consciousness as a commitment to the practice of social justice that leads to praxis:

It is sort of this constant struggle, which is what I think part of the definition should be, part of the practice. So, it is a constant struggle to alleviate things that make school hard for kids.. There has to be a commitment to that struggle, not just in words.

For George, critical consciousness goes beyond understanding some marginalizing structures and must include groups that are marginalized who often go unmentioned in the social justice literature, yet face oppressive situations in schools:

There are a lot of populations we do not think about like incarcerated youth and the incarcerated males...the deaf and hard of hearing...those that have autism...we have some gender issues we are dealing with. We have some alternative lifestyle issues we are dealing with. These are the things in schools...it is all connected.

Although George described his childhood in Canada as a background for understanding difference, it was not until two specific incidents arose in his life, that he developed an awareness that critical consciousness goes beyond understanding differences. The first incident occurred as a young teacher working with Inuit students at a Canadian school:

Ten percent of my students were from an Inuit population in eastern Canada...I was a bit naïve and green at the time, and a lot of students would come to my classroom and sit in the back and be very quiet. I made the assumption or preconceived notion that THESE people, that was my perception at the time, was that THESE people did not participate, did not care.....I thought there had to be more to this. There is a reason why these students are sitting in the back. They never spoke, they were not creating any kind of havoc or chaos in the classroom. So, I went to my principal at the time and spoke to my colleagues, and asked why is this happening. They said well, that's what THEY do and I thought that was a little bizarre. So, I eventually contacted the elders and invited them to come to class and help with some special lectures....and help me develop meaningful curriculum for them. I realized that I had made an assumption that a population of Inuit at the time did not care about education. And, after I followed up with that and spoke to the elders of the community, it was very clear to me that I had made a very wrong assumption. And a lot of my colleagues had the wrong assumption too. I decided that this

is wrong and we had to do something about it. That's where social justice began to develop for me

George's initial naiveté, the use of the word THESE, and the principal's use of the word THEY, provide an exemplar of how privilege and othering work. It was not until he reached out to Tribal elders to better understand the culture of his students that his consciousness was raised regarding his own and others assumptions.

While George explained the development of his critical consciousness in terms of his upbringing and his work with Inuit populations, it was later that George experienced a family circumstance that would frame his definition of critical consciousness to include special populations:

I have always been interested in special populations. Special populations in my eyes, deal with those who live on the margins or are disenfranchised. There are a couple reasons for that. One I have already shared (Inuit experience), but since then, I have also had microcephaly in my family. Simply meaning that special needs have come to my family....And when it hits home like that, it is personal. You pound the pavement to do what you need to do to ensure that all kids are getting equity and ample opportunities for learning at a high quality.

George's work continues with his life experiences framing his approach to social justice. For George, critical consciousness development and socially just work is in the struggle, the struggle to better understand the circumstances in populations often overlooked in dialogue regarding social justice.

Professor Anne

Professor Anne defined critical consciousness as critical interrogation. She explained critical interrogation as “not just taking things at face value, always questioning. It's just constantly questioning what is presented to you and thinking about alternative ways... the importance of recognizing context, when things are written, and who is being taken into

consideration". Anne attributed her consciousness to her growing up in a diverse area (south) and to her parent's emphasis on education. Growing up in a diverse area, the daughter of educators, Anne was exposed to conversations throughout her childhood:

I come from a family of educators. My mother is a teacher. My brother is a professor and my dad is a professor, so its kind of a family business and it has always been something, I was always into education and I loved school, loved being around young students who have a passion for learning and so for me, it was always growing up in a household where I would come home and hear about things that my father was teaching as a professor.

Anne expressed that her parents values around teaching laid the foundation for her critical understanding, explaining that family discussions centered on criticality:

It's more like a dialogue, where we go back and forth and we are very critical about things. So yeah, it's just been something that has always, education has always been something in my family that's been highly valued and I do a lot of policy work.

This criticality aided Anne in her youth when she experienced her own injustices based upon her religion and wanted to understand at a deeper level:

I feel like growing up, I'm Jewish and I've been, it's not the same as saying I am a person of color, difference, we're all different, but I have experienced injustice in my life and have learned, not learned, but recognized that just because I am not of a majority population doesn't mean that what I am is wrong. And, I think that is something that has always been in the back of my mind that I can understand it to some extent so I want to do everything to understand it even more, inequities that people face. So, that has helped me a little bit and who I am as a person.

Anne differed from many of the participants in that her religion led to her own experiences of injustice. Despite her own experiences, Anne also recognized that her experiences also come with privilege, a privilege not experienced by others.

Critical Consciousness and Development

Critical consciousness as critical interrogation. Participants described their critical consciousness development in a myriad of ways including identity development, awareness of

inequity, understanding the need for political and social responsibility, critical interrogation, understanding the world through social struggle, and becoming a better social scientist. For some participants (e.g. George, Paul), it was the role of family that encouraged their growth in understanding privilege and social inequities. Conversely, for Becky, the family was a potential barrier to consciousness, actually promoting a separatist ideology that valued othering. Others, (e.g. Lauren, John) identified the social movements of their youth as the impetus for their critical consciousness development.

While participants experienced some marginalizing and oppressive situations (e.g. Dustin's Vietnam War experience, Anne's experiences growing up Jewish), it was the observation and critical interrogation of the experiences of marginalized populations that pushed further development in the participants' growth of critical consciousness. Seeing oppression and "knowing it just wasn't right" led to further inquiry and a desire to positively impact the oppressive conditions of others through their former work in social work, political activism, policy, and practitioners of K-12 education; ultimately guiding the participants to work in universities to prepare leaders to confront the status quo in education. Furthermore, it is important to note that many participants cultivated their critical consciousness development through experiences and self-study, lacking mentoring and exposure to critical works in their preparation programs.

Role of privilege. Throughout the interviews, participants raised the concept of privilege, both in terms of benefits and a moral imperative to do something with that privilege. While consciousness regarding privilege does not necessarily lead to praxis, the professors in this study saw their role as privileged, critically conscious scholars and educators, as using this privilege to

benefit those on the margins and students unaware of social and structural inequities. For some, this has not come without questioning their intentions.

For example, several of the participants have been questioned about their role in promoting social justice leadership. According to George, he is confronted by the question of what gives him the right to promote social justice regularly:

Funny thing is there are so many people out there that think we have no right to be studying or talking about social justice because we are white. What are we trying to be socially just about? We have all the privilege we need around us. That's true. We have a lot of privilege, but what we do not have is equity for those around us that feel that they do not have equity, so for us to turn our deaf ears or blind eyes to that, is wrong.

George noted that his response is to “simply acknowledge that I do have privilege. What I want is to use that privilege to create opportunities”.

Similarly, Albert stated that his privilege allows for the creation of space for social justice work to occur. For Albert, privilege brings with it a moral imperative to understand that there is a difference between being an activist, an ally, and savior. He viewed privilege as an opportunity for creating space, but not as taking the role of savior. He has found himself “wrestling with [privilege] my whole career doing this kind of work” and values the criticality of others regarding White people doing social justice work. According to Albert, the idea of doing this work as a White professor requires reflection on intentions for doing the work: “I think on one hand you have the white people as savior crap that is out there... poor black people, white people saving the day kind of stuff, and I think that it's a very slippery slope from being well-intentioned to being exploitative also”. For Albert, his role as a teacher and a researcher has kept him grounded. He stated that his work focuses on the fact that “ignorance is not on the table” and that as a researcher he has realized that by “commission or omission, I am engaging in issues of

race...If I am silent on it, then my silence contributes to the hegemony of social injustice that we've had in schools and higher education institutions for a long time".

John identified the concept of privilege as an ongoing struggle, one that he reflects upon through daily meditation, knowing that there is a quandary in his work, one that requires giving up a privilege that is not truly his to give up:

To give up privilege is the only way to deal with it [social and racial inequity] on a real level. It is hard to give up that privilege. You try to even though you can't really give up privilege. I am who I am, and I have benefitted from it and continue to benefit from it. You hope to give it up, some of that, but you never really do. So, it is a constant struggle.

An understanding of privilege and knowing that privilege cannot simply be given away has allowed participants to participate in the social justice conversation in ways that others may not have been able. Participants highlighted several ways that privilege has allowed them to participate in social justice discourse. Likewise, Becky became aware of the role of privilege when she was hired as an assistant principal at a predominant minority, low socioeconomic school. According to Becky, she was hired because of her moral imperative and her Whiteness allowed her to promote a social justice agenda in ways that her African American principal could not. Becky stated:

Actually, she [principal] asked me to come and join them because of my work at the high school and what we did was, she knew that I could say things that she couldn't say because as a black woman. If she was to say 'their discriminatory behaviors towards our black children', the white teachers would say "well of course you're saying that because you're a black woman"...what I did was I used my white privilege then to speak with people who identify this way and I started to collect data regarding who was coming to the office, how much school they were missing because of that, what disciplinary or I should say what allegations were being presented to these particular children.

George recalled a different situation regarding his privilege, whereas his privilege allowed him to bring up the marginalization of a colleague in a university faculty meeting.

Using his privilege, he confronted the silencing of an African American peer, calling out other professors for their lack of awareness:

I had an African American colleague, male, who stood up at one of our faculty meeting and raised an issue... and it was pretty much just well, thank you for sharing that and that was it. I thought, that's not good enough. There's an issue being raised here and it had to do with not serving the underserved well enough at our university. I said you know what, I'm glad you brought it up, what do you think of the reaction you got? He said 'I don't think there was a reaction. It was just ok fine, another African American male you know beating the pavement unnecessarily'. I thought that's interesting, so I said to him, do you mind if I make the same issue? He said 'yes, please do and let's see if we get the same reaction'. I did. I raised the same issue and I got a completely different reaction. At that point, I said to the group, this is really important. I'm glad we're talking about this; but, what I'm doing is repeating what he just said and I'm getting a very different reaction. We need to talk about this. There is a dialog that is being silenced. There is an elephant in the room and its white. So, let's take that white elephant and let's talk about it.

For Leah, her privilege allows her to disrupt the “false” identities of her students, bringing race to the forefront and allowing her to confront gender and White privilege. She noted that without dismantling the identities of her students, those that are privileged remain the norm and remain empowered in class discussions. She noted that “white men have a harder time with this than most because they have experience and privilege that is unusual from most”. It is important for her to bring forth the conception of privilege because “you can't tell whether you are privileged or not. You just make assumptions that people are that way around you”. When identities of her students are “dismantled”, students are often given a voice where they have had none and students who usually dominate are able to see “their ideas are no better than anyone else's”. Similarly, Anne identified her critical awareness surrounding concepts of privilege and race as a guide for her willingness to discuss and confront topics of privilege and inequity in her classes.

George summed up the conception of privilege that drives the work of the participants, commenting, “If I can use my privilege to help create opportunities for those that live on the

margins, then why would I not want to do that? For the participant professors, privilege requires both critical consciousness and praxis. These concepts were identified in the ways that the participants have understood their privilege, wrestled with their privilege, and utilized their privilege to create spaces for bridge building, ongoing dialogue, and research regarding social justice issues. While they have used privilege to create these spaces, their critical consciousness and praxis have led several of them to be critical of both their work in social justice/social justice leadership and the impact that social justice preparation in their program has had on leadership students in their courses. In the next section, participants' reflections on the field problematize the work of social justice researchers and identify barriers for social justice leaders taking newly found awareness of social inequities and privilege into K-12 settings.

Critical Consciousness about Social Justice Meaning and Praxis

While many of the participants spoke of social justice in terms of racial equality, equity for gender and sexual orientation, inclusion, and transforming structural inequity, the participants also problematized the term and its use in both the literature and teaching.

Dustin problematized the use of the term social justice in response to how researchers approach the term with a priori assumptions of what social justice is. For Dustin, the term must be defined in context and the researcher should be the "last person on the food chain who should know what social justice is... It is not for researchers to pontificate". As stated by Dustin, "You don't go out and define social justice. What you do is listen to the injustices, the problems, the situations, and the various solutions that the people are parceling out and you get engaged in those kinds of conversations to the best of your ability".

Similarly, Leah found the use of the term social justice problematic. She stated social justice is an "oxymoronic" term because "it comes out of the legal realm where fairness or

following policy to deliver consequences no matter what the circumstances is justice”. Leah questioned whether we should be focusing on a “notion of care versus justice”.

Although Dustin and Leah problematized the a priori definitions researchers bring to their work and the use of the term social justice, other participants found issue with the exclusion of aspects leading to marginalization in its usage. For Laura, social justice often overlooks culture as a key component of inequity and identified the accountability movement as a barrier to its inclusion in social justice leadership:

The reason I bring up the culture piece is that’s been more associated with multicultural education but it’s been less associated with leadership and social justice... Whose culture is represented whose culture is not. I would expect to see leaders looking at the curriculum and actually working with curriculum around inclusion of multicultural and culturally responsive curriculum. I think that’s one issue that is really hard for people to take on, particularly looking at the curriculum and changing the curriculum, based on the high stakes tests.

Agreeing with Laura that specific groups are often overlooked when the term social justice is used, George noted, “there are populations we do not think about”. Meg reiterated George’s views when she discussed the notion of silencing. For Meg, silencing can create an oppressive situation where we miss out on an opportunity to “know more and be in a situation where people could hear others think critically about what we are doing and why we are doing it”.

While some of the participants discussed social justice in terms of misuse and missing components of the definition, Anne feels that the term social justice is often used neutrally to avoid real discussion and dialogue:

I feel that when a lot of people use social justice they try to use it to encapsulate a lot of different things and that tends to bother me a lot. Because, I feel like a lot of times people say social justice, so I am talking about race, gender, diversity, sexuality etc. So it is really context specific. I use social justice a lot specifically in my work. I use race and class. That’s the meaning that I give to it, looking at equity in terms of race and class. If

you want to talk about, if you want to be a proponent of social justice, be specific about what you're talking about.... I feel like, sometimes social justice is used as a safe word when you don't want to talk about immigration, or talk about race, or talk about language. I just have a problem with people talking about, you know, if we are going to talk about something, tell me what we are talking about and don't sugar coat it.

Despite the problematizing the use of the term social justice, participants still believe it is necessary to provide an education that provides students with the critical understanding of social and structural inequities necessary to create more equitable schools and society. George highlighted this when he stated the necessity for creating "equitable opportunities for advancement and improvement, whether it be personal or professional". Similarly, Meg noted the need for students and leaders to "start looking and really reflecting on life experiences, and seeing the system of social reproduction in a different way".

Barriers. While the participants agreed that leadership preparation should provide an emphasis on critical consciousness and social justice, they also identified several barriers for leaders implementing theory into practice. These barriers included standards-based certification requirements for leadership preparation programs, the system of accountability in K-12 education, barriers for the individual in their role promoting social justice, and a lack of support.

Accreditation and certification

Several participants were critical of the process for accreditation of leadership preparation programs and the removal of the terms social justice from NCATE standards. These participants believed that the accreditation process and standards for leaders de-emphasize the importance of social justice in the work of leadership practitioners.

For example, Lauren, in a discussion regarding her department's recertification was critical of how standards indicators disregard social justice and emphasize maintenance of the status quo:

Although on the face it looks like they're [indicators] neutral; actually, when you look at them more critically, you realize that they have a particular vision of a leader. And, it's not particularly a social justice leader. So, the challenge for university professors; if we had challenged that, our program wouldn't be certified... If you're going to challenge the status quo, you still have to keep your programs going. So, we attempt to do the work and the course work that goes beyond those. I mean it's really a kind of a bureaucratic task to just sort of show where those are aligned.

Similarly, Dustin was critical of the nature of standards and how requiring quantification of the standards leads away from social justice work, putting emphasis on practices that perpetuate the status quo:

Social justice was taken out of the standards because they did not know how to measure it. And, so often, good ideas that educators have, when you are talking to evaluators, when you can't measure it, they become the tail that wags the dog.

While participants were critical of the evaluation and certification components of our educational system, they were also critical of the system of accountability; specifically the delegitimizing of public education and the overwhelming pressure it puts on educators.

Dustin spoke in terms of stymying of social justice leaders. For him, the "system" has its own constraints that principals and superintendents feel:

People who work for the system are stymied. Their kind of frustration is different from social justice frustration. Social justice frustration would lead to some kind of action, while everyone else expresses frustration in terms of NCLB, Race to The Top, or standardized testing. This is just another way to keep the voices and actions of educators from actually making a difference. It is all about displacement of goals.

He went on to further discuss what he meant by displacement of goals. Dustin identified the privatization of public education and the inability for criticality in the system of accountability as barriers to social justice work:

If we can't have social justice in education, it's crazy. Because, the purpose of public education is to redistribute resources. It was public education for the public good. As public education loses legitimacy and is depicted as a special interest for the private good, private goals surpass the public notion of public education. When we create a

system that does not allow for decent, critical friends, devil's advocates, we fire people who say things. We label them as mavericks, troublemakers, all of those things shut down social justice leaders.

Like Dustin, Paul and Becky also identified system of accountability as a barrier towards social justice in schools. Becky defined the barrier of accountability as the overwhelming demands that accountability brings, demands that often take precedence over socially just leadership. She noted, students who have developed consciousness get “caught up in other demands”, demands and mandates that during their program the students did not perceive as “going to stop” them, but then “they become overwhelmed”. For Paul, the system of accountability has raised students test scores, but at a larger price, creating schools that are welcoming:

We don't talk about that enough, I think, with the rapidly increasing pressures, hostility towards public schools; schools are becoming places that no one wants to be. Even if kids are reading at higher rates, that is not socially just. Who wants to spend that many hours in a place that feels like a prison?

Individual Barriers and Lack of Support

Albert described what others described as the classic rationale for the choice of leaders to avoid social justice leadership. What he described as the “classic rub” on promoting social justice efforts with practitioners is that leaders “have mouths to feed at home...I cannot afford to lose my job to stand up on principle. Similarly, Dustin described leader's choice to avoid socially just leadership in terms of the effects of living in a capitalistic society. He stated:

What I experience on a day-to-day reality are people in their late twenties and early thirties who have locked themselves into lifestyles.... In many senses, people in their late twenties and thirties have decided they want to live like people who are forty and fifty years old in the old days. They feel like rushing into lifestyles that are driven by material realities and they don't see doing it differently because when you present them with radical alternatives, they aren't going to choose those.

Although job security and the need to maintain a certain lifestyle were identified as barriers, the personal toll of leading for social justice was also mentioned as a tremendous barrier. Paul noted that becoming critically conscious is painful and comes at a price each time inequity is presented. He said, “once your eyes are open to social justice, you see it at every turn. ..they see injustice and it hurts”. Despite the pain, Paul felt that leaders are better for knowing: “They’re smarter for it, but never having wrestled with that pain, they feel it time and again. For those that take their critical consciousness and enact socially just leadership, there are consequences beyond the emotional pain. According to Paul, “being ahead of the curve in pushing people about big issues, it hurts. It causes emotional damage; it can cause professional damage, relationship damage. It’s recognizing that there is a toll”.

While drawing lines regarding socially just issues comes at a personal toll, Meg and Becky said that it is the pain of having little support that creates the barrier for social justice leadership. Meg noted several interconnected areas that go unsupported for principals partaking in socially just leadership: teacher wants, parents, and the board. According to Meg, “The teachers have this vision of the perfect classroom, and THAT child should be moved, THAT child should be put in ISS, suspend the child, or call the parent, and everything will be fine”. She noted that when principals stand up and do the right thing to oppose deficit perspectives, they get “no support from the district because they don’t get it. They have pressure from a board that doesn’t get it, and from parents that don’t really care about all kids, just their own”.

Participants were able to identify several circumstances that may prevent critical consciousness awareness developed in social justice leadership preparation programs from reaching fruition as praxis for school leaders. Although these barriers exist, participants

displayed a belief that these barriers can be overcome to achieve praxis, led by a critical consciousness based in the critique of our current political economy in education.

Toward a Theory of Critical Consciousness Development in Leadership

This study provided insight into relationships among necessary components of consciousness development, the role of privilege, the necessity of ongoing reflection, and potential barriers (structural and otherwise) to those engaged in the work of social justice leadership. While it is clear that their efforts are to create opportunity for a more just schooling system and society, the professors also indicated the need to problematize the term social justice in its use in the literature and conversations with practitioners of educational leadership. Specifically, the professors in this study demonstrated four key characteristics for both critical consciousness development and praxis for White privileged individuals:

- Critical interrogation of the political economy of education and the marginalization of non-privileged populations,
- Understanding that privilege comes with a moral imperative to “do something” to positively impact the understanding of and action for transformation of circumstances faced by marginalized populations,
- Ongoing critical reflection, and
- Understanding and working through barriers

Thus, findings from this study extend the extant literature on critical consciousness development in education (e.g. Boske, 2011; Kumashiro, 2000; Freire, 2009)

Critical Interrogation

Participants in the study demonstrated an understanding of the political economy of education and its role in both subtractive schooling practices and creation of barriers for socially

just work in schools. Although the participants developed their critical consciousness in a variety of ways (family values, activism, marginalization of peers, personal experiences with systemic barriers), the commonality was their openness to critically interrogate the system of education and the desire to do something about it. Understanding for some developed in childhood; while, others developed awareness later in life. Despite the timing of their awareness, the critical interrogation of the system led all participants down paths where they sought further understanding and developed research agendas that deepened their critical consciousness through their scholarship. While critical consciousness alone does not guarantee praxis, the participants felt that their consciousness brought forth a need to transform current practice to benefit those marginalized within the current system. This need carried forth a moral imperative to use their privilege to create space for socially just work. Scholars (e.g. Apple, Ylimaki) have identified the standardization of curriculum and the accountability movement as common ground in education for Neoliberals, Neoconservatives, authoritarian populists, and the new middle class. Labeling the melding of these group's interests as the New Hegemonic Alliance in education, this alliance has created a meritocratic system that values competition and accountability, overshadowing the structures that marginalize many students in schools. Students that benefit from the system are seen as successful, while others are presented with a subtractive (Valenzuela, 1999) form of schooling, placing blame on the individual for a lack of success.

Moral Imperative of Privilege

Participants in the study demonstrated a deep understanding of their privilege, White and other privilege juxtaposed to marginalization (e.g. sexual orientation, disability) in our discussions. Having benefitted throughout their lives from privilege, many identified that a deeper understanding of different aspects of privilege developed as their critical consciousness

developed. Understanding privilege, the participant professors indicated that their awareness of the marginalizing structures in society and education carry with it a moral imperative for action. Participants in the study indicated that that this moral imperative drives their work.

For the participants in the study, the moral imperative to transform marginalizing structures was the bridge between critical consciousness and praxis. The belief in the moral imperative did not allow for ignorance of situations of marginalization; rather, the moral imperative guided the desire to participate in socially just actions and activities. Understanding privilege meant naming privilege and dictated the need to create spaces for their privilege to benefit others. It also brought forth an understanding that choosing to deny privilege, its existence, and its power, promotes the status quo and makes those that ignore privilege complicit in the hegemony of the political economy that leads to oppressive and marginalizing circumstances. For the participants in the study, that was not an option. Peggy McIntosh (2001) described White privilege as an invisible backpack that allows Whites to believe that their lives are neutral and normal; yet, they possess unearned assets that provide benefits on a daily basis. White privilege allows Whites to avoid marginalization and provides them with identities framed in an institutional structure of dominance (Harris, 1995) where these unearned assets, products of skin color, provide opportunities not afforded non-Whites.

Ongoing Critical Reflection

Only through critical consciousness can praxis occur. Critical consciousness frames transformative action and transformative action is critically analyzed, theorized, and adapted (Freire, 2009). As structures and practices are problematized and people are able to provide deep interpretations of problems, people theorize their conditions and test these theories through action and reflection. While the participants in this study demonstrated critical consciousness of

the effects of marginalization, problematized the political economy of education's marginalizing effects, and identified the moral imperative of their privilege as the impetus for their work, participants also demonstrated ongoing reflection regarding their work.

Critically reflecting upon their work, many of the participants questioned both the term social justice and the effects of their work researching and preparing leaders for social justice. According to North (2006), social justice is an under-theorized concept and there is little agreement to a specific definition in terms of education and leadership (Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009). Various conceptions of social justice have emerged in the literature and often these different conceptions create tensions in agreement of a universal definition of social justice. Social justice has been defined in terms of equity, equality, affirmative action, diversity, and inclusion (Blackmore, 2004). Jean-Marie et al. (2009) defined social justice as equitable schooling that addresses issues of race, gender, diversity, marginalization, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and identity. Theoharis (2007) agreed that equitable schooling is essential, he noted that social justice is about inclusion, especially inclusion of students with disabilities. Similarly, scholars have argued that socially just education needs to address the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students (Capper et al., 2006; Lugg, 2003).

Although there are no agreed upon meanings applied to the term social justice, equity is a constant across all definitions. However, social justice is also about transformation. Participants' critical reflections highlighted the lack of transformation in policy and practice and wondered if we can really call it social justice if it does not transform society. Others indicated that there are socially just practices in schools, but these practices have had little impact on the greater society. Therefore, many participants noted, despite their own work regarding social justice and educational leadership, that social justice may be an inappropriate term because it has not led to

transformation. They reported that the term is often used as a neutral term to discuss marginalization without specifically naming racism, sexism, bias against sexual orientation and disability, and other ism's, moving away from the purpose of education for social justice. The use of the term allows for these ism's to go unnamed and unchanged and may be a barrier to discussing issues to the extent necessary for transformation.

While the term social justice came into question, effects of the work preparing socially just leaders were also mentioned. For some participants, there was evident frustration that leaders preparing to be socially just often face barriers to implementing socially just practices in their work in schools. According to the participants, few students trained in the programs of the participants have taken their critical consciousness to praxis. Emphasizing this point, there has been little empirical research to demonstrate that preparation for social justice has led to more socially just schools. Furthermore, Furman (2011) discussed the lack of research regarding praxis. Participants highlighted several barriers preventing people from implementing socially just practice including standardization and accountability, lack of district support, and the personal toll that it takes to be a socially just leaders. Without addressing these barriers, some participants saw little hope for social justice being an emphasis.

Despite the "problems" regarding the work of social justice, the participants used their critical reflection to adapt their approaches to socially just work. All seemed to understand the potential for social justice and seemed hopeful that socially just practices could overcome the barriers. Stressing the potential, several participants identified the legitimacy social justice has gained at conferences such as UCEA and AERA, and in educational publications. If anything, participants' reflections identified areas to address in the future and a deep understanding that we are at the beginning of the growth of social justice in educational leadership. Thus, participants

continue to theorize the current condition, test these theories through action and reflection, and adapt their approaches to the work. Although some of the critical reflections of their work may seem nihilistic, the participants remained hopeful that their work would benefit those that are marginalized and aid in the transformation of educational leadership approaches and societal change. The barriers presented can be overcome, much like some have overcome barriers in their work.

It is logical to infer that the key characteristics of consciousness development and bridging praxis for those that are White and privileged, who research, publish, and teach leadership for social justice and consciousness raising, apply to the way that we instruct future leaders for leading socially just schools. These characteristics: a) critical interrogation of marginalizing structures and practices, b) the moral imperative of using privilege for transformation, c) ongoing critical reflection, and d) working through barriers inform how we can embed practices into the classroom that develop these traits and provide support for students engaged in the work of social justice. Creating space for students to conceptualize and problematize the policies and structures of the political economy of education, differentiation in traditional conceptions of leadership and socially just leadership, and identification of the role that privilege plays in praxis is a necessary first step for developing socially just leaders.

The study deepens understandings how leadership preparation programs could approach bridging critical consciousness and praxis in privileged students and extends extant conceptual literature by adding to a limited empirical base for programs preparing leaders to do social justice work. Specifically, differentiation in approaches is necessary to develop socially just leaders, and although students may come to programs with a lack of critical awareness, it can be developed. Preparation programs may want to include study in other disciplines (e.g. social

work, counseling) where a main tenet is the understanding of one's self to aid in development of consciousness and provide students with an opportunity to better interrogate their current beliefs. Additionally, the study of White privilege in leadership preparation would allow for privileged students to interrogate their own bias and privilege, building upon critical pedagogical approaches of teaching about the marginalization, oppression, and othering of marginalized persons. Studying whiteness allows for both privileged and marginalized students to critically engage in a dialogue about race and privilege, giving voice to marginalized groups about their experiences with(out) privilege. Additionally, providing both White students and minority students the space to critically interrogate the political economy of education, critique the term social justice, and the identify the role privilege plays in education could build upon students' prior understandings of their own experiences and guide the moral imperative to do something to confront the status quo. Lastly, preparation programs should provide support systems (e.g. ongoing mentoring for students beyond graduation, cohort groups, alumni networks) so that students do not have to face the work of social justice leadership alone.

Further research is necessary to better understand critical consciousness development in professors teaching social justice and students who have engaged in preparation programs emphasizing social justice. Students exiting socially just preparation programs could provide insight into critical consciousness development, praxis, and barriers to praxis. Lastly, researchers should identify acting social justice leaders in K-12 settings for case studies to identify leaders' development of critical consciousness and how critical consciousness was bridged into praxis. Barriers and limitations to the work of social justice leaders could be further be identified, as well as, specific strategies for overcoming these barriers.

References

- Anderson, G. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, M., Taylor, H., & Logio, K. (2014). *Sociology: The essentials* (8th Ed.). Independence KY: Cengage Learning.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. (1999). *Power, meaning, and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the right way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Applebaum, B. (2009). Is teaching social justice a liberal bias? *Teachers College Record*, 111(2), 376-408.
- Banks, J. (1995). *Multicultural education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blackmore, J. (2009). International response essay: Leadership for social justice: A transnational dialogue. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4 (1), 1-9.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education group.
- Bogotch, I. (2000). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 138-156.
- Boske, C. (2011). Audio and video reflections to promote social justice. *Multicultural Education and Technology Journal*, 5(1), 70-85.
- Brunner, C., Hammel, K., & Miller, M. (2010). Transforming leadership preparation for social justice: Dissatisfaction, inspiration, and rebirth- an exemplar. In S. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cambren-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19(1). 201-222.
- Campbell-Stephens, R. (2009). Investing in diversity: Changing the face and heart of educational leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 29(3), 321-331.
- Capper, C., Alston, J., Gause, C., Koschorek, J., Lopez, G., Lugg, C. & McKenzie, K. (2006). Integrating lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender topics and their intersections with other areas of difference into leadership preparation curriculum: Practical ideas and strategies. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16(2), 142-157.
- Charmaz, K. (2009). *Constructing grounded theory*. New York: Sage.
- Cochran-Smith et al. (1999). Seeking social justice: An education faculty's self-study. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 2(3), 229-253.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Diemer, M. & Blustein, D. (2006). Critical consciousness and career development among urban youths. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(2), 220-232.
- Doyle, L. (2004). Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14(4), 352-377.
- Duncan-Andrade, J. (2005). Developing social justice leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 70-73.
- English, F. W. (2005). Educational leadership for sale: Social justice, the ISLLC standards, and the corporate assault on public schools. In T. Creighton, S. Harris, & J. C. Coleman

- (Eds.), *Crediting the Past, Challenging the Present, Creating the Future* (pp. 83-106)
Huntsville, TX: National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Furman, G. (2011). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(4), 469-484.
- Giroux, H. (2007). *Democracy, education, and the politics of critical pedagogy*. In McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. (1985). *Introduction*. In Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. & Giroux, S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Glass, R. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 15-25.
- Glatthorn, A. & Jallal, J. (2009). *The principal as a curriculum leader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gramsci, A. (2000). *The Antonio Gramsci reader (D. Forgacs editor)*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hafner, M. (2005). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson.
- Harris, S. (2006). Changing leadership paradigms and practices of doctoral students. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, 2(5), 5-11.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (8th Ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A., & Brooks, J. (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.
- Johnson, L. et al., (2011). Leadership preparation for culturally diverse schools in Cyprus, Norway, and the United States. In Ylimaki, R. & Jacobson, S. US and cross-national policies, practices, and preparation. Springer.
- Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Evolution for survival*. In McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 25-53.
- Lee, S. (2008). *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Leonardo, Z. & Zembylas, M. (2013). Whiteness as technology of affect: Implications for educational praxis. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 46(1), 150-165.
- Leistyna, P. (2007). *Neoliberal nonsense*. In McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Lugg, C. (2003). Sissies, faggots, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation and a new politics of education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, 95-134.
- Lund, C. (2010). The nature of white privilege in teaching and training adults. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 125(18).
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson.
- McIntosh, P. (2001). *White privilege: Unpacking the invisible backpack. Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- McKenzie et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- McKenzie, K., Sklra, L., & Scheurich, J. (2006). Preparing instructional leaders for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 158-170.
- McLaren, P. (1999). A pedagogy of possibility: Reflecting upon Paulo Freire's politics of education. *Educational Researcher*, 49-56.
- McLaren, P. & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mullen, C. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: A social justice perspective of educational quality and practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Fall 2008, 137-153.
- Mullen, C., Harris, S., Pryor, C., & Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: Tensions, actions, and principals in action. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18, 224-248.
- Ogbu, J. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. London: Erlbaum.
- Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (2005). Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality. *The Civil Rights Project*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Orr, T. (2011). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1, 492-524.
- Orr, T. (2010). Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 114-172.
- Ravitch, D. & Thernstrom, A. (1992). *The democracy reader: Classic and modern speeches, essays, poems, declarations, and documents on freedom and human rights worldwide*. New York: Perennial.
- Richardson, L. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shaull, R. (2009). *Foreward*. Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge Press.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. New York: Sage.

- Sturman, A. (1997). *Social justice in education*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Theoharis, G. & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing school leaders. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Watts, R., Diemer, M., & Voight, A. (2011). Critical consciousness: Current status and future directions. *New Directions for Adolescent Development*, 134, 43-57.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ylimaki, R. (2011). *Critical curriculum leadership: A framework for progressive education*. New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX B

**DAVIS K-8 SCHOOL: UTILIZING TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP TO
DRIVE INCLUSIVE PRACTICE**

**Thad Dugan
University of Arizona**

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Abstract

Scholars have been calling for educational leadership that emphasizes socially just practices to restructure school policies and practices to create an equitable schooling experience for all students. The case of Davis K-8 exemplifies how a more traditional model of leadership (transformational leadership) coupled with a professional learning community model has created socially just practices that fully include the school's deaf and hearing-impaired students. Davis has recreated the school environment to truly value participation from all students. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, data were gathered that highlight the practices that drive the inclusive culture of the school. Implications for practice include the impact that a socially just vision can have in more traditional leadership models and provides a model for including students with disabilities into the school culture.

“Unless school professionals see themselves as advocates for more equitable placement of children, they are colluding in a tracking system that is unjust” (Anderson, 2009, p.24). This quote lies at the heart of this chapter. Presented in this chapter is the case of Davis K-8 School, a real-life example how transformational leadership can be utilized to promote socially just practices (inclusion of students with disabilities in mainstream classes with non-disabled peers). The Davis case is an exemplar of how social justice leadership “moves beyond present day definitions of school leadership” (Theoharis, 2008) and responds to criticisms (i.e. Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008) that there is minimal literature linking leadership for social justice and inclusive schooling.

The chapter begins with an overview of literature on social justice leadership and inclusion. This is followed by contextual information about Davis K-8 School and the methods used to gather data. Next, transformational leadership is defined and this provides the framework for presenting Davis' development of inclusive practices. The chapter concludes with a brief

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

discussion of implications for practitioners and scholars promoting social justice leadership in preparation programs.

Social Justice Leadership

Over the past decade, educational leadership scholars have moved beyond an emphasis on school management to emphasize the need to transform society through schools (e.g. Otunga, 2010). These scholars have called for leadership that confronts inequitable structures and practices that marginalize portions of the student population while privileging others (e.g. Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2002; Marshall & Oliva, 2005). While it is not uncommon for some leaders to effect change by encouraging instructional leadership, distributed leadership, or transformational leadership models to support effective instruction, some leaders adopt other approaches to explicitly address inequities. Often at the forefront of transformative discourse is the call for leadership for social justice.

Bogotch (2002) noted, “there are no fixed or predictable meanings of social justice prior to engaging in educational leadership practices”; however, scholars have presented various conceptions of social justice leadership that link leadership practices with the transformation of school structures and practices. While social justice leadership is at the core of transformative educational change, an agreed upon definition remains elusive.

For example, McKenzie, Sklra, and Scheurich (2006) viewed the role of the leader for social justice as a change agent whom confronts issues of inequity and transforms traditional, marginalizing practices to more just practices. Similarly, Theoharis (2007) argued that leaders

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

for social justice guide schools to transform the culture, pedagogical practices, and school-wide priorities to benefit marginalized populations. Others have defined social justice leadership in terms of advocacy leadership (Anderson, 2009), moral transformative leadership (Foster, 1986), culturally responsive leadership (Johnson et al., 2011), and inclusive leadership (Doyle, 2004; Sapon-Shevin, 2003). Despite the differences in approaches presented by each of these scholars, a common thread among them is the focus on leaders promoting equitable schooling that addresses issues of race, gender, diversity, marginalization, gender, religion, sexual orientation, language, ability, and identity. While equitable schooling is essential, social justice, for the purpose of this chapter, is about inclusion, especially inclusion of students with disabilities.

Inclusion is premised on a belief that inclusive practices “assist all individual students while improving society by fostering care, adaptability, and inclusiveness” (Doyle, 2004, p. 12). For Doyle, inclusion is a school-wide reform that eliminates tracking and integrates programs and blends resources for the benefit of all children. While inclusion seems straightforward, it cannot simply be approached as the opposite of exclusion. Rather, inclusion is a mindset and a part of the school culture (Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). According to Ainscow et al. (2006), inclusion can be understood from two premises, narrow definitions and broad definitions. Narrow definitions promote the inclusion of specific groups of students into mainstream classes while broad definitions refer to how school staff and members of the school community react to the needs of diverse student groups. It is imperative, for this chapter, that inclusion be defined in

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

broad terms to emphasize the positive effects on all students, not just deaf and hearing impaired students.

Sapon-Shevin (2003) argued that social justice is about inclusion and the two cannot be separated. Leaders for social justice promote inclusive practices. These practices are not to be confused with integrating students. Integrating students is simply placing students with disabilities in proximity of non-disabled peers while inclusion is more than proximity. Inclusion is the process of changing values, policies, and practices to create a school culture that values all students (Polat, 2011). The purpose of this chapter is to present how Davis K-8 School created such a structure.

While discussions of social justice and inclusive practices have moved focus away from more traditional models of leadership, Davis K-8 provides an understanding of how more traditional models of leadership (i.e. transformational leadership) and adopted structures such as Professional Learning Communities can be used to operationalize social justice in practice. By embedding a vision that all students can learn and be active members in the school community, Davis K-8 has leveraged their Professional Learning Community Practices to implement inclusive structures and practices into the daily lives of their deaf and hearing impaired students, as well as non-disabled students. This is their journey.

Who is Davis?

Davis K-8 School is a “Highly Performing” school located in the Southwestern United States and is one of over 100 schools in the Southwest Valley Unified School District. Southwest

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Valley Unified is a large, urban district that is comprised of schools varying from elementary and intermediate schools, middle schools, high schools, alternative education schools, and combination K-8 schools. Davis is the only school that has identified as an exploratory learning center in the district.

Davis K-8 School has an enrollment of 305 students ranging from preschool aged to eighth grade. The school is comprised of 26 teachers and 1 principal. There is also a large number of exceptional education staff specializing in working with hearing impaired student populations as many of the students have diagnoses of deaf and hard of hearing and are included in the classrooms with non-disabled peers³. While Davis is one of many schools in the district, they have adopted inclusive practices that differentiate them from other schools in the district. These practices, including multi-aged classrooms, inclusion of students with disabilities (co-convended classes), and transformation of the way the school community views dual language instruction, will be discussed in the framework of transformational leadership. By adopting a strong sense of transformational leadership, the school has pushed the boundaries of what it is meant to be socially just regarding students with disabilities.

To provide context for the case, the next section discusses the original impetus for the study and outlines methods used to gather data.

Methodology and Data Collection

³ The city where Davis is located also has a school specifically for Deaf and Blind students from around the state.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

The case presented in this chapter was studied as part of the International Successful Principal Project (ISSPP) and included piloting adaptations made to existing surveys. ISSPP is a vast project spanning more than eight countries. The project utilizes a mixed-methods approach including principal and teacher surveys, semi-structured qualitative interviews, document analysis, and participant observations. While the study emphasized the knowledge, disposition, and skills principals have used in successful schools across national and international contexts, other findings have emerged that extend beyond capacity building. It is these findings that will be presented later in the chapter.

Surveys

Piloted teacher and principal surveys were based on modifications to previous surveys developed by ISSPP (Day & Leithwood, 2005). The modified teacher surveys contained seven sections that assessed teacher perceptions of student learning, school capacity, curriculum and instruction, priorities, systems for evaluation and accountability, leadership tensions and dilemmas, and perceptions of student background and attainment and how they perceived that the principal contributed to these. All items (N=155) were ranked according to a five-point Likert scale.

Principal surveys contained an additional section that assessed the extent to which the principal perceived that they demonstrate successful leadership characteristics in 12 areas (e.g. reflection, relationship-building, planning, and professionalism). Principal responses were

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

compared with teacher responses with particular attention paid to patterns of similarities and gaps. These patterns were used to develop qualitative interview protocols.

Qualitative Semi-structured Interviews

Based on survey results, interview protocols were developed to gain a deeper understanding of leadership and capacity building at the school. Results from surveys indicated that there was a high level of capacity and significant differences were noticed on only four items (collaboration between school and outside partners, principal contributes to collaboration with outside community, receipt of resources from outside the school, and principal contributes to receipt of resources from outside the school). Survey results also indicated that the teacher and principal prioritized democratic citizenship, valued teacher collaboration and decision-making, were accountable to stakeholders, and were ethically responsible for student success. Similarly, teacher initiative and risk-taking were rewarded and the school's vision and results were clearly communicated to all stakeholders. Surveys additionally indicated that students and parents were valued and participate in school decisions.

Interview protocols focused on trends identified in the data consisted of nine teacher questions and nine principal questions. Teachers were asked to narrate the school's philosophy and how it has changed, how curriculum is developed and implemented, how teacher leadership is developed, ways that teachers collaborate with each other, ways in which they feel supported, how accountability has impacted practice, and how professional development aligns with school goals. Principal questions were similar with the addition of describing the process for involving

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

parents and the community in school decisions and how she communicated the school's vision and results to stakeholders.

Additional Data Sources

Additional data sources were used to both garner additional information and triangulate findings from the quantitative and qualitative components of the study. These sources included non-participant observations, document reviews (e.g. lesson plans and mission statement), review of the school's website, and survey results from district satisfaction surveys given to staff, parents, students, and the larger community. The review of additional data sources indicated that responses given during the initial survey and interviews were trustworthy. Additional insights were gained from the satisfaction survey and pertinent results are presented in Table 1.

Participants

Survey data were gathered during a professional development block that is regularly scheduled on Wednesday afternoons. The principal arranged for the survey to be given and the study was placed on the agenda. Through the support of the principal and face-to-face administration, there was a 100% return rate on the surveys (teachers and principal). Qualitative interviews comprised of four teachers (ranging from primary to middle grades) and the principal. The small number of interviews could be conceived as a limitation. Another limitation is that students and parents were not interviewed. However, the use of multiple data sources including the satisfaction surveys mitigated this. Additionally, the interviewing of parents and students was not a component of the pilot study.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Table 1.
Staff, Parent, and Student Satisfaction Survey Results

Category	N	% agree/strongly agree
I reflect on my own cultural background and biases related to race and culture that may influence my behavior	4,047	93.7%
Students respect the special needs of others	4,128	89.6%
Students participate in a school program and activities that represents the diversity of the school	3,941	92.2%
Are satisfied with the school	4,161	90.1%

Note: Survey is distributed online by district each year

Beyond Initial Findings: Inclusion and Social Justice

While initial findings identified that Davis K-8 School is a high capacity Learning Community school (Mitchell & Sackney, 2009), it was how the school used transformational leadership and leveraged a Professional Learning Community model to operationalize socially just practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities, specifically students identified as deaf and hearing impaired, that was most intriguing. Davis provides a real-life example of how a social justice agenda can be achieved through the use of transformational leadership structures. More specifically, the school has used a transformational leadership model coupled with Professional Learning Community practices to not only include students with disabilities but also to change the school's culture to bring forward the strengths and cultural aspects of their deaf and hearing impaired students. Davis K-8 School practices will be discussed in the framework of transformational leadership and the adoption of the tenets of a Professional Learning Community school in the upcoming section.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Transformational Leadership: Practices for Social Justice

When one thinks of transformational leadership in the context of education and educational leadership literature, social justice is not explicitly thought of as a goal. Rather, one thinks of a leadership model that addresses change and meeting adopted standards brought forth by No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002). However, Davis K-8 School has utilized the various aspects of transformational leadership and created a school culture where social justice practices are behind every aspect of principal, staff, student, and parent action. Social justice, for the Davis community, lives through the inclusion of its deaf and hearing-impaired students and mission of learning for all students.

Schools and their leaders must be flexible and open to change; as well as knowledgeable about how to do so. One such way was the contextual change in the role of the principal as a transformational leader. Transformational leadership has been defined in a variety of ways. Leithwood (1994) identified three categories of leadership in the area of transformational leadership. Utilizing the concepts of setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) developed a framework based on two generalizations: transformational leadership directly affects teacher perceptions in the areas of student achievement and student grades. It also indirectly affects student outcomes by influencing perceptions of organizational learning, teacher commitment, and school characteristics.

According to Marks and Printy (2003), transformational leadership is needed to lead schools through reform efforts. Changes are developed through ideas, influence, and

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

consideration for the individual in the process. Similarly, Bass and Avolio (1994) categorized transformational leadership into four I's: idealized influence which is defined as building trust and respect, inspirational motivation which is defined as setting the vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, building on people's strengths.

Transformational leadership has had significant and large impact on perceived organizational effectiveness and independent indicators of organizational effectiveness. It has impacted independently measured student outcomes and has displayed a modest positive impact on student engagement in school (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). This case study depicts a transformational leadership model that has driven a social justice agenda, one focused on inclusion of students with disabilities.

For the purpose of this investigation and discussion, transformational leadership will be defined as setting directions, redesigning the organization, and developing people (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Each of these areas will be discussed regarding specific actions undertaken by Davis K-8 School to transform the school into a real-life model of inclusion. While many schools have utilized a transformational leadership model to produce change, Davis is unique in the way that transformational leadership practices have transformed school structures and practices to meet the needs of all students through inclusion.

Setting Directions

Leadership from principals is essential in creating inclusive schools (Capper et al., 2000; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008). Principals that lead schools set directions that drive

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

school practices and policies. Leithwood (1994) defined setting directions as creating a vision, developing school-wide goals, and having high expectations. Through setting directions, leaders create opportunities to define social justice and develop empowering environments (Bogotch, 2002). Davis' principal created such an empowering environment framed in a vision for inclusion, collaboration, and engaging the entire school community. Davis' vision emphasizes high achievement, inclusion, and responsibility for the success of all children. At Davis, this vision extended beyond integration of deaf and hearing impaired students to full inclusion of all students in the school community. Rather than emphasize students adapting to existing school structures, the mission and vision was driven by the need for restructuring and reculturing the school to emphasize the needs and participation of all students.

The vision of Davis K-8 involves several key components: the education of all students, staff collaboration for inclusive practices regarding their deaf and hearing impaired students, and engaging the school community. According to the school's mission statement, each individual is valued and involved and teachers, students, and parents work together as active engaged readers, writers, researchers, mathematicians, scientists, artists, athletes, and historians. The emphasis is on the creation of an inclusive, collaborative culture whereas students develop skills in inquiry and research, face real problems and construct solutions while developing self-confidence. When asked to summarize the school's mission, the principal responded with statements such as "non-competitive spirit" and the "whole child". She noted that putting kids first is the right thing to do. She also emphasized the school's focus on inclusion of their deaf and hearing-impaired students

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

and providing a quality education for all students. “What you do is try to take care of the kids. We have that mentality here which is a good thing because I believe in that.” Teachers also responded that the school’s mission is linked to developing students’ self-esteem and educating students as individuals, paying particular attention to their individual needs. This was highlighted by responses such as “What’s best for kids trumps particular curriculum or personally held philosophy”.

The school’s mission has become a working philosophy to which all staff, students, and parents adhere. The school’s philosophy is child-centered and is based on inclusion, individual needs, and high levels of achievement of all students. There is also an emphasis on community. However, community was not defined in terms of the broader community. Rather, community was defined within the school walls and was seen as the parents, *all* students, and staff. There was no mention of the district or community partnerships regarding the definition of community. The school’s instructional coach stated that the school’s philosophy “has to do with the community.”

The last tenet of the schools mission is collaborative practices for inclusion. This tenet is explained in more detail in the following section. Collaborative practices at Davis are directly linked to their Professional Learning Community model and the ways that community is fostered. Through the development of people, Davis K-8 School’s philosophy has taken hold and socially just, inclusive practices have been developed.

Developing People

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kose (2009) conceptualized social justice leadership as a leadership model where principal practice is guided by visions of teaching and learning for social justice. Principals enact this vision through staff professional development that increases content expertise and emphasizes a social justice perspective. Kose (2009) indicated that the goal of professional development must develop socially just organizational capacity that aligns the school culture, structure, curricula, and assessments with sustained development and promotion of socially just learning and classrooms. Doyle (2004), in agreement with Kose, identified that a focus on building capacity and reflection leads to reculturing for inclusive practice.

A vital component to the successful incorporation of the Davis mission into practice has been the use of a Professional Learning Community model. According to Graham and Ferriter (2008), a key role of administrators is to support the development of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and to emphasize the distribution of leadership. Thus, the role of principal changes with the initiation of PLCs. “Principals of PLCs are called upon to consider themselves as leaders of leaders, rather than leaders of followers, and broadening teacher leadership becomes one of their priorities” (Dufour et al., 2005, p. 23). The principal creates structures for participation in discussions and builds consensus about school goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Hoy and Miskel (2008) stated that “followers become leaders, and leaders become change agents and ultimately transform the organization” (p.448). In this section, an overview of PLC practices at Davis K-8 School will be discussed.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Capacity building was evident in the school's practices. Davis K-8 School utilizes an early release schedule each Wednesday to foster professional development and staff collaboration. According to the principal, professional development "depends on what the needs are each week" and professional development activities and collaboration time is based upon projects that the staff develops at the beginning of each school year to support inclusive practices. School teams, comprised of grade level groups (primary, intermediate, and middle), determine the course of action necessary for success of all students. The principal noted:

We all have a brainstorming session at the beginning of the year, come up with different topics we are interested in, network with each other to figure out what other people are in and figure out how we can collaborate, how we can learn together, and form teams . Those teams take on certain goals with their professional development, what they are interested in, and we have sheets that we report what we've been doing, what the next goal is, where we're going with professional development, and what we've learned.

Additionally, she mentioned that the brainstorming generally revolves around developing student-centered curriculum, identifying individual goals, and promoting inclusive practices for students with disabilities. Through this process, teams develop priorities, identify specific goals, and schedule focused collaborative time. Teachers identified that the use of collaboration time allowed for them to develop curriculum and build upon their leadership skills. Pam, a middle-school science teacher, responded that professional development and collaboration time was the area she got the most support from the principal. "A huge part of it [principal support] is allowing us to have professional development time, not necessarily to do lessons, but to allow us to collaborate together." She also stated that the principal gives time to work together as a team

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

and encourages outside professional development, including scheduling summer workshops such as *Skillful Teacher*, *Understanding by Design*, and *Professional Learning Communities*.

While the collaboration time was most important to Pam, Sally, an elementary teacher viewed the opportunity to collaborate as an opportunity for teachers to take on leadership responsibilities. She felt that the principal supported teacher leadership and the teacher projects were a way for them to take a larger responsibility in the school. For her, the most important supports from the principal were that she [principal] “treats us like professionals” and “encourages teacher leadership”. While teacher leadership and collaboration were emphasized, teachers also responded that the collaboration time allowed them to develop curriculum that reflected their philosophy and mission, “what’s best for kids” and “promoting inclusion”.

Although each of the teachers discussed curriculum in terms of standards, they did not lose focus of the individual needs of students. Standards and curriculum were discussed in terms beyond them. As an intermediate teacher mentioned, curriculum is developed with standards in mind and “we justify how we meet objectives”; however, curriculum is developed around problem solving skills, team goals and meeting the needs of all students. Elements of the curriculum that “don’t work for us” are reworked and sometimes discarded. Sally noted, that “curriculum is more student led than in a lot of schools and pacing is definitely guided by the students.” The principal responded that few teachers at the school use the adopted textbooks, opting for student-centered learning experiences and hands-on activities. In fact, the school “got rid of a lot of unused, brand new textbooks”. Several teachers and the principal responded that

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

the curriculum choices were led by school structures such as multi-aged classrooms and students' current levels of mastery in the specific content areas. Rather than follow district curriculum guides, collaboration time is devoted to work together, with other teachers, to develop units on a three-year cycle. This allows for the development of deeper knowledge. There is a "more narrow, deep focus; as opposed to an inch deep, mile wide focus", and students, especially the school's deaf and hearing-impaired students are able to excel in areas of strength and receive additional time in areas that need improvement.

The PLC process at Davis extends beyond the school staff and integrates parents, staff, students, and community members into the decision making process. The school has adopted a shared decision making process where decisions are made through a consensus process with the school's vision "making decisions that are in the best interests of students' academic achievement and personal growth" at the forefront of all decisions. Coordinating Council members work in collaboration with staff and students to facilitate practices that are in the best interest of students and the school community. In the next section, processes that have been achieved through the implementation of PLCs and the shared decision making process will be discussed.

The most important aspect of the school's PLC model is that it fosters discussion around school policies and structures that run counter to the school's philosophy of inclusion. Eleweke and Rodda (2002) stated that inclusion redefines a school's culture and changes policies and practices to meet the learning needs of all students. Through dialogue and collaboration, the

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

school has transformed its practices to become inclusive and foster the culture of its deaf and hearing-impaired students. Not only are these students present in the classroom, their needs are placed at the forefront of many of the schools practices including a multi-aged approach, co-convened classes, and American Sign Language as the school's second language program. Through the implementation of these practices, the school has been redesigned to become more socially just.

Redesigning the Organization

Professional Learning Communities have been implemented to encourage collaboration and shared leadership among faculty in schools. This shift in focus has had significant effects on improving schools (CCSO, 2002). While PLC's are based on three core ideas: ensuring that students learn, a focus on results, and a shift in culture from individual to collaborative work (Dufour , 2004), they also provide an opportunity for staff to dialogue, question existing practices, and develop organizational structures that best benefit students and their learning. In the case of Davis K-8 School, PLCs have been the driving force for instructional practices and structures that have moved beyond mere integration of deaf and hearing impaired students and students with disabilities, to reculturing practices that value and build upon the strengths of students with disabilities. At Davis, the school has adopted practices that adopt the culture of these students and promote inclusion for all students. In this section, Davis K-8 School's co-convened and multi-age programs will be discussed along with a differentiated view of second language learning.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Davis has adopted the practice of co-convened/co-enrolled classrooms where students work alongside students with disabilities. The co-convened model allows for students with disabilities to be fully integrated into the school's classrooms. The co-convened model integrates both deaf and hearing impaired students and their hearing peers in a classroom setting where a general education teacher and a teacher of the deaf and hard of hearing work together educating students in curriculum developed in PLCs. Each of the classrooms is staffed with two additional support staff (sign language interpreters) and an instructional aide. Classrooms have also been modified with sound field systems that amplify teacher's voices and instruction is presented in both spoken form and sign language. The expectation at Davis is that all students and staff become proficient in sign language.

Besides being able to participate with non-disabled peers, the co-convened classes also support deaf and hearing-impaired students by providing a forum of supportive peers who can communicate with each other. According to Sally, this social support allows for students to "develop friendships and participate in the education process as equals, without any of the negatives sometimes attached to students who are different". Thus, all students are valued and the signing skills of deaf and hearing impaired students are seen as an asset.

Another aspect of the Davis K-8 program is an adapted grade level structure where students engage in multi-age classrooms. This structure, coupled with the co-convened nature of the program, allows for students to develop skills over a three-year period with the same teachers. The program structure includes Primary grades (K-1-2), Intermediate grades (3-4-5),

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

and Middle School (6-7-8). According to the teachers and principal, the multi-aged component of the school leads to students' sense of belonging, encourages community, and allows for students to work on mastery of skills without time lapses getting to know students at the beginning of each year. Students are also able to develop leadership skills and help each other learn to support each individual student's growth. According to the teachers, the multi-aged format "allows kids to work at the level they are really at". The multi-aged concept allows for students to be role models for other students including younger students and disabled students role modeling for older and non-disabled students. It also promotes a cooperative learning environment where students' individual needs are met.

Meeting students' individual needs and developing a sense of community has also led to the development of Davis' second language program. Since courses are co-convened and multi-aged, students are able to develop second language skills in American Sign Language. Besides the benefit of promoting peer interaction and support, the development of sign language skills provides both disabled and non-disabled students with a tangible skill and the ability to communicate with members of the deaf community who often participate in school activities. By taking a perceived deficit and incorporating it into school practice, deaf and hearing-impaired students are placed on a level playing field with hearing peers and they are able to model for students struggling with learning a "new language".

Summary

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

The Davis K-8 School is a model of excellence and social justice regarding deaf and hearing-impaired students. Driven by a philosophy of inclusion, community, and collaboration, the school has transformed itself into an exemplar of inclusive practices that promote the strengths and individual needs of all students. Through the use of a Professional learning Community model, collaboration has fostered transformation and has displayed how traditional school practices can be used to push forward a social justice agenda. Not only are students learning at a high level, they are encouraged to develop self-esteem, take leadership roles, and learning for all remains the focus of efforts at the school. Davis shows us that perceived deficits in students could be utilized to build a sense of community and belonging. The school also provides a real-life example that creates a “sense that social justice in schools is not just educational theory or rhetoric but actually practiced by leaders (in the case of Davis, all stakeholders) and indeed possible (Theoharis, 2008, p. 4).

Implications for Practice

Scholars have called for leadership that is inclusive (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008; Doyle, 2004), transformative (Foster, 1986), advocates for marginalized students (Anderson, 2009), is democratically accountable (Mullen et al., 2008), and socially just (Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008). The common theme is a more socially just practice of schooling. Often overlooked in discussions are the ways that other models of leadership can be used in concert with a social justice agenda to promote inclusive practices that benefit all students. While social justice is a term that is abstract and conceptual, more

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

traditional, accepted leadership structures can be included into the discourse around social justice. Davis K-8 School is an example of how social justice practices can be derived through the use of a leadership model based on transformational practices and provides a model for making inclusion work.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

References

- Ainscow, M., Booth, A., Dyson, P., Farrell, J., Frankham, F., Gallannaugh, A., Howes, A. & Smith, R. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, G. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. London: Routledge.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2003). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 138-156.
- Capper, C., Frattura, E. & Keyes, M. (2000). *Meeting the need of students of all abilities: How leaders go beyond inclusion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Council of Chief School Officers. (2002). *Expecting success: A study of five high performing, high poverty schools*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Day, C., & Leithwood, K. (2005, September). *International successful school principals project survey*. European Conference of Educational Research, Dublin, Ireland.
- Doyle, L. (2004). Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14(4), 352-377.
- Dufour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community. *Education Leadership*. 11(8). 6-11.
- Dufour, R., Dufour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Eleweke, C. & Rodda, M. (2002). The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6(2), 113-126.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Graham, P. & Ferriter, B. (2008). One step at a time. *National Staff Development Council*. 29(3). 38-42.
- Goldfarb, K. & Grinberg, J. (2002). Leadership for social justice: Authentic participation in the case of a community center in Caracas, Venezuela. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 157-173.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (8th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Johnson, L. et al., (2011). Leadership preparation for culturally diverse schools in Cyprus, Norway, and the United States. In Ylimaki, R. & Jacobson, S. US and cross-national policies, practices, and preparation. Springer.
- Kose, B. (2009). The principal's role in professional development for social justice: An empirically-based transformative framework. *Urban Education*, 44(6), 628-663.

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here

(<http://dissertations.umi.com/arizona>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-199.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999) Changing leadership for changing times. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson.
- Marks, H. & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- McKenzie et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- McKenzie, K., Sklra, L., & Scheurich, J. (2006). Preparing instructional leaders for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 158-170.
- Mitchell, C. & Sackney, L. (2009). *Sustainable improvement: Building learning communities that endure*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Mullen, C., Harris, S., Pryor, C., & Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: Tensions, actions, and principals in action. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18, 224-248.
- NCLB (2002) No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).
- Otunga, R. (2010). A response to leadership for social justice: A transnational dialogue. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership*, 4(1), 1-5.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion a matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-28.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 228-251.
- Theoharis, G. (2008). Woven deeply: Identity and leadership of urban social justice principals. *Education and Urban Society*, 41(1), 3-25.
- Theoharis, G. & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing school leaders. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.
- Ylimaki, R., & S. Jacobson. Editors (2011). U.S. and cross-national policies practices and preparation: Implications for successful instructional leadership, organizational learning, and culturally responsive practices. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer-Kluwer.
- Zepeda, S. & Langenbach, M. (1999). Special programs in regular schools: Historical foundations, standards, and contemporary issues. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

APPENDIX C

USING MASLOW'S THEORY OF MOTIVATION AND SOCIALLY JUST LEADERSHIP
FOR COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION: A CASE STUDY

Prepared By:

Thad Dugan

University of Arizona

Prepared For:

Dr. Rose Ylimaki: Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Jeff Bennett: Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Nolan Cabrera: Department of Higher Education

Dr. Lynette Brunderman, Department of Educational Leadership

April, 2015

Abstract

This article draws on findings from a larger research project of social justice leadership and focuses on community (Bordertown) and school (Jefferson) transformation. More specifically, this article presents findings based upon one particular aspect of Jefferson, socially just leadership practices and the development of a school climate and culture that is familial, inclusive, and engages the greater community. Utilizing a qualitative case study approach (Stake, 1995), perceptions of the principal, teachers, and staff are presented. This case provides a unique insight into how Maslow's (1943) Theory of Motivation (hierarchy of needs) and insights from George Washington Carver were leveraged to create a community culture and high levels of achievement for students.

Introduction

Since the seminal work of Foster (1986), addressed the need for a more transformational role in educational leadership, a growing number of educational leadership scholars emphasizing leadership for social justice have moved beyond a classic emphasis on organizational change leadership and management, to emphasize the importance of the transformative role they believe schools should play in bringing about a more just society (Anderson, 2009; Foster, 1986; Marshall & Oliva, 2006). Scholars emphasizing traditional approaches (e.g. Hoy & Miskel, 2008) discussed the use of motivational approaches (e.g. Maslow) with an aim to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of staff, with little emphasis on the role that motivational factors can play in transformative efforts. Educational leadership scholars promoting social justice have drawn attention to unequal educational structures and practices to confront the challenges of neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies present in our current political context in education (e.g. Apple, 2004; Foster, 1986; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Theoharis, 2007), focusing on the transformative role of school leaders and schools. These scholars have emphasized leadership models that are inclusive (Doyle, 2004, Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008; Sapon-Shevin, 2003), transformative (Foster, 1986), democratically

accountable (Mullen et al., 2008), democratically ethical (Gross, 2008), socially just (Marshall & Oliva, 2006, McKenzie et al., 2008) and advocate for marginalized students (Anderson, 2009). While these scholars vary in terms of their definitions of social justice, they all advocate the transformation of schools and communities through socially just leadership that addresses structures and policies that create barriers to student achievement and learning. Specifically, socially just approaches transform the schooling experiences of students and families who are traditionally marginalized while engaging issues beyond the school context. At the same time, social justice oriented educational administration literature has not explicitly considered how leaders motivate school and broader community members to engage in the transformation process. The purpose of this study is to better understand how the leveraging of Maslow's theory of motivation (1943) led to transformation in the case of Jefferson School. Thus, this article merges Maslow's theory of motivation with social justice leadership studies to explain case study findings.

Rationale for Study

Several case studies have examined principal practices that contribute to socially just leadership (e.g. Cochran-Smith et al., 1999; Dugan, 2012; Merchant & Shoho, 2010; Theoharis, 2007) and disparate leadership preparation activities that report development of socially just leaders (Boske, 20011; Brunner, 2008; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008); however, these studies have not shown the ways that socially just leadership practices motivate, work with, and transform the greater community. In an earlier phase of this larger study, Dugan (2014) interviewed practicing professors engaging in social justice leadership work, noting that these professors critiqued the work of social justice,

identifying that a lack of demonstrable community transformation is a gap in the extant literature. Based upon this criticism, this phase of the study seeks to answer the following research questions: a) How does a leader engage socially just practices that involve the larger community in transformation?, b) how do transformation efforts integrate the community and school cultures?, c) what do participants regard as the impetus for transformative efforts, and d) in what ways are transformative leadership activities that positively alter and engage the greater community similar or different than previously reported cases?

In the following sections, I will introduce literature relevant to provide background to the study. Social justice conceptions and a review of socially just leadership provide this background. Next, I discuss the methods, participants, and school and community demographics. Methods are followed by findings and a discussion before concluding the article.

Review of Relevant literature

Social Justice Conceptions

Social justice is an under-theorized concept, and there is little agreement to a specific definition in terms of education and leadership (Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009). Various conceptions of social justice have emerged in the literature and often these different conceptions create tensions in creating a universal definition of social justice. Neoliberal and neoconservative conceptions of social justice (e.g. accountability policies, common back-to basics curriculum, competition) define social justice in narrowly defined market-based terms to remedy deficits that diverse students bring to school. In this definition of social justice, high achievement, merit, and assessment

strategies are promoted to bridge the achievement gap between Whites and minority students (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Thus, educational achievement for all students is promoted. Ravitch and Thernstrom (1992) exemplified this conception of social justice and concluded that social justice is about curing social ills through assimilating the entire populace to a common culture through standardized curriculum.

Applebaum (2009) noted that the language of the neoliberal/neoconservative form of social justice emphasizes neutrality and that it is this neutrality that leads to injustice through curriculum that is focused on White, middle-class norms and a Eurocentric viewpoint. This neutrality creates “conditions in which education covertly reproduces dominance” (Applebaum, 2009, p. 385) and sustains biases. For Applebaum, social justice must take a liberal bias because there is systemic injustice that if unchallenged, validates the dominant viewpoint and leads to unequal outcomes. Similarly, Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2005) asserted that the by-product of discourse defining social justice in terms of accountability and standards is a “safe language” that avoids necessary and controversial dialogue about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and other forms of oppression and marginalization.

Agreeing with Applebaum (2009) and Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2005), educational leadership scholars emphasizing the need for social justice have taken an approach divergent to the neoliberal and neoconservative conception of social justice. Instead, social justice has been defined in terms of equity, equality, affirmative action, diversity, and inclusion (Blackmore, 2004). For example, Jean-Marie et al. (2009) defined social justice as equitable schooling that addresses issues of race, gender, diversity, marginalization, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and identity. While

Theoharis (2007) agreed that equitable schooling is essential. He noted that social justice is about inclusion, especially inclusion of students with disabilities. Similarly, scholars have argued that socially just education needs to address the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students (Capper et al., 2006; Lugg, 2003). While there is little agreement on the specific approaches to social justice regarding education, definitions of social justice have several common threads including the conceptual framework of Foster (1986). Foster noted that social justice efforts need to be transformative (school, community, society) and that social justice efforts need to create equity and raise achievement for all students. While equity and transformation are themes across conceptions of social justice, there has been a lack of specific attention to community (Capper & Young, 2014), and particularly, how theories of motivation are leveraged to motivate transformation amongst community and school members.

Social Justice Leadership

Guided by various conceptions of social justice, educational leadership scholars have defined dispositions and practices of socially just leaders (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006; Theoharis, 2010). These social justice leaders do not see neoliberal and neoconservative ideology as a barrier to transformative education. Rather, they confront unjust school practices and policies that fail to benefit all students. Social justice leaders see institutions as being in a position to serve as a catalyst for making education more socially conscious and politically responsive in a time of growing racism, neoliberalism, conservatism, and social injustice (Foster, 1986; Jean-Marie et al., 2009; Marshall & Oliva, 2004).

Social justice leaders engage in inquiry driven by a critique of community barriers and school structures and practices that marginalize students. These leaders understand that the well-being of students and society are at stake in the education of all students, yet little attention has been given how deficiency needs are met in order for students to reach self-actualization, Maslow's state of well-being. Social justice leaders understand the historical and current demographic trends, (Jean-Marie et al., 2009), know how to deconstruct mainstream assumptions, beliefs and values rooted in conventional institutions (Bogotch, 2000), and advocate for traditionally marginalized and poorly-served students (Jean-Marie et al., 2009). Further, leaders become activists within schools as educational institutions that focus on equity (Johnson, 2011; McKenzie et al., 2008). Thus, leaders for social justice guide their schools to transform the culture, curricular and pedagogical practices, atmosphere, and priorities to benefit marginalized students (Theoharis, 2007) and the greater community (Foster, 1986). Leaders for social justice increase accountability for achievement for all students while supporting teachers to addresses issues of race and marginalization. Leaders focus on building equity and developing staff investment in social justice (Kose, 2009). Although transformative efforts have been defined in terms of the school practices individual efforts, there has been a lack of similar explicit treatment of work with the community.

Framed in an interaction between instructional leadership and social justice (McKenzie, Sklra, & Scheurich, 2006), the role of the leader for social justice is as a change agent who confronts issues of inequity and transforms traditional, marginalizing practices to more just practices. These leaders not only model responsive characteristics but also address negative attitudes and deficit perspectives while raising expectations.

In sum, social justice leaders are advocates who confront issues of marginalization and oppression. These leaders are fearless and willing to take risks to promote equitable *school* practices in order to equalize positive outcomes for all students. And while scholars frequently argue that socially just leaders must understand the greater community context and work with and through the community to transform not only the school context but also impact the greater community in a positive manner, processes to motivate, engage, and support community transformation have not been fully explored. Maslow's hierarchy of needs provides a conceptual framework for meeting individual needs in order for both school staff and the community to focus on transformative efforts to reach self-actualization. In schools settings, self-actualization is conceived as high academic attainment and development as human beings engaged in the goals of the greater community.

Methodology and Data Collection

Method

While much of the work regarding social justice and educational leadership remains conceptual and theoretical (e.g. Jean-Marie et al., 2008), the field has provided empirical evidence of socially just practices in the work of school leaders (e.g. Theoharis, 2007), schools (e.g. Dugan, 2012), and preparation activities (e.g. Boske, 2011). Most of these empirical studies have used a qualitative case study approach. Based upon the extant literature and the guiding research questions, this study used a qualitative instrumental case study approach (Stake, 1995). As noted by Stake, using an instrumental case approach allows the researcher to learn about a particular case. The goal is to particularize, not generalize, and the emphasis of the researcher is the uniqueness and

complexity of the case within a specific context. Similarly, Bogdan and Biklen (2003) specified that qualitative researchers need to be concerned with context. Following these recommendations, this study, the study of James Jefferson School, was completed using an instrumental case study approach with special interest paid to the uniqueness of practices and context.

Data Collection and Analysis

Interviews followed recommendations from Denzin and Lincoln's (2005) qualitative inquiry method. As Stake (1995) noted, interviewing is "the main road to multiple realities." Since this study sought to identify particulars within the context of the Jefferson Park neighborhood, interviews provided the main source of data. Qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with sixteen members of the Jefferson staff and one former Jefferson staff member that is currently employed within the Bordertown District. Questions were open ended and focused on participants' perceptions regarding leadership, community transformation, and practices at Jefferson School that were unique.

Although semi-structured interviews were the "main road" for gathering data several other sources were used to gather additional data and "crystallize" (Richardson, 2005) findings from the interviews. Other data sources included state, county, and school websites, online information presented by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, participant observations, school publications, and you-tube videos.

Data were inductively coded using methods consistent with the constant comparative framework (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Although the purpose of the case study was not to develop a theory, constant comparison allowed for inductive coding through

constantly comparing data derived from one interview participant to another, and from interview to observation etc. Utilizing the constant comparative method, data were coded into categories and these categories were compared with previously developed categories. Following the constant comparative method, categories and their properties were integrated resulting in four core categories: leadership, community, culture, and achievement.

School / Neighborhood Demographics

The Jefferson Park neighborhood of Bordertown, located on the US/Mexico border, is a 22-block area located in the north end of the city. Prior to the neighborhood revitalization, Jefferson Park was considered “blighted”, with high levels of crime, high levels of transiency and unemployment, and dilapidated houses and trailer parks. After the revitalization efforts (see findings section), the neighborhood transformed to a much safer environment including new apartments and condominium complexes, rehabilitated single-family homes, code enforcement, and community resources for residents.

In addition to the community revitalization, Jefferson School was also revitalized. Newer buildings were added and a community garden was planted. Sidewalks adjacent to the school were built to provide students and families with safer access to the school. The school, comprised of one main building and several smaller buildings, services 466 students. Jefferson is school-wide Title 1 with 95% of the students receiving free and reduced lunch. Despite high levels of economic disadvantage and English as a Second Language (ESL) students, Jefferson transformed from one of the lowest schools in the state (lowest in district) to a high achieving school. Overall school ratings have fluctuated between a B and C using the current state labeling system. Students demonstrate great

levels of growth during their time at Jefferson, attaining levels in sixth grade that rival some of the best schools in the state (e.g. 85% proficiency with 53% Exceeding in math; 89% reading proficiency).

Participants

Participants were chosen to be representative of the school's overall staff and represent 40% of the school's overall staff 42. Measures were taken to ensure that office staff (Stileda, Leah, Hortensia, Betty), core teachers (Felix, Oscar, Diane, Shirley), elective teachers (Jonelle, Stephanie), special education staff (Mike, Janet), and school support staff (Anna, Trudy, John) were included in the interview pool. Additionally, one participant, Principal Juan, was included to verify findings, as he was a member of the school's staff for seven years and served in a variety of roles including teacher, counselor, and school effectiveness mentor. It is also important to note that several of the participants represent the views of parents and the local community.

Findings

The case of Jefferson School promotes both school and community transformation of school utilizing an approach guided by socially just leadership practices. Utilizing a unique vision, practices at Jefferson redefine the way in which traditional leadership practices are leveraged for socially just means. Guided by participant voices, five main themes are presented.

Leadership- Guiding Principles

While traditional models of educational leadership (e.g. instructional leadership, transformational leadership) demonstrate the importance of setting the school mission and vision (e.g. Leithwood, 1994), scholars emphasizing leadership for social justice (e.g.

Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009, Theoharis, 2007) are explicit that this mission and vision must have aims to increase inclusive practices, address marginalizing structures, and lead to transformative outcomes. In my discussion with Principal Dee, and the Jefferson staff, the social justice mission of the school was evident.

Initially discussing leadership with Dee, she emphasized that her role as a principal was to “hire the right people” and then “get out of their way”. She saw herself as a support structure that allows a buffering between the school community and various levels of expectations. Her role was to provide the necessary support to teachers “who care” to achieve desired goals. In fact, she regarded teaching as something that could be taught and learned versus an initial skill that people must have. In fact, her discussions of hiring practices denoted an interest in people’s interests and beliefs rather than their pedagogical understandings. Hiring interviews and my own interviews often involved driving around the community to point out areas of transformation, discussing interests, and talking about the students, parents, and community.

Hiring key personnel (teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff) often meant hiring parents and community members. According to Oscar, “more often than not, parents have been hired, then trained, then they become teachers. This was similarly stated by Shirley when she discussed Dee’s focus on getting “quality people”. “Most of us have been here since student teaching. Many parents have worked themselves up into becoming teachers”. Additionally, Dee’s office staff and community resource personnel are entirely comprised of former parents and community members. According to Stileda, “I devoted my time to the school on Mondays because my daughter went to school here. I fell in love with the school and the kids. So, I closed my business and came to work at the

school.” Hortensia, the school’s community representative, worked as a paraprofessional before entering her role. Likewise, Leah, the attendance clerk was recruited by Dee to work at the school. She stated “My kids came to the school when we moved here from California. I started bringing them to school everyday. [Dee] offered me a job. I started as a paraprofessional.

Although participants talked at length about hiring practices, they also described Dee’s tenacity, support, and high expectations as leadership characteristics. For example, Mike, a special educator stated that Dee is “very hands-off as it goes with letting us teach. Teachers here are very different. Some stand on desks, some of us lecture. Some do whole groups...She allows each teacher to be their own. Although Principal Dee allows people to develop their own teaching styles to meet student needs, her approach is not *laissez-faire*. Oscar noted that Dee is “demanding and nurturing at the same time”. Support for struggles is present, but so are the expectations for academic and social results. “She expects us to do something... the kids expect themselves to do something...She doesn’t let this place do what it wants. She has absolute control, but there is also a lot of freedom. This freedom and support have created a view of leadership by the Jefferson staff that describe Dee’s leadership as that of “fearless leader” (Stephanie), “shield” (Felix), “supporter” (Janet), and “voice of the students, staff, families, and community” (Anna).

In sum, Dee’s leadership, as perceived by her staff, is caring and supportive while demonstrating high expectations. Stileda acknowledged caring and supportive leadership when she declared:

She [Dee] is all about helping the kids, the community, and the staff. She is all about getting them to the next level....She loves her staff. She protects them. Her door is always open for any situations they have, even beyond the school. While initial discussions on leadership emphasized the need to get the right people hired, train them, and provide support, Dee also identified the core mission and leadership vision that drive the school and its interactions with the community. Beyond support of teachers, Dee viewed providing a caring, loving environment and meeting the basic needs of students, families, and the community as an impetus to not only raise student achievement but also to give voice to the community.

According to Dee, her leadership is based upon two specific ideals that have care, support, and high expectations at the core. The first of these ideals is based on a quote by George Washington Carver. According to staff, the quote is not “just an idea, but a practice” at James Jefferson. Carver’s quote:

How far you go in life depends on your being tender with the young, compassionate with the aged, sympathetic with the striving and tolerant of the weak and strong. Because someday in your life you will have been all of these.

guides not only the leadership practices at the school, but also the way in which teachers and staff approach their work with students, families, and the greater community. The second ideal integrates with Carver’s quote and emphasizes the importance of meeting the needs of students and families as human beings before pushing students as academic beings. This ideal is also derived from the work of psychologist Abraham Maslow (1943), his theory of motivation based upon a hierarchy of needs. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs provides a guide for reaching full potential. The hierarchy of needs begins with the most basic needs and ends with self-actualization, reaching one’s full potential. While the needs are interrelated and may not follow the specified levels, Maslow believed that to reach self-actualization, the lower levels of needs must be met and mastered. The idea of

meeting needs to reach self-actualization has been the guiding vision of Principal Dee in her approaches to leadership and her engagement with students, staff, parents, and the community. The hierarchy followed by Principal Dee and the Jefferson staff is:

1. Physiological needs- survival needs including shelter, food, and clothing
2. Safety needs- personal and financial security, and health and well-being
3. Love and Belonging- sense of belongingness including friendship and family
4. Esteem- feeling respected and valued by others and self
5. Self-actualization

The mission and vision of Jefferson was driven by a guiding framework based upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943). This defines James Jefferson School as a unique case of socially just leadership for school and community transformation.

Community Transformation- Needs and Safety

According to Maslow (1943), deficiency needs must first be met in order for motivations to move from a focus on physiological needs and safety to higher order needs such as esteem and self-actualization. If these needs are not addressed, anxiety and tension overwhelm efforts and there is little chance that motivation will shift. In the case of education, this means that students come to school with a focus on factors (i.e. housing, safety) rather than on the purpose of schooling, education. For Jefferson School, the community revitalization efforts mediated many of the barriers caused by community trauma experienced by students and families, and allowed families and students to engage in the school.

When describing the transformation, Principal Dee stated:

We took scary housing and replaced it with safe, affordable housing. People used to look for ways to leave the neighborhood. Now, people want to live here. They

stay. They are committed to the neighborhood. When the attitude toward the neighborhood changes, the attitude to school changes.

With this in mind, the transformation became a “perfect storm”, allowing school efforts to integrate the community into its practices. Understanding the need for revitalization, Dee was at the forefront.

In collaboration with the James Jefferson School (Principal Dee), the City of Bordertown, the Jefferson Park community, and various community and faith-based organizations, the Jefferson Park Revitalization Plan was developed and submitted to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The plan was based upon identified community needs and was driven by a community committee. Strengths and needs included in the plan were diversity of ethnicity, high unemployment rate, age of the neighborhood, high levels of poverty, high crime rate, school and park in the neighborhood, businesses located in neighborhood, and substandard housing issues. In 2002, HUD approved the revitalization plan and 27.5 million dollars (10 million in private donations) was leveraged to transform the community.

To address substandard housing and to provide safe, affordable homes for families, a variety of projects including housing rehabilitation, demolition of substandard housing including an 80 unit apartment complex and six townhome sites consisting of 36 townhomes were completed. Additionally, family services were implemented, including construction of a community center housing various community organizations, revitalization of the community park, the development of a domestic violence intake shelter, implementation of two pre-school programs, citizenship assistance programs, monthly food bank distributions, homeowner training and counseling, and Red Cross Services in CPR training and first aid. Youth services, including summer youth

employment, development of a Boy's and Girl's club, school-based counseling services, a Big Brother's/Big Sister's mentoring program, and an Olympic style youth boxing program were started. ([Bordertown] Department of Community Development Neighborhood Services).

The development of safe, affordable housing and the implementation of community programs revitalized the neighborhood and engaged the community in an effort to improve outcomes for its residents. No longer was the Jefferson Park neighborhood "blighted"; rather, it has become a model for revitalization that the City of Bordertown has used in efforts to improve other neighborhoods and parks in the city.

Despite the economic circumstances of the Jefferson Park community (95% of students qualify for free and reduced lunch), when participants were asked to describe the neighborhood, the word unsafe was never used to describe the neighborhood. Participants described the community in positive terms, as "safe", "friendly", "clean", and "welcoming". Gone are the drug houses, the dilapidated structures, and the gangs that were once prevalent in the neighborhood. People use the neighborhood park and code enforcement officials work with the community to keep the neighborhood clean and free of graffiti. Rather than "running from the community at the first chance they got to escape, families now want to live in the neighborhood" (Hortensia).

While participants recalled the transformation of the community, several recounted that the transformation began prior to the revitalization plan. According to Trudy, the transformation began with the removal of barbed wire as the principal's first act in the community: When I got here, the word was the gates came down. There was the barbed wire. There was barbed wire around the playground at one time.... It was

[Dee], her first goal was to have those taken down. Similarly, Stephanie recalled the “fence coming down”, and noted that this act was the first step in welcoming families and the community into the school:

When I first started, they had fences, barbed wire fences, around the school. And she [Dee] said Oh no, get rid of the barriers. Open it up to the community. She started a PTO, started having parents stay after school to use the computers to learn English, make copies if they need to, get the parents in here. She started having parents come in once a month to learn how to teach math to the students... It’s not that parents were not welcomed, but they were not invited. They now feel a part of the school.

Although Dee’s initial efforts and the revitalization created a safe neighborhood and invited families and the community into the school, there is always a concern that the initial transformation would return to its old state. In the case of the Jefferson Park neighborhood and Jefferson School, revitalization efforts have been maintained through “community pride” and maintenance and development of community partnerships. Since Dee became principal, the school has developed and maintained many traditional and one untraditional partnership that have maintained the safety and sense of security that evolved from the revitalization efforts.

Community Partnerships

Since 2007, when the 5-year revitalization effort was completed, Jefferson School has maintained a myriad of partnerships to maintain efforts to meet students and families’ needs. While many of the partnerships are traditional and a component of collaborative, school-linked partnerships, some of the “partnerships “ are less traditional.

One example of a non-traditional partnership developed when Dee first started her role as principal at Jefferson. While “bringing down the fences”, she engaged the local gang in community efforts to make the neighborhood and school safe zones, giving ownership of the school to the community. The story of the partnership has become folklore at the school. As Anna recalled:

She [Dee] talked about the different gangs in the neighborhood and she talked about, at first how she had to win them over. She won them over by inviting them to the school. That’s the story. There were fences in front of the school and she asked to bring those down. When she brought those down, she invited all the parents in. She started doing all the activities with Cinco de Mayo, Carver Days Festival. The parents, community, and even the gangs had ownership of the school. The [neighborhood] gang would watch over the school and whenever they would see something that was out of the norm, they would come over and keep them off. They were actually watching over our school at one point.

Once the revitalization of the neighborhood occurred, the neighborhood gang no longer remained in the neighborhood and the school partnerships transitioned to more traditional partnerships with an emphasis on collaborative, school-linked partnerships and community services.

Two of the partnerships provide health services to students based upon economic need. Examples of these partnerships include a dental program. According to Betty, the dental program is a mobile unit that “parks behind the cafeteria and provides dental services to our children that are uninsured and underinsured”. Additionally, a local eye doctor provides students with eye exams and “significantly reduced” prices on eyeglasses.

Other school-linked services that the community provides, outlined by the school’s community representative, focused on basic physiological needs of some of the families and students. Hortensia outlined two services, one partnership with the

community food bank and another, a local church that provide students with food for the weekend. She noted the food bank gives “50 backpacks full of food every Friday for the weekend”. Additionally, the local church provides 30 more students with food for the weekends. Providing food for students over the weekend allows the students to be prepared for school when they return on Mondays.

While some partnerships aimed at ensuring students’ basic needs are met, other partnerships aimed at making sure that students and families are more prepared when students begin kindergarten at Jefferson. John, a former kindergarten teacher and reading interventionist, was proud of the partnerships that were developed with two local pre-school programs and a parent engagement program that was developed by the school. The purpose of the pre-school partnerships is to collaborate with early childhood educators to better prepare students for elementary school.

We work with them and their staff... help them to figure out what they could do so when their kids would come here, they would be more prepared. They would come into our classrooms and we would do little things with them, just so they get to see us, the classroom. They would come a little more prepared.

In addition to the pre-school program partnerships, John and other Jefferson staff implemented a “Jumpstart to Kindergarten” program to assist not only students but also parents in being better prepared for elementary school. He stated:

Jumpstart to kinder is with the parents. It covers three nights. One night was literature based, the second math based, then the third night was technology based. On Tuesday, for example, we did various math activities that the parents could do at home with their child... We kind of better prepared them when they come in... They would take all of the stuff home with them. We got a lot of participation, and that helped a lot. When the students came in they remembered us. Parents were starting to hear about it from other schools and then, we had a lot of people come from out of our district area to come to our school. They saw what we did and they liked it. Other schools did not have the program.

The Jumpstart program engaged parents and students from both the Jefferson Park neighborhood and greater Bordertown community. Its purposes were three-fold: preparing students in academic work to better prepare them as they entered elementary school, engaging parents in their children's schooling at a young age, and recruiting potential students.

Other existing partnerships are intended to engage the community in efforts that are reciprocal and mutually beneficial to the students and the community. These partnerships align with Dee's vision based upon the aforementioned quote by George Washington Carver. These partnerships involve participation of the students and elderly community members. Retirees escaping the harsh weather in the Midwest occupy Sunny Fields Mobile Home Park. These "winter visitors" collaborate with the school through volunteering and making donations. In turn, students get the opportunity to showcase their skills learned in after-school programs (e.g. folklorico, marching band, cheerleading) for the residents. Another partnership that works with elderly constituents of the community is a sewing partnership. This partnership involves third graders and builds upon skills learned in a sewing club. As stated by Shirley, each Veteran's Day, "the third grade takes up collections of fleece fabric and I teach them how to make lap blankets for veterans living in nursing homes or hospitals... In return, they have helped us out with donations for future sewing classes."

Although many of the partnerships are focused on remediating basic needs or engaging the community, the school's partnership with the housing authority provides an example of the success of the revitalization and continued partnerships with other community organizations. This partnership is now based upon building self-esteem and

feeling loved and encouraged. The housing authority plays a pivotal role in their work with students, playing sports with students after school hours. Additionally, the relationships built by these partnerships make it possible for the staff at the housing authority to encourage students during a time of great anxiety and stress for many students, state standardized testing. According to Hortensia, “They make these cards for students, inspirational cards for students, and they make a personalized card for each of our students. They write something nice so they won’t be nervous, to give them a little push when they need it.”

Leveraging community resources and school-linked partnerships allows the school staff to focus on a climate and culture that fosters a sense of belonging and building students’ self-esteem, the next levels on Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy. Overwhelmingly, the participants cited that the school is “inclusive”, “welcoming”, “collaborative”, and has an emphasis on “family”. That is the culture of Jefferson.

Jefferson’s Unique Culture- Belonging and Esteem

Thee community revitalization and development of partnerships removed physiological and safety barriers from students and families and allow the school to focus on developing a sense of love and belonging. In the case of Jefferson School, love and belonging, characteristics emphasized by Dee, the school’s leader, have enabled staff and students to experience high levels of self-esteem. Esteem is developed through the school’s culture, a culture of family, inclusion, and innovation

The Conception of Family

Terms such as *love* and *family* are not generally responses that one gets when they ask school staff to describe the environment and culture of a school. However, when I

asked Jefferson participants, I overwhelmingly heard that response or some iteration of the response. Fifteen of 17 participants, including Juan, a principal at another district school, described the Jefferson culture as family. Based upon Principal Dee's beliefs and modeling, the culture of Jefferson can best be described as familial.

When I walked into the main office and classrooms, the school's culture was evident. The staff's beliefs were most evident when I walked into the staff lounge and saw the staff's priorities outlined on a whiteboard (e.g. TEAM, Inclusion, Family Oriented, Accessing multi-media technology, support). In discussions with participants, the responses I received highlighted the notion of family. For example, Felix stated, "We are a family. We don't call it the Jefferson staff, we call it the Jefferson family, from the custodian, to the teachers, to the nurse."

Hortensia described the school's staff and culture as roles in a traditional extended family: "We have the big sisters, the grandmas, the aunts, the uncles, and the brothers. We are a big team...we have very open communication with one another and we help one another." With each person assuming a role as a family member, the concept of family is extended to include teamwork and problem solving.

Anna emphasized teamwork and collaboration when she stated, "There is intense team work that happens here. This teamwork provides a supportive environment for students and adults that don't feel welcomed at other sites. This allows us to grow in areas that we need." Trudy added, "It is a solve-it kind of culture. When you work with children, there are going to be issues, but every one of them gets addressed. But, it takes an entire staff to get it done."

High levels of collaboration and teamwork creates an environment of meaningful “love” that guides efforts to create equity and fairness for students and families, making Jefferson unique. Diane summed this up when she said, “You just feel it when you walk in, the love. Everybody is just so kind. You are just welcomed immediately [into the family]. I feel the love that everyone has not only for each other but also for the kids. You won’t find that anywhere.”

Based in the culture of love and family, Jefferson School has adopted equitable practices based upon 2 I’s, inclusion and innovation:

Inclusion. Doyle (2004) premised that inclusion is a belief in practices that benefit all students. In the case of Jefferson, it is a culture that is welcoming and loving to all students, parents, and staff. Inclusion not only refers to the students, but also to the staff. Inclusion is a mindset derived from conceptions of family and belongingness.

According to several participants (e.g. Dee, Shirley, Janet), Jefferson school does not turn away any students that want to attend the school. It is not part of the established culture. As Shirley stated, it is the school’s inclusive practices create the culture: “It’s a very loving environment. We don’t turn away students. It doesn’t matter if they are coming with behavior problems or they are coming with IEPs, this or that, we just don’t turn away students. And, I think that brings that culture together.”

Mike, whose son has Down Syndrome and is mainstreamed into a first grade class, highlighted the inclusive culture at the school and noted that it is not only the students that are included, but also the students:

The environment at this school is very inclusive and very open. I feel that any kid could come to school here and be excited to be here.... There are many schools in this district, and I have been in most of them, and this culture here is just welcoming. It is joyful, very accepting.... The collaboration of the staff, maybe it

is because of the environment we are in, but I always felt supported and wanted. I felt wanted here, like I had something to give.

Additionally, Anna discussed inclusion as its impact students and teachers; adding that acceptance is at the core of Jefferson practices. She identified the key component of the school is the culture, “very welcoming, friendly, familial, accepting of everyone and everyone. For example, we might accept people other sites may refuse, whether it is students or teachers”. She additionally noted:

If I had a child of my own who had special needs, I would want them to come to Carver School.... I think that’s a positive because I think in other schools, students with special needs are misunderstood and sometimes shunned because they don’t understand how their needs are the same or different than their own needs. The students are very accepting of students with special needs, and if ever a student is not accepting of another student for whatever reason, that is taken care of quickly and it goes away. It’s that atmosphere of acceptance.

The culture of acceptance and inclusion is a hallmark of Jefferson. While the inclusive culture is embedded into the practices of the school, it has been developed systematically over time. Stephanie, the school’s PE teacher and former special educator recounted the beginning of inclusive practices when she started at Jefferson, and noted that the environment was very different than her previous assignment.

I was at another school and could not get one teacher to allow my students into their class. We started the program over here and our first year. It was miraculous. The teachers here did not want to give them back to us. We want them all day long. That’s how it got started. They wanted them all day long. They didn’t want to give them back.... Having that support and their peers treating them as equal. We have seen growth in so many areas. It’s awesome here to have the administrative support and at other schools, you don’t have that support and the teachers are allowed to say I don’t want that student in my class.

Although Dee and the Jefferson staff were open to inclusion, getting students to understand difference and acceptance took specifically teaching students about various disabilities. Mike, whose role as a special educator teaching students with significant cognitive abilities, students needed to understand that his students were not students in

the “baby class”. He described the process of teaching and learning about difference, starting with students from their first weeks at the school:

Students are exposed because when they come in as kindergartners, we give them the exposure and give them an understanding of why the students in my class are the way that they are. We do those at the beginning of the year and then I switch gears, because you can only talk so much about inclusive practices with kindergartners before they are like yeah, yeah, so he’s different. Identifying inclusive practices at Jefferson happens immediately.

As Betty stated, “the school is embracing of everybody. The kids, the adults, teachers, the cafeteria ladies, custodian, everybody is that way. Everybody is always looking out for one another, the students especially.” In my observations, I noted several things that highlight the school’s inclusive practices. It was not uncommon to see students with disabilities using technology in classes with their non-disabled peers. Students who had disabilities played next to non-disabled peers on playground equipment that was designed with the needs of students with disabilities (e.g. swings for students in wheelchairs). When Mike posted a sign to “end the word” (retard), students who began as kindergartners when he started at the school were the first to sign the banner that was hung in support of their peers. One instance was observed in a classroom where a student with a cognitive disability yelled out. Both students and the teacher’s responded to the student by saying “nobody laughs at that.”

Inclusive practices at Jefferson engage students and give all students a sense of belonging. Non-disabled students treat disabled students as able peers, and watch out for them. As Hortensia stated, “There is no handicap while they are here. Every child is here to learn... Our children are very protective of children who have special needs.” This protection at Jefferson has led to students being advocates in the community and has changed practices at the district level. According to Stephanie, students who transitioned

to junior high questioned why their peers (disabled students) were not able to attend the same school. This advocacy created opportunities for students to remain together, and transformed practice. Inclusive practices, coupled with innovation, guide students toward self-actualization.

Innovation. Adding to a sense of belonging and esteem, the school has developed into a technology rich school. Walking into any class, the library, or principal's office, you see a variety of devices (computers, I Pads, interactive white boards) for students and teachers to use. In fact, the PE room and art room, along with the principal's office have technology to be utilized in daily practice. While computers, portable computer labs, and interactive white boards are common place in schools that have now emphasized 21st Century skills, the vision behind their use the way that they are used are unique.

The vision for the technology use at Jefferson was at the forefront of a district blended learning initiative (see Horn & Staker, 2015). While arguments have been made to use technology to improve student motivation and increase engagement, at Jefferson the vision behind the implementation was rooted in an ideal of equity. In discussing the school's technology, Dee responded that the technology integration has to do with equalizing opportunity and representing George Washington Carver, whom Dee draws a lot of inspiration from. According to Dee, "Technology levels the playing field for our students. It is the great equalizer. It allows our students to have the same things THOSE students (more economically advantaged students in Bordertown) have." Dee's emphasis on technology innovation was not based in having students use the devices; rather, the focus was on giving access to all students, including students with special needs and lower economic circumstances. She followed up by adding "Being innovative meets

specific student needs, the needs of students with special needs with accommodations, benefits all students.... If you can put technology into the hands of children in poverty, they can do anything.”

In my conversations and interviews with the Jefferson staff, it was evident that her staff mirrored Dee’s belief in technology integration. Several participants discussed technology as a priority for the creation of equity and thus, a priority in the school’s budget. According to Stileda, since Dee started as principal, “she has really pressed getting better technology.” Further highlighted by Shirley, she stated “she puts that at the forefront. That’s more important than anything else on the supply list.” Diane added, “she has always been big on technology and always finds ways to get it to us.”

Felix described technology integration in terms of *innovation*. When asked to describe the culture of the school, Felix defined Jefferson’s innovative nature in terms of both teaching practice and technology. He said, “We are allowed to be innovative. We are allowed to try new things... We are always looking for what will help students the best.” Anna also stated that innovation was a key to the school’s success. She noted that the innovations, especially the integrated technologies, are the tools needed to provide opportunities. She cited Dee’s frequent conversations that emphasize the importance of technology use to create equity, stating “She truly believes that technology is an equalizer for our students and says it any time she gets a chance. Technology is going to be the path for these children to level out the ground for them so that they can go further.”

Participants discussed technology in terms of “equalizer” and “equity”, emphasizing the importance in terms of mission and vision. Shirley provided a concrete experience, drawn from a situation at another school in Bordertown where she worked,

that emphasized the need for providing the Jefferson students access. While recalling the story, she talked about technology as the way to “open so many doors”. She recalled:

A few years ago... we took a group of second graders to the SD zoo, and I will never forget sitting next to some students on the bus that were literally glued to the window, just everything is so green. I have never seen so much green. They were more amazed by that than the zoo itself. That has stuck with me forever”

Innovation and technology provide access to information and experiences that students in Bordertown may never get first-hand. For many of the students, economic circumstances preclude them from traveling much further than the neighborhood. However, the culture of family guided by practices of inclusion and innovation at Jefferson provide students an opportunity for success.

High Achievement- Self-Actualization

Maslow (1943) describes the highest stage in the hierarchy, self-actualization, as reaching one’s full potential. At James Jefferson School, self-actualization, the desire to accomplish, to be the most that one can be, is realized through school and community efforts aimed at developing a sense of belonging, love, and self-esteem.

For students, self-actualization occurs through high levels of student achievement as measured by sixth grade state assessment scores and their growth as human beings, specifically in the area of understanding and valuing differences. While the state average in reading is 70%, Jefferson students achieve at 89%. Students in mathematics score at 85% proficiency and the 53% exceeds rating for students, rivals the state proficiency average ([State] Department of Education, 2015). Students not meeting standards from the state achieve at levels commensurate with their ability levels. Staff understanding of

students, guided by a sense of family responsibility, allows learning expectations to be modified to accommodate specific student needs. This was emphasized by Felix when he described expectations and levels of achievement for special education students: “Even my special needs kids have a goal. Meet your goal. It might be 2 spelling words. Sit down and do your best. If that’s what you can do, it is what you can do”.

The staff at Jefferson has also demonstrated high expectations and high levels of success. In the past ten years, six teaching staff have been acknowledged by the County of Bordertown and the Rotary Club by being awarded County Teacher of the Year. As Dee stated in our discussions:

This is a hard working staff. When they come to work after the summer, they know they are here to work. They work at high levels and it is amazing what they accomplish. Everyone collaborates and works to the best of their abilities. There are no slackers. Everyone just does whatever is needed to meet the needs of our kids.

With high levels of student achievement and growth, Jefferson staff continues to innovate and improve upon practices. As Anna noted, “the work is never done.” However, the culture at Jefferson promotes belonging and offers promises on reaching new levels of self-actualization for students, staff, and the greater community.

Discussion

Foster (1986) posited that “school is more than simply a class to attend or a degree to obtain; rather it is a living statement of culture and of values that forms part of the consciousness of every society member” (p.10). Scholars engaging in the work of social justice and education have aligned with these views and have proposed various definitions of social justice and socially just leadership. For example, Jean-Marie et al. (2009) proposed that social justice is about advocating for traditionally marginalized and

poorly served students through the reconfiguring of hierarchical power structures.

Similarly, Marshall and Oliva (2006) defined social justice as reaching into the deep roots of injustice emanating from policies and practices that maintain elite privileges.

Additional definitions of social justice and social justice leadership have called for socially leadership that is inclusive and supportive of teachers and students (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008), and socially just leadership that considers context (Bogotch, 2002). Scholars have also emphasized socially just leadership that has high expectations and positive academic outcomes for all students (McKenzie et al., 2008).

While there are variations in definitions and approaches to socially just leadership, several traits regarding social justice were present in the study of Jefferson School. For example, Dee could be characterized utilizing traits defined by Theoharis (2007). First, Dee demonstrated a complicated mix of arrogance and humility. In discussions about Dee, staff described her as a supportive leader who “goes to bat” for her staff, students, and the community. She is often the voice for families and other administration in addressing issues at a district level. At the same time, Dee remained humble regarding her roles in the community transformation, often using we and they, and her own leadership. Rather than taking credit, Dee identified her role as “getting out of their [teachers] way. Next, Dee exemplified leading with intense visionary practice (e.g. inclusion, innovation). Finally, Dee demonstrated a tenacious commitment to social justice in empowering staff. Dee is not a micro-manager and often trains parents into becoming teachers.

In defining New DEEL leadership, Goss (2008) identified three characteristics exemplified by Dee’s leadership. The first characteristic, an inner sense of responsibility

to students, families, and the community, were presented in her involvement in the neighborhood transformation and her practices in hiring staff from the community. Dee's emphasis on George Washington Carver's quote about caring and compassion further exemplified this trait. Her development of community partnerships and her being defined by staff as a "shield" and a "fighter" characterized Dee's leadership. These characteristics align with what Goss referred to as leading from an expansive community building perspective that includes shielding the school from turbulence and facilitating change. Lastly, Dee operates from "a deep understanding of ethical decision making in the context of a dynamic, inclusive, and democratic vision. Dee's mission of creating a familial environment that is collaborative, inclusive, and innovative has transformed outcomes for students and the Jefferson Park community.

Utilizing Maslow, Dee's vision of creating an atmosphere that is familial, inclusive, and innovative has had several positive outcomes for students, families, and the greater community. The family approach has created a culture that is additive rather than deficit in the way the community is viewed. At Jefferson, all family members, whether they are parents, community members, staff, or students with(out) disabilities, are treated with compassion and love. They are viewed as human beings and not data points used to meet state testing mandates. The additive view of education is evident in the way that teachers and students support each other and protect "family" members that are traditionally marginalized in other places. In conversations with participants, families and students were referred to in terms of "caring", "hard working", and "supportive" despite the obvious needs in the community. There were no evident practices or structures at the school that indicated subtractive schooling practices (Valenzuela, 1999). Rather, there

was a sense of belonging and esteem that arose from being part of a culture that values and builds upon difference to achieve the best that each can.

The sense of belonging and esteem were best understood through the school's inclusion practices. At Jefferson, inclusion is a part of the mindset of everyone involved with the children and main component of the school culture. Inclusion at Jefferson is not merely integrating (Sapon-Shevin, 2003) students into mainstreamed classrooms; it defines the values of the students and the staff. Students in the school are taught about disabilities and students with disabilities participate in all aspects of the school. Specialized playground equipment, utilizing technology to meet student needs, and having high levels of expectation based on each child's threshold for learning are all indicators of inclusive practices. Students and staff at Jefferson not only protect students with disabilities, they advocate for their success. As noted by Hortensia, there are "no handicaps" at Jefferson.

Leveraging the familial and inclusive aspects of the school culture, innovation is at the core of meeting the needs of Jefferson students and families. Innovation at Jefferson not only refers to the implementation of technology into teaching practices but also the manner in which teachers present information to students. Teachers are given freedom and support to implement strategies that "best meet the needs of students". Technology allows for individualizing math and reading instruction to meet specific needs, but also increases student motivation (Horn & Staker, 2015). Additionally, technology "provides access" to information and experiences that otherwise would be unlikely for the Jefferson students. Technology is the leverage that allows students and families access to experiences and opportunities that 'Those' (more affluent) students and

families have. As Dee noted, “These kids deserve what those kids have”- These families and this community deserve to have opportunities that those families have.”

As a result of the leadership, community transformation and development of a family atmosphere, students at Carver demonstrate academic growth and achievement in 6th grade that rivals some of the best schools in the state. Furthermore, students leave Carver as human beings that demonstrate an understanding of differences, demonstrate compassion, and take advocacy roles.

Conclusion

Foster (1986) advocated a paradigm shift in the way leaders approach the subject of educational leadership. He suggested a shift from managerial perspectives of school to a moral transformative view of education. In his view, leadership must be transformational and lead to changes in the greater society. Foster stated the essence of leadership is “the desire and attempt to change the human condition (p.187). While the story of James Jefferson School does not demonstrate a shift in society, it does demonstrate changing the human condition on the scale of a community. It provides an example of community transformation, school transformation, and shows that transformation at a school level and transformation at a community level are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they are mutually reliant on each other for transformation.

There are several implications for leadership practice from the case of Jefferson. The first of these lessons is that social justice ideals of inclusion (Polat, 2011; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2007) are limited. Polat (2011) defined inclusion as the process of changing values, policies, and practices, to create a school culture valuing all students. Similarly, Theoharis and Causton-Theoharis (2007) defined inclusion in terms of students.

The Jefferson case provides evidence that inclusion should be more broadly viewed to include, at a school level, students and teachers. Furthermore, a community view of inclusion would include parents and community members who traditionally are not given a space or voice.

Next, the case of Jefferson demonstrates that an additive perspective on education leads to high outcomes for all students. Scholars emphasizing social justice leadership (e.g. Marshall & Oliva, 2005) identified marginalization of students due to factors such as ethnicity, language, and socioeconomic status and Valenzuela (1999) presented a strong case that deficit, subtractive views of students and families negatively impact students. Jefferson demonstrates that an additive, familial view of students improves sense of belonging and esteems, increases student achievement, and develops students into caring and compassionate beings.

Lastly, the vision of Dee presents an argument that principals can draw inspiration from various fields, in this case canonical psychology, to guide practices that meet the needs of all students. Rather than emphasize managerial models of leadership (e.g. transformational leadership, instructional leadership), principals must develop a conceptual framework/ social justice lens to add to the development of culture and management aspects of school. In the case of Carver, “students are seen as human beings first,” and this guides the school’s practices. This study extends social justice leadership into the community. Additionally, the Jefferson case extends Maslow’s theory of motivation from the traditional realm (motivation for the sake of efficiency) into the realm of social justice (a vision that drives socially just practices including inclusion and innovation).

The case of James Jefferson School provides insight into aspects of the school's leadership and school practices that have worked with and through the community to transform both the school and greater community. While the study focuses on one school in a specific context, it does present an example of socially just leadership that is transformative of both community and school. This case study builds upon the extant literature and provides possible directions into new research possibilities. These possibilities include identification of other community/school transformative projects that can be used as comparative studies, identification of other community housing projects that have positively transformed communities and maintained transformation after grant funding is exhausted, and policy implications for school-linked community. Furthermore, the Jefferson case provides direction into the re-conceptualization of traditional theories of motivation and the potential role for transformative vision.

References

- Anderson, G. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Applebaum, B. (2009). Is teaching social justice a liberal bias? *Teachers College Record*, 111(2), 376-408.
- Blackmore, J. (2009). International response essay: Leadership for social justice: A transnational dialogue. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4 (1), 1-9.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education group.
- Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 138-156.
- Boske, C. (2011). Audio and video reflections to promote social justice. *Multicultural Education and Technology Journal*, 5(1), 70-85.
- Brunner, C., Hammel, K., & Miller, M. (2010). Transforming leadership preparation for social justice: Dissatisfaction, inspiration, and rebirth- an exemplar. In S. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cambron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19(1). 201-222.
- Capper, C. & Young, M. (2014). Ironies and limitations of educational leadership for social justice: A call to social justice educators. *Theory into practice*, 53, 158-164.
- Capper, C., Alston, J., Gause, C., Koschorek, J., Lopez, G., Lugg, C. & McKenzie, K. (2006). Integrating lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender topics and their intersections with other areas of difference into leadership preparation curriculum: Practical ideas and strategies. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16(2), 142-157.
- Charmaz, K. (2009). *Constructing grounded theory*. New York: Sage.
- Cochran-Smith et al. (1999). Seeking social justice: An education faculty's self-study. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 2(3), 229-253.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Doyle, L. (2004). Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14(4), 352-377.
- Dugan, T. (2014). Professor narrations of critical consciousness and praxis: Implications for preparing socially just leaders. A paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Conference in Washington D.C.
- Dugan, T. (2012). Moving beyond colonialism: Authentic caring and leadership in Arizona. In (Boske Ed.) *Educational leadership: Building bridges among ideas, schools, and nations*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Goss, S. (2008). (Re)-constructing a movement for social justice in our profession. In (Normore ED.) *Leadership for social justice: Promoting equity and excellence through inquiry and reflective practice*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Horn, M. & Staker, H. (2015). *Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A., & Brooks, J. (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.
- Johnson, L. et al., (2011). Leadership preparation for culturally diverse schools in Cyprus, Norway, and the United States. In Ylimaki, R. & Jacobson, S. US and cross-national policies, practices, and preparation. Springer.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Lugg, C. (2003). Sissies, faggots, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation and a new politics of education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, 95-134.
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson.
- McKenzie et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- McKenzie, K., Sklra, L., & Scheurich, J. (2006). Preparing instructional leaders for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 158-170.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mullen, C. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: A social justice perspective of educational quality and practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Fall 2008, 137-153.
- Polat, F. (2011). Inclusion and education: A step towards social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31, 51-58.
- Ravitch, D. & Thernstrom, A. (1992). *The democracy reader: Classic and modern speeches, essays, poems, declarations, and documents on freedom and human rights worldwide*. New York: Perennial.
- Richardson, L. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sapon-Shevin, (2003). Inclusion is a matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-28.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Theoharis, G. & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing school leaders. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.