

Fairness, Voice, Dialogue: Measuring Collective Social Justice Practice in Schools

Craig Howley
Aimee Howley
WordFarmers Associates

Amy Farley
University of Cincinnati

Marged Dudek
WordFarmers Associates

Courtney Gilday
University of Cincinnati

The United States is an inequitable society growing more inequitable in recent decades, and schooling is both part mechanism of oppression and part pathway toward social justice. Improving the extent to which schooling actually contributes to equity, however, depends on efforts to cultivate educator practices that advance social justice. Defining these practices and measuring their use among school faculties are necessary parts of the improvement process. Unfortunately, adequate measures of collective social justice practice in schools have not been developed for use with teachers. Based on a conception of social just as a three-part structure, we report progress on developing a 22-item instrument to measure collective social justice practice in schools, using data from teachers about their schools (rather than about their own practice). This report explains the rationale and conceptualization of the instrument, argues its intended use and its validity relevant to the intended use, accounts for item development, and presents empirical evidence of the relationship of items to the construct and of the construct to contextual variables. We argue an intended use in the summative evaluation of professional development that aims to foster improvement in collective social justice practice in multiple schools. Empirical work (exploratory factor analysis and correlation) supported the theoretical model and showed that the proposed measure is unrelated to political orientation. Although additional validation studies are certainly necessary more fully to establish validity for the intended use, the considerable work thus far completed on the items should prove helpful to other researchers struggling to measure social justice practice in schools in an historic era of increased concern for equity.

Schooling is widely acknowledged as a contributor to inequity in American society, in part via a “hidden curriculum” that governs norms of practice in schools (Anyon, 1980; Apple, 2018; Dee & Gershenson, 2017; DeMarais & Lecompte, 1999; Langhout & Mitchell, 2008; Tye, 2000;

Willis, 1977). As public institutions, however, schools are also officially authorized to take a lead in cultivating equity: for instance, in preparing citizens to exercise the franchise wisely and in providing equal opportunity to learn (Apple, 2018; DeMarais & Lecompte, 1999; Meier, 2003; Tye, 2000).

Improving the extent to which schooling actually contributes to equity, however, depends on efforts to cultivate educator practices that advance social justice and alter the tacit messages communicated through the hidden curriculum. Defining these practices and measuring their use among school faculties are necessary parts of this improvement process. Unfortunately, no instrument exists as yet to measure *collective social justice practices* in PK12 schools in the United States.

The ongoing work of developing such an instrument—one focused, not on individual teachers' practice, but on schools' collective practice—is reported here. The present article reports initial work to test the validity claims for an instrument to measure collective social justice practice in PK12 schools. Such measurement would prospectively “inform teaching and learnings...at the curricular level” (AERA et al., 2014, p. 185). Explication of development and validity take an argument-based approach focusing on intended use (Kane, 2013). Samples and statistical analyses are reported transparently (standard 1.8). At this first stage, the report of the development and validation provides evidence (see AERA et al., 2014, pp. 13-31), especially about content and internal structure (standards 1.11 and 1.13) but also provides limited evidence related to other variables (standards 1.16 and 1.17). Given the progress of the development and validation work so far, this report cannot address the consequences of testing except for arguing for circumspection about intended uses (standards 1.1 and 1.2).

Validation is an ongoing process, and the work reported here begins to suggest that results from the study support valid uses of the instrument and valid interpretations of data derived from its use. Additional evidence on sources of validity will be forthcoming as the work proceeds. The work reported here is part of a supported, long-term, ongoing professional development project.

Rationale

The instrument development process actually begins even before item development with establishment of the need for the instrument. This section provides an argument to establish the need for the intended instrument. It explains the context in which a well-developed measurement tool that taps faculties' reports of school-level use of social justice practices would prove helpful to educators.

First, social justice is a major issue in education worldwide (Condrón, 2011; Williams, 2005), and, particularly in the United States, with its legacy of racialism and its rising inequality in present times (Anderson, 1988; Isenberg, 2016; Johnson, 2014; Rury & Hill, 2011). The level at which students and families experience the inequities, however, is not in direct interaction with abstract social institutions (e.g., the institution of schooling), but much further down the food chain. They experience it as prejudicial practices—acts of commission and omission—in schools and classrooms; for instance, as microaggression (e.g., Huber, 2011; Lester et al., 2017) and implicit bias (e.g., Dee & Gershenson, 2017; Staats, 2015-2016).

Second, *many* American schools appear to be inequitable places, and critics note that the prevalent inequity is structured from the top down by systemic routines that are readily identified (e.g., Glass, 2007). Such routines prominently include the ways that

- states and localities direct (and misdirect) fiscal revenue flows,
- districts and schools allocate (and misallocate) resources,
- schools engage (and marginalize) families and students,
- schools enable (and block) access to programs,
- schools overlook (and punish) infractions of school rules, and
- schools encourage (and discourage) the intellectual development of students.

For each of these routines, the research base on contributions to inequity is broad and deep and the findings durable (e.g., Anderson, 1988; Anderson & Ritter, 2017; Atkins et al., 2002; Cardichon et al., 2020; Carr et al., 2007; Clotfelter et al., 2005; deCarvalho, 2001; Hirschfield, 2008; Knoepfel, 2007; Kupchik & Catlaw, 2015; Lleras & Rangel, 2009; Valenzuela, 1999).

Third, among these systemic routines, nonetheless, are many sets of practices nominally under the control of educators in schools: practices of inclusion and exclusion (Frattura & Capper, 2007; Gorski & Swalwell, 2015); discipline practices (Anderson & Ritter, 2018; Atkins et al., 2002; Gagnon et al., 2017; Hirschfield, 2008); practices of discourse and silence (Huber, 2011; Hytten & Bettez, 2011; Staats, 2016), and practices of hoarding leadership or distributing it among organizational members and stakeholders (Blair & Bligh, 2018; Capper & Young, 2014; Harris & Spillane, 2008; Lindahl, 2008; Rigby, 2014). Discounting the systemic norms of inequity that typically structure such practices, educators might in theory alter their joint practices towards greater equity (and social justice in general).

Fourth, thoughtful theorizing about social justice in American schooling *abounds* (e.g., Gewirtz, 2006; Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002; Llopart & Esteban-Guitart, 2018; Lewis, 2016; Mills & Ballantyne, 2016), as do extended arguments about its importance (e.g., Anyon, 2005), research reviews (e.g., Llopart & Esteban-Guitart, 2018; Sampaio & Leite, 2018); and standards (e.g., Burns & Miller, 2017; Ohio Department of Education, 2011; Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2021) that advise and even require educators in PK12 and postsecondary contexts to attend carefully to equity, diversity, and social justice. There is every reason, in consideration of the evidence and advice, for practicing educators to do something about inequity in schools.

Fifth, changing social justice practices in schools has thus far proven very difficult: despite ample theorizing, argument, research, and activism (Dorling, 2010; Glass, 2007; Johnson, 2014). According to many commentators over the decades (Anyon, 2005; Blacker, 2014; Glass, 2007; Kozol, 1991; Rigby, 2014; Tye, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999), the difficulty lies in how prevalent and deeply embedded are greed and prejudice in American society:

As inequality becomes ever more deeply entrenched into contemporary everyday life, there has been a creeping return to the idea of innate ability. At the same time, priorities in education have become increasingly determined by a utilitarian concern for the needs

of the economy, rather than for developing the thinking of each child. (Dorling, 2010, p. 35)

This “deep structure” (Tye, 2000) of inequity generates broad swathes of American culture, and school practice, in ways that have proven difficult to oppose or redress. For example, Rigby (2014, p. 636) found that social justice leadership was itself a “marginalized” option for guiding principals’ preparation and work. In this light, a lack of instrumentation for measuring social justice in schools would be entirely predictable.

Nonetheless, an instrument that measured collective social justice practice would seem essential for professional development (PD) efforts that *did* aim to change schoolwide social justice practice. Moreover, such a measure would ideally capture what teachers themselves report that the school as a whole is doing. It would resemble measures of collective teacher efficacy (e.g., Goddard et al., 2000) in this way: systematically assessing school-level reality through the report of the most numerous adult actors embedded in that reality—teachers.

Finally, quantitative instruments to measure *social justice as collective practice* in schools have not been reported as yet. Indeed, quantitative instruments addressing the social justice-like features of schooling practice are quite rare. The research team conducted searches of major databases in education (ERIC, Education Research Complete, Education Full Text), psychology (Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection), sociology (Sociological Collection, Social Sciences Abstracts), and business (Business Abstracts Full Text) and discovered nine instruments (see Appendix A for descriptions). Searches combined relevant terms such as *social justice, equity, measurement, and instrumentation*; searches were limited to peer-reviewed journal publications appearing later than 1999. Among the nine instruments discovered were two for use with principals (Flood, 2019; Zhang et al., 2018) and one for use with pre-service teachers (Ludlow et al., 2008). None was designed for use with practicing teachers, and none was designed as a collective measure.

Methods and Analytic Approach

In this report we take an argument-based approach to instrument development (Kane, 1992, 2013). Thus, having established the need to measure collective social justice practice in schools, we next present the conceptualization of the instrument, argue its single intended use, and provide relevant empirical evidence in a validity argument. To advance validity claims for the instrument under development, this report applies the insights of Kane (1992) and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA et al., 2014): “Validity is...the most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating tests” (p. 11). Though we appreciate the tightly structured approach of Schilling and Hill (2007), the argument presented here resembles Kane’s (2013) more open perspective on intended use and validity arguments.

The analytical approach in this report relies principally on exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to assess item performance (Studies 1 and 2) with respect to the theoretical grounding explained in the narrative about conceptualization. Additionally, we report internal consistency measures and correlations with key contextual variables (e.g., respondents’ political orientation). At this

juncture in the instrument development process, EFAs have been performed at the individual level. School-level studies are planned for the future.¹

Conceptualization

In this section we describe the conceptualization of a schoolwide, collective measure of social justice practice based on faculties' report of relevant educational practices in their schools. This conceptualization need not be viewed as the only or the best conceptualization. We argue that it is appropriate for practical evaluation work, including work in which the authors are presently involved on an ongoing long-term basis.

Calls for appropriate educational action on behalf of social justice have become more common in recent years (Hyttén & Bettez, 2011; Miller & Martin, 2014; Zhang, Goddard, & Jakubiec, 2018). Such action must involve teachers, though, because the collective behavior of teachers—the most numerous adult actors in a school—dominates the cultural tenor of a school (Blair & Blight, 2018; Harris & Spillane, 2008). Arguably, attempts to characterize and measure schools' social-justice related practice are part of the evidence needed to change them for the better (in order to scaffold appropriate change more effectively).²

What is social justice? What collective practices of teachers are relevant? The task is to specify a defensible meaning in the context of the schoolwide practices of teachers. Despite its apparent complexity and controversy, social justice is commonly represented in categories of related ideas. Zhang and colleagues (2018) used four categories: process, transformation, context, and preparation. Gewirtz and Cribb (2002)—following philosopher Iris Young (2001)—suggested *distributive*, *cultural*, and *associational* forms. From this vantage “social justice” is more than distributive justice (i.e., the combination of equality or *sameness of resourcing* plus equity or *suitability of resourcing*). Inequality and inequity are familiar terms, often used to conjure the lopsided distribution of wealth, income, and credentials. As it relates to schooling, such patterns of maldistribution are also very familiar: schools in impoverished communities are staffed by less experienced teachers, they receive more meager funding, and they occupy more decrepit buildings than those in affluent communities (Atkins et al., 2002; Cardichon et al., 2020; Carr et al., 2007; Knoepfel, 2007). Distributive justice, then, reflects an ideal that fits with commonsense conceptions of fairness (e.g., Rawls, 1999).

The cultural dimension is similarly familiar but refers to a different injustice: it refers to exclusion from or inclusion in groups that are favored and better resourced. In schools, tracking is a classic example of cultural inequity (e.g., Oakes et al., 1990). The cultural dimension works to “other” entire groups of students—to “marginalize” them or exclude them altogether. When othered or marginalized, students are seen to lack legitimate voice (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002;

¹ Although the focus of this report is on the 22 items that emerged from Study 2 (reported in the validity argument), we have also been testing 12 items as part of an evaluation project for a client. That experience motivated development of the instrument reported here. Unpublished work on the 12 items has included school-level factor analysis (EFA and CFA); those 12 items are among the 22 studied in this report and are identified in the tables.

² There are, of course, many approaches to gathering such evidence, and formal measurement is not the only one. Notable alternatives include advocacy (e.g., Capper & Young, 2014), professional development (e.g., Howley et al., 2019), and the complex local studies known as equity audits (e.g., Skrla et al., 2004).

Meister et al., 2017). Once these students are excluded, moreover, their real needs become invisible (White, 2017). In fact, the adults who work with them erroneously draw on stereotypes about the reduced potential, limited aspirations, low motivation, and indiscipline of these students to justify decisions about excluding them (e.g., American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

The associational dimension refers to an even better protected realm harboring still more devastating effects: decision making. Unfairly resourced, othered students (and schools) are not invited or permitted to join discussions about the provisions, rules, or policies (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002; Lewis, 2016) that keep resources to them meager and their voices mute. They are not part of the dialogue that guides decisions about their own existence, subverts their aspirations, or constricts their life chances.

From this vantage on social justice, one sees how the forms of injustice work jointly towards a powerful end that, in various ways and through various practices in schools, disables the capabilities of some students (e.g., those from impoverished families, Black and Indigenous People of Color—BIPOC—students, students with disabilities, students speaking additional languages, LGBTQ students) and scaffolds those of others (e.g., those from affluent families, White families, able students, heterosexual students, and monolingual English-speaking students).

Iris Young's framework has proven durable (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002). We ground our theoretical orientation in it, hoping to capture important dimensions of social justice as reflected in school practice. We renamed Young's theoretical dimensions (based partly on the subsequent empirical analyses): *fairness* (distribution), *voice* (culture), and *dialogue* (association).

The theoretical framework implied the need to compose items to reflect the three dimensions in categories of school-level activity. The categories were chosen to ensure that draft items would distribute across a spectrum of school-level phenomena arguably related to social justice: (1) classroom dynamics at the school, (2) professional purpose at the school, (3) follow-through skills of the faculty, and (4) leadership at the school. The choice of such categories resembled the processes used by Corning and Myers (2002) and Nilsson and colleagues (2011) by being more practical than theoretical.

What of fairness, voice, and dialogue? First, we expected that by starting with categories of practice, we would in fact surface items that reflected the three dimensions of social justice. The introspective and reflective processes we used for developing items, moreover, allowed us to keep fairness, voice, and dialogue in view. Second, we decided to let the empirical findings guide our eventual decision about the fit between school practices and the theoretical model. Young's model, after all, was not developed in consideration of school practices. So, we were not willing to dismiss a priori the possibility that the school social justice practices we identified would fail to align empirically with the model. Third, as is common in this sort of work, we composed more items than would be used (AERA et al., 2014, p. 81): letting the chips fall empirically where they might.

Item Development

Having specified social justice as a construct and established the applicable categories of practice, we drafted actual items. The appropriateness of an instrument for its purpose rests ultimately on test content (AERA et al., 2014), which in this instance is theoretically guided (Kane, 2013), as detailed in the previous explanation. More narrowly, however, test content originates in item design, and this section explains the circumspection and care exerted on item development for this instrument, attending to AERA standards 4.1, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.12 (AERA, 2014, pp. 85-89). Composition was guided by four general process issues:

1. inspection of available quantitative measures for practical insights,
2. coverage of the three dimensions of social justice across the categories of practice,
3. phrasing to specify collective or schoolwide phenomena, and
4. care to avoid wording reflective of political bias.

As to existing instruments, we searched across multiple disciplines (education, sociology, psychology, business) to discover existing measurement approaches as well as the nine instruments previously noted.³ The review reinforced some of the guiding issues and surfaced others. Overall, the lessons from the review of instruments relevant to the process of drafting items were:

- Items should address features of the school rather than features of the respondent (as in Goddard et al., 2000).
- Items should address practices or judgments of realities rather than attitudes.
- Items should not correlate with respondents' position on the political spectrum (to guard against political bias).
- Reverse-coding should *not* be used (as in Gehlbach & Brinkworth, 2011).
- The expression in items should follow the usual rules for clarity and simplicity (as in Corning & Myers, 2002; Nilsson et al., 2011).
- Items should avoid the phrase "social justice" (as possibly aversive to some respondents and related to the issue of political bias).

For the collective phrasing of items, we also consulted the well-established instrument measuring collective teacher efficacy (Goddard et al., 2000). Thus, for instance, Goddard and colleagues used "Teachers here are well prepared to teach the subjects they are assigned to teach" (p. 492) rather than "I am well prepared..." Such phrasing logically orients respondents, as they proceed through a set of items, to reflect about the school as a whole. Phrasing of such items, as we discovered in our review of extant instruments, must also remain positively valenced, as Gehlbach and Brinkworth (2011) advise. For instance, the instrument constructed by Ludlow and colleagues (2008), though not a collective measure, contained involute, negatively coded items

³ *Activism Orientation Scale* (Corning & Myers, 2002); *Critical Consciousness Scale* (Diemer et al., 2017); *Learning to Teach for Social Justice Scales* (Ludlow et al., 2008); *Social Issues Advocacy Scale* (Nilsson et al., 2011); *Social Issues Questionnaire* (Miller et al., 2009); *Social Justice Behavior Scale* (Flood, 2019); *Social Justice Leadership in Education Questionnaire* (Zhang et al., 2018); *Social Justice Scale* (Torres-Harding et al., 2012); and *Social Privilege Measure* (Black et al., 2007). See Appendix A for a descriptive table.

like “The most important goal for me in working with immigrant children and English language learners is to assimilate them into American society” (p. 213).⁴ Gehlbach and Brinkworth (2011) also recommended that instrument developers avoid negatively worded items *altogether*, and we followed that counsel as well.

We focused our items on practice (e.g., actions, conversation topics, and decision rules) rather than on personal attitudes or beliefs. Our expectation was that such a focus would anchor respondents’ thinking on what the faculty does and not on broad issues of politics. In theory, it would be possible, from this perspective, for a faculty to behave with fairness, kindness, and generosity toward students and families whatever their political orientation. After all, a prevalent commitment among teachers is love of children (Tye, 2000). Note that the assumption about political orientation is empirically testable (i.e., with a suitable question). The underlying issue is whether or not such an instrument is politically biased and hence unfair, for instance, to respondents with conservative political views (see AERA et al., 2014, pp. 50-52). As we prepared to start item composition, we also decided to avoid using the phrase “social justice,” even though it identifies the key construct. Some Americans regard usage of the term as a sign of leftist political orientation (Applebaum, 2009). We simply wanted to avoid unnecessary provocation resulting from intrusive item content among a portion of likely respondents (see e.g., Blair et al., 2018).

We composed and edited draft items across January and February 2019, exchanging drafts several times and meeting twice to collaborate on item critique, unpack related language, interrogate items with respect to the realities of school practice, and revise items. By the end of February 2019, we had created a set of 43 draft items for pilot testing, anchored to a 1 to 4 scale (coded for analysis as 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree). Appendix B provides all 43 items, organized by the categories of activity used to structure their creation. The items referencing “TBTs” and “BLTs” refer to school governance structures familiar to PK12 educators in Ohio. The acronyms refer to teacher teams: TBTs for grade levels or departments and BLTs for the school as a whole. Item revisions for the work reported here changed these locally applicable terms to “educator teams” (see the related discussion in the presentation of Study 2 findings).

The initial objective was simply that the 43 items represent a wide range of schooling practices involving teachers, principals, families, and students and represent the theoretical construct to an acceptable degree; Appendix B shows that items exhibit ample range. Some of the practices are quite familiar (e.g., “Teachers help students with disabilities succeed in general education”), while others are perhaps more unusual: “Teachers at this school are courageous on behalf of students.” Others might be more rarely practiced but certainly bear on social justice (e.g., “Teachers at this school speak openly with one another about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate at the school”). We hoped, of course, that the empirical performance of the items would reflect “social justice” as theorized.

⁴ The item may demand that respondents judge assimilation as unjust, and it complicates this difficult judgment with the concept of “importance” as applicable, however, only to immigrant children and English language learners. In other work, we administered Ludlow and colleagues’ instrument, originally piloted with pre-service teachers, to a large sample of practicing teachers—of whom over half (more than 500) refused to respond to this particular item.

Intended Use Argument

This argument follows Kane's (2013) more open format for intended use arguments rather than Schilling and Hill's (2007) prescriptive alternative (with its use of elemental, structural, and ecological assumptions and related inferences), useful as that approach is for many efforts. At any rate, the discussion in this section and the next attend to relevant features of item character, structure, and context. The key question for the intended use argument is, "What should scores rendered by this instrument be used for?"

We argue that the most appropriate use of the instrument is to measure the extent of social justice practice in groups of schools that are undertaking professional development (PD) related to equity, inclusiveness, and social justice. The fundamental objective of such evaluation is to determine if change occurred across a period of time. Due to the documented difficulty of change (e.g., Blacker, 2013; Fullan, 2001), however, we expect that the time period would be relatively long (e.g., years not months). Despite its difficulty, change in social justice practice has been documented in case studies (e.g., Parke et al., 2017) and evaluation work (e.g., Dragoset et al., 2017). We have found no evidence pointing to the possibility that school-level social justice practice is simply impervious to change.⁵ The intended use for which we argue is quite narrow from the perspective of test validity: the decision to be made is a judgment about aggregate differences (yes or no) across groups of schools. High stakes—admission, placement, or sanction—are not involved. For instance, Kane (1992), asked with some irony, "Most tests are also linked to some decision. If the test scores were not relevant to any decision, it is not clear why the test would be given." The intended decision-making power in this case is small: individual-level consequences for those providing the data are negligible. Consequences for schools are unknown (see standard 1.25, AERA et al., 2014, p. 30), but the context of program evaluation with groups of schools (the intended use) renders such consequences negligible as well.

Specifying a narrow use is prudent when the construct is social justice. Social justice practice is a field of struggle in schools and society, the context of the struggle is unusually dynamic (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002), and PD efforts acknowledge this fact (Kemp-Graham, 2015; Riehl, 2000; Rigby, 2014). In other words, evaluation of change ought not to get in the way of the struggle that social justice PD efforts inevitably foster. The character of the struggle and its timetable will differ across schools. So, expecting every school to change to the same degree over the same amount of time would be unrealistic. Considering these circumstances, the appropriate evaluation use would be with groups of schools involved in social justice PD: a large enough group of schools to ensure adequate power for evaluating change across the entire group. At this stage of development, we have no evidence to suggest the sample sizes (standard 1.20) needed to secure adequate power to detect as-yet-unknown effect sizes (see AERA et al., 2014, p. 29). What we are advising, instead, is common sense: groups of fewer than 10 schools would seem imprudent, and more would seem better.

⁵ American society itself, after all, has expanded its own social justice practices (e.g., extended the franchise, abolished de jure segregation, and authorized marriage for same-sex couples).

If change occurs in a group of schools across a lengthy PD effort, the change may logically have something to do with the PD effort. But school practice is subject to a wide range of influences (see e.g., Fixsen et al., 2013) and, empirically, the cause of change also needs to be isolated from such influences: random assignment of schools, regression discontinuity, quasi-experimentation with propensity score matching, and so forth. None of that careful work with respect to altered collective social justice practice in schools, however, is possible without an adequate measure of that practice.

An important corollary to the main intended use is that measuring social justice change in a *single school* with this instrument is not appropriate, tempting as such use might seem. Validating such a use would seemingly require establishing norms, itself a lengthy development process: especially for a construct that reflects a dynamic and historically shifting social reality. Again, this instrument is not a “test” of knowledge, accomplishment, or achievement: the conventional use of that term (see AERA et al., 2014, pp. 2, 183). It is instead a research tool with an intended use in program evaluation. Use to measure change in a single school has not been validated, though that issue could be addressed in the future.

Moreover, labeling particular schools as deficient or superior in social justice practice, for instance as a result of administering an instrument of this sort for that purpose, could alter the dynamic of struggle in ways that might subvert the substantive work: much as high-stakes achievement testing has too often done (Blacker, 2013). Far too little is known about the prevalence of social justice practices (those represented in the instrument or others) to warrant use of that sort. Moreover, historical analyses of shifts in the way social justice PD has changed over time (e.g., Sleeter, 2018) suggest that practices that seem relevant at present may turn out to differ from those that will prove relevant in the future.

In this light, two other uses—though not formally intended—might be appropriate: (1) as one data vector in studies that measure social justice practice (among other variables) in a sample of schools and (2) as a source of data for conversations in a single school or district about social justice practice. The second use seems promising as a starting point for local PD, especially when the main purpose of assessment is formative.

Validity Argument

The instrument has one intended use and two possible (but not formally intended) uses. Here we report initial work to evaluate only the intended use: as a measure of change in collective social justice practice in a relatively large group of schools that are participating in PD efforts to improve practice. The research team has been working with this set of items for more than two years and has assembled the evidence reported here that is relevant to those items. The empirical work presented at this juncture is partial, due in part to the intervention of the COVID-19 pandemic. Planned followup studies are, for the moment, on hold.

One may ask why we are reporting an instrument that is not yet fully developed for uses beyond supplying contextual information to PD efforts. Our reason is the paucity of instruments that collect information about school-level social justice practice from teachers. At this historical juncture, we imagine that other teams could benefit from the work reported here—not just the

instrument or the items, but the approach taken in examining related instruments and in conceptualizing and testing items for this one.

We can at this time report findings about relevant questions: (1) Do the items exhibit internal consistency? (2) Does the presumptive construct for social justice hold up empirically? (3) What is the relationship to political orientation and locale? Answering these questions contributes to our confidence in conducting future school-level tests of the instrument, even though the validity argument, as presented here, does not yet fully validate the intended use. Gathering additional evidence is part of the plan for the future (described in more detail near the end of the article).

Internal Consistency

The 43 items received a first pilot test (Study 1) in April 2019 with 621 teachers whose principals were involved in a PD program to increase collective use of social justice practices at their schools. The sole purpose of that administration was pilot testing (i.e., not program evaluation). Cronbach's α using all 43 items showed high internal consistency $\alpha = 0.96$. Successive administrations with as few as 12 items continued to yield $\alpha \geq .90$ in all cases. Subsets of the items are also internally consistent.

Construct Validity

To what extent do the items reflect the theoretical three-part construct (i.e., fairness, voice, dialogue)? Responding to this question, instrument development conducted successive exploratory factor analyses using two samples (Study 1 and Study 2), aiming to select appropriate items to settle on a version of the instrument suitable to administer to large samples of teachers.

Analyses in both studies were conducted at the individual level for two reasons. First, at the stages of the work reported here, enrollment of a sufficiently large group of schools was not an option. Even the reduced pool of 22 items identified at the end of Study 2 would have required hundreds of schools and likely thousands of teachers. We anticipate that our ongoing evaluation work *will* permit such school-level study in the future using the pool of 22 promising items. Second, the short client instrument, following a similar early process, did enable such testing, with good results.⁶

Study 1. The initial set of 43 items was administered to 621 teachers in April 2019. Initial pilot testing was the only purpose and the only respondents were teachers, all of whom were faculty in 35 schools of the principals in the professional development program previously mentioned. Schools were located in all regions and locales of Ohio. The number of responding teachers in a school varied from 1 to 55; 23 schools were represented by more than 10 respondents.

Table 1 presents the results of the EFA, with items sorted by factor loading ($r \geq .40$); item numbers are those used in Appendix B.

⁶ The short client instrument—with items identified in the Tables and Appendices—was subject to a school-level analysis ($n=99$ schools) with a compatible factor structure and adequate model fit in a confirmatory factor analysis ($CFI=.925$). None of the items yielded standardized estimates below .750.

Factor 1, with high loadings ($r \geq .68$) on items 21-26, might be characterized as fairness (distributive justice). Factor 2, with high loadings ($r \geq .64$) on items 33, and 35-39, might be characterized as “dialogue” (or influence—the associational mode in Young’s scheme). Factor 3 exhibited high loadings ($r \geq .62$) from items 7, 19, and 20 and might be called “voice.”⁷

Table 1: EFA: Factor Loadings for 43 Items

	Item	Factor		
		1	2	3
26	This school educates everyone well, whatever their family or cultural background may be.	.81		
24	In this school students from all races would get a good education.	.78		
23	In this school students from impoverished families get a good education.	.74		
25	At this school students with disabilities receive an education equal to that of other students.	.71		
21	Teachers here believe in equal access to academic opportunities.	.68		
22	Teachers here believe in equal access to extracurricular opportunities.	.68		
12	Teachers here help students respect those who seem different from them.	.63		
29	Educators here work hard to develop rules that are fair.	.62		
30	Educators here work hard to apply school rules fairly.	.59	.41	
16	Teachers at this school believe that all students are capable of meeting high expectations.	.57		
9	Teachers at this school welcome families from other cultures.	.56		.44
6	Teachers here help students with disabilities succeed in general education.	.55		
3	Teachers at this school believe ...working with everyone is an opportunity51		
4	Teachers at this school accept and learn from cultural differences.	.50		
17	Teachers at this school believe their work helps change society for the better.	.49		
31	Teachers here remind one another that each student has assets.	.49		
8	Teachers at this school use students’ backgrounds and knowledge48		.48
18	Teachers at this school collaborate to make sure the school’s practices aren’t unfair...	.46		.45
1	Teachers at this school really care about all their students.	.45		
2	Teachers at this school are courageous on behalf of students.	.43		
15	Students here know that teachers want to give depth and meaning to academic experiences.	.42		
36	My voice has influence at this school.		.82	
35	My input about this school is respected.		.82	
37	My views influence this school's decisions about students.		.76	
33	Decisions that come from BLTs and TBTs represent many voices.		.73	

⁷ At this juncture in our work with some the items, evaluation purpose dictated creation of a brief instrument specifically for summative evaluation for a client’s PD program. For that early evaluative use (September 2019, with 3,325 teachers in 105 schools in Ohio) we selected 12 items: the highest loading items on Factors 1 and 2 but substituting four other items that were more relevant to the PD program in place of the top-loading items in Factor 3. The initial EFA (n=621 teachers) had sorted those 12 items into three factors, in fact. The subsequent administration (of those 12 items) yielded high internal consistency and a clear three-factor structure in confirmatory factor analysis (further details available from the lead author). Suspension of face-to-face schooling, however, makes the follow-up (post-program) administration in June 2021 unlikely, even though PD events have continued virtually in 2020 and 2021.

Table 1: EFA: Factor Loadings for 43 Items

	Item	Factor		
		1	2	3
38	Leadership at this school goes above and beyond the call of duty on behalf of children's66	
39	Leadership at this school uses student concerns ...to help guide decision-making.		.64	
42	The BLT at this school really exercises decision-making power.		.62	
43	The BLT at this school discusses students' views and insights.		.60	
32	I would be (or am) proud to serve on the BLT at this school.		.58	
41	TBTs are concerned with treating students fairly.		.50	
27	Faculty at this school feel safe enough to take a public stand on important issues.		.47	
40	The principal at this school cares about doing the right thing.		.47	
20	Teachers ...speak openly about how race, class ... operate in American society.			.72
19	Teachers ...speak openly about how race, class... operate at the school.			.70
7	Teachers at this school openly discuss issues of racism and inequality with students.			.62
13	At this school, the faculty examines its own attitudes about social differences.			.54
10	Teachers here enjoy learning from students about their families' cultures.	.46		.54
11	Teachers here help students ask questions about government policies and actions.			.53
5	Teachers at this school help students know it's important to speak more than one language.			.49
28	Teachers at this school engage with students' views and insights.	.42		.47
14	How well students do in this school depends mostly on how hard teachers work.			
34	Community members exercise important leadership roles at this school.			

Note. maximum likelihood extraction, varimax rotation, factors with eigenvalues ≥ 1.0 ; total variance explained by 3 factors = 48%

Study 2. Additional experience (see footnote 8) prompted us to continue work to winnow the item pool to produce a smaller set based partly on the results of Study 1. Our aim was to select a more parsimonious set of items to represent a somewhat broader conceptual footprint than the evaluation short form we had developed for our client (footnote 8), but of still reasonable length: prospectively 20 items or so, similar to the length of most of the nine instruments we had reviewed.

The selection of items for Study 2 was based partly on item performance and partly on purposive choice. We began by identifying the 10 items exhibiting the highest correlations to the sum of all 43 items. Correlation for these 10 items appear in Table 2. Italicization identifies the five among them that had been used in the 12-item client version.

To this list of 10 items, we added 10 items selected purposively, beginning with the three highest loading items of the EFA factor 3 from Study 1 (items 7, 19, and 20; see Table 1). These items concerned teachers' discourse with each other and with students about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and disabilities in school and society. Though not a priority for the client evaluation, they were logically quite relevant to the overall construct of collective social justice practice. Moreover, inspection of the items and their correlation with the sum of all items shows they are both empirically and theoretically pertinent to the overall construct.

Table 2: Items Exhibiting Highest Correlations with the Sum of All 43 Items

#	Text	R
18	Teachers at this school collaborate to make sure the school's practices aren't ...	0.71
26	<i>This school educates everyone well, whatever their family or cultural</i>	0.71
29	Educators here work hard to develop rules that are fair.	0.70
28	Teachers at this school engage with students' views and insights.	0.69
3	<i>Teachers at this school believe that working with everyone is an opportunity...</i>	0.69
30	Educators here work hard to apply school rules fairly.	0.69
13	At this school, the faculty examines its own attitudes about social differences.	0.68
24	<i>In this school students from all races would get a good education.</i>	0.67
12	<i>Teachers here help students respect those who seem different from them.</i>	0.67
2	<i>Teachers at this school are courageous on behalf of students.</i>	0.67

Note. Item numbers are those used in Appendix A. Italicized items were used in the 12-item version. Of the 43 items, just four exhibited item-total correlation less than $r = .50$ (5, 14, 32, 34).

To help us select an additional seven items, we turned again to the theoretical literature, drawing more deeply on Gewirtz and Cribb's (2002) translation of the work of Young (2002) and Fraser (1997) to the field of education. At least in theory, the three dimensions of social justice might be construed to represent a sort of progression, with associational justice the pinnacle. In this light, *distributive justice* (fairness) embeds the usual (e.g., Rawlsian) conception of distributive equality, which is at base economic: a potent authority or mechanism decides who gets what, and the authority is responsible for any changes to the arrangement. Reform would involve appeal to the authority or regulation of an unregulated mechanism. Allocation of school funding to different priorities or groups would be an example of distributive justice in education. *Cultural justice* (voice) deals with the hegemony of one cultural formation over others in a society (e.g., WASP culture over all others), such that the related norms and discourse shape everyone's experiences. Reform would entail more frequent representation in institutions and the media of other groups (an historical evolution clearly discernable in American history). As noted earlier, placement in flexible or rigid groupings by ability (i.e., tracking) implements cultural justice (or injustice) in schools. The distinction between distributive and cultural justice recalls the Marxian distinction (e.g., Martin, 2008) between structure (economics) and superstructure (culture).

By contrast, *associational justice* (dialogue) relates specifically to the exercise of power: the identity and dynamics of individuals and groups seated at the tables where the substantive decisions are made. Reform, in this dimension, would see the marginalized groups welcomed into the authority—as in election to the U.S. Senate or appointment to Cabinet positions or, in educational organizations, into influential leadership and governance roles.

Gewirtz and Cribb (2002) argue that associational justice entails access to the power to redress distributive and cultural injustice. It therefore provides a clear and direct path to secure beneficial changes in distributive and cultural justice. Collective power determines what happens, in this view of social justice. One may recall that political theorist Hannah Arendt (1958) argued that political power was a collective rather than individual phenomenon.

This theoretical perspective suggests that efforts to help educators work on equity issues in schools ought to lean heavily on associational justice: the exercise of collective power and voice in designing the work of schooling in order to benefit the common good. One may note, as well, that such a perspective links social justice work in schools with efforts to enhance the exercise of collaborative leadership in schools.

Seeking to reflect associational justice, we settled on the following seven items, two of which (items 33 and 42, italicized) had been used in the 12-item client version (item numbers are again those in Appendix B):

- 11. Teachers here help students ask questions about government policies and actions.
- 27. Faculty at this school feel safe enough to take a public stand on important issues.
- 33. *Decisions that come from BLTs and TBTs represent many voices.*
- 35. My input about this school is respected.
- 37. My views influence this school's decisions about students.
- 42. *The BLT at this school really exercises decision-making power.*
- 43. The BLT at this school discusses students' views and insights.

These items arguably represent the extent of teachers' influence in the school, including as advocates for students. Item 11, in fact, might be understood as teachers' scaffolding of students' own voices directed toward distributional justice in the wide world, and perhaps cultural justice as well.

Because this set of 17 items also included seven of the 12 items on the client instrument, we decided to add the remaining five items from that set for administration in Study 2: for a total of 25 items. The benefit would be the opportunity to conduct an additional individual-level confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the client instrument, while helping to develop the longer, broader-footprint instrument for a wide audience of potential users.

For this most recent administration, we also altered the wording of items 35 and 37 to render them in the collective form that had been our intention all along:

- 35. At this school teachers' input is respected.
- 37. At this school teachers' views influence decisions about students.

Also revised were the three items (33, 42, 43) that had referenced the state version of educator teams, in order to render them more widely applicable:

- 33. At this school everyone on educator teams has a voice.
- 42. Educator teams at this school really exercise decision-making power.
- 43. Educator teams at this school discuss students' views and insights.

Additionally, we streamlined the overall presentation of items, hoping to make them easier for respondents to engage. We reorganized items into two sets, one set beginning "Teachers at this school..." and the other beginning "At this school..." Although most of the items received minor changes to wording on this basis, content remained the same. Appendix C provides the 25

substantive items as administered in Study 2. Note that in the discussion that follows, item numbers remain those for the corresponding items as originally formulated and listed in Appendix B and Table 1 (but with the modest revisions just explained).

Finally, we included five items about respondents' circumstances: (1) years of experience as a classroom teacher (whole years, drop-down menu); (2) grade-level band (K-5, 6-8, or 9-12); (3) locale (using a slider from 0 = most rural to 100 = most urban); (4) gender (open-ended response item); and (5) political orientation (slider from 0 = most conservative to 100 = most liberal).

The administration of the 25 substantive items and five contextual items for Study 2 took place in February and March 2020: just prior to the closing of schools for the pandemic. For the first time in this development effort, we used a sample not associated with the PD evaluation work. Teacher respondents were recruited in two ways: (1) deans of colleges of education in Ohio invited graduate students (who were practicing teachers) to respond via the survey link and (2) all principals in Ohio were invited to share the survey link with their faculty.

When the online collector was closed, 428 teachers had opened the survey link (with 268 completing all 25 substantive items). Respondents taught at all levels; of the 260 who provided school grade level data, 35% taught at the elementary level, 15% in middle schools, 37% in high schools, and 13% taught both middle and high school—Ohio operates numerous 7-12 schools. Of the 251 providing identifying sex, 27% were male and 73% female. Of the 257 respondents providing data about years of teaching, 35% had taught for 20 years or more; 26% for fewer than 10 years; and 39% for 10 or more years but less than 20. Of the 253 providing locale data, 17% identified as very urban (90 and above on the slider) and 13% as very rural (10 and below on the slider). Politically, 11% identified as very liberal (90 and above on the slider) and 8% as very conservative (10 and below on the slider), with a strong mode at 50 and a very slight negative skew (-.08). An unknown, but likely small, proportion of these teachers probably taught in schools whose principals were or had been involved in our client's PD program. In the discussion below, we first consider the results of construct-testing (EFA); then we report the association of political orientation and locale with the sum of scores on the final set of items.

We performed an EFA on the 25 items (parallel analysis, maximum likelihood extraction, and varimax rotation). Internal consistency was high ($\alpha = .95$) with 22 items loading at $r = .50$ and higher. Model fit for all 25 items was promising (RMSEA=.064; TLI=.91).⁸ Removing the three items with factor loadings less than .50 and recomputing the EFA for the remaining 22 items yielded the factor loadings reported in Table 3.

⁸ Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) values of .90 or higher indicate good fit, as do Root Mean Square Error of Approximation estimates (RMSEA) of .06 or less (see, e.g., Bruin, 2019; Kline, 2013).

Table 3: EFA for 22 Collective Social Justice Items

	Item	Factor		
		1	2	3
20	Teachers... speak openly about how race, class ... operate in American society.	.80		
19	...speak openly with one another about how race, class... operate at the school.	.78		
7	...openly discuss issues of racism and inequality with students.	.74		
8	<i>...use students' backgrounds and knowledge to inform and enrich instruction.</i>	.64		
28	...engage with students' views and insights.	.62		
12	<i>...help students respect those who seem different from them.</i>	.60		
2	<i>...are courageous on behalf of students.</i>	.58		
18	...collaborate to make sure the school's practices are not unfair to any student subgroups.	.56		
3	<i>...believe that working with everyone is an opportunity for learning and teaching.</i>	.55		
11	...help students ask questions about government policies and actions.	.53		
35	At this school, teachers' input is respected.		.74	
42	<i>...educator teams really exercise decision-making power.</i>		.70	
33	<i>...everyone on educator teams has a voice.</i>		.67	
43	...educator teams discuss students' views and insights.		.60	
39	<i>...leadership uses student concerns and perspectives to help guide decision-making.</i>		.57	
29	...educators work hard to develop rules that are fair.		.55	
38	<i>...leadership goes above and beyond the call of duty on behalf of children's well-being.</i>		.54	
27	...teachers feel safe enough to take a public stand on important issues.		.51	
26	<i>...students get a good education, whatever their family or cultural background may be.</i>			.79
24	<i>...students from all races would get a good education.</i>			.75
23	<i>...students from impoverished families get a good education.</i>			.74
25	<i>...students with disabilities receive an education equal to that of other students.</i>			.55

Note. Parallel analysis with maximum likelihood extraction and varimax rotation.

Model fit remained approximately the same (RMSEA=.067; TLI=.92). The three factors explained 55.6% of total item variance (Factor 1 = 23%, Factor 2 = 18%, Factor 3 = 14%). Examination of the scree plot suggested that the data manifested three meaningful factors.⁹

Despite using a sample not implicated in the PD effort from which initial work with these items proceeded, the factor loadings resemble those in Table 1. The salience of the factors, though, is altered. Factor 3, explaining 14% of total variance, is clearly representative of *fairness* (Compare the items that load heavily on this factor with those loading heavily on Factor 1 in Study 1). Factor 2 in Study 2 maps well to Factor 2 in Study 1: in both cases the relevant items address participation in decision making. Note that in Table 3, the revised version of item 35 (revised from “My input about this school is respected” to “At this school, teachers’ input is respected)

⁹ Italicized items in Table 4, again, are those in the client instrument. Although not a focus of this study, we used the administration of Study 2 to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis for those 12 items, establishing very good model fit (RMSEA = .05, TLI=.97 and CFI=.98); further details available from the lead author.

loaded heaviest ($r = .74$) on the factor, just as item 35 did in Study 1 ($r = .82$). Factor 2 in each study (as reported in Tables 1 and 3) represents *dialogue*.

What does the main factor (Factor 1) in Table 3 represent? The heaviest loading items in Factor 1 (Table 3) mapped to the heaviest loading ones in Factor 3 of Table 1: speaking openly about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate in American society and in the school—with one another and with students. Additional items loading at or above .50 on Factor 1 (Table 3) add information that likely reflects collective concern for students whose existence is affected by prejudice and marginalization. This constellation shares the concerns for associational justice that we identify as *voice*.

These results support the inference that the 22 items selected from the items administered in Study 1 and Study 2 reflect the theoretical construct informing their creation. The range of practices reflected in the items, we argue, represent a conception of social justice work in schools that goes beyond simple fairness to reflect at least some of the social dynamics that characterize schools' engagement of social justice in discourse about the practice of leadership and governance.

As to political orientation and locale, we computed zero-order correlations of our measures of political orientation and locale with the sum of the 22 items. This analysis was an initial test of whether or not either is related to teachers' assessment of school-level social justice practices. One might expect, in particular, that political orientation would demonstrate a relationship if one considered that concern for social justice is a commitment more politically liberal than conservative (Hayek, 1976; Ikeda, 2016). The extreme conservative value on the variable was 0 and the extreme liberal value was 100; the extreme rural value was 0 and the extreme urban value was 100. Both correlated $r = -.11$ but were statistically non-significant. In addition, summed-score differences by sex and by school grade level were also not statistically significant, as was the correlation of years of experience ($r = .09$) with the summed item scores.

The lack of relationship between political orientation and the summed values of the 22 items may stem from (1) the schoolwide focus, such that the influence of any individual's orientation would be both muted and indirect; (2) the focus of items on external phenomena (practices) instead of internal ones (personal attitudes or beliefs), which imposes a degree of objectivity; (3) the care for student wellbeing exhibited substantively across the item set; and (4) our purposive decision to eschew the term "social justice."

Discussion

Following a consideration of study limitations and recommendations for further research, this section discusses practical applications of the instrument in its current form. It also points to methods that schools and districts might use to test the instrument's suitability for supporting locally responsive improvement work.

Limitations and Planned Future Studies

The development work has thus far, we think, advanced a set of promising items that warrant additional work in the future, and we are planning such studies. Most pressing would be studies at the school level that correlate totals from the social justice practices instrument with other school-level measures (e.g., Flood's social justice instrument for principals). Our client has, in fact, already agreed to adopt the Flood (2009) instrument for use with principals in subsequent cohorts participating in its PD program. Correlational studies between that instrument and the one reported here will ensue (AERA et al., 2014, standard 1.16, pp. 28-29).

Fortunately, our evaluation work will enable additional validation studies. Anticipated studies include CFAs and school-level analyses (see, e.g., Goddard et al, 2000) for both the 22-item set that emerged from Study 2 and the 12-item client version, as well as the criterion study noted above and possibly others (e.g., correlation with the collective teacher efficacy instrument of Goddard and colleagues).

The noted difficulty of altering social justice practice in schools suggests, as well, that studies with the instrument are also needed to demonstrate that it is capable of documenting change in schools' social justice practice within the time periods that are typical for intensive PD efforts lasting one to three years. Such effort would advance the validation research toward consideration of consequences (standard 1.25).

Opportunities for us to move this work forward will present themselves as resolution of the COVID pandemic allows schools to reopen on a stable basis. If other researchers and evaluators find this work prospectively useful, however, they must understand that development is still incomplete and that their use of the instrument should include appropriate validity efforts that build on the work reported here.

Practical Implications

Despite the limitations considered above, this report does provide a set of related items backed by theory as well as empirical work across two pilot tests to evaluate claims about the instrument's mapping to a relevant construct (and subconstructs) and the instrument's intended use. The instrument, even in its current form, addresses an important need. Notably, the historical moment is momentous: the Black Lives Matter movement; the #MeToo movement; the inequitable responses to the pandemic threat; encouragement of racism, sexism, and xenophobia from the highest level in government; and a rise in hate crimes (Balsamo, 2020, November 16).

Under the circumstances, the rationale, conceptualization, and evidence presented in the forgoing report provide researchers and evaluators with far more substantial options than we found at the start of this effort two years ago. The present effort has thus far reduced the initial item pool by about half, and prospects seem promising for establishing an instrument suitable for summative evaluation purposes in large-scale efforts in many different PD programs. Given educators' heightened concern for social justice (National Academy of Education, 2020), moreover, PD programs with a social justice focus may well become more common in the coming years. With

these considerations about PD for educators in view, an instrument that measures collective social justice practice would likely prove useful.

In such a context the ongoing work reported here also offers details about one of the few quantitative options for evaluating social justice practice in schools as a starting point for change. First, this report provides a theoretical grounding for the measurement of collective social justice practice in schools, building on significant and widely accepted philosophical origins (fairness, voice, and dialogue). Second, the conceptualization frames social justice work in schools on the basis of solidarity (school level) and not on individual preference. One might also interpret the lack of a relationship with respondents' individual-level characteristics (political orientation, locale, sex, grade level) as evidence that the items measure a relevant collective reality. Third, for the intended evaluation purpose, this work offers a large set of items that have been substantially pilot-tested, with documented results. And, finally, the intended-use basis of validity work conservatively limits the proposed instrument(s) to formal PD efforts in groups (or coalitions) of schools.

One can imagine a range of PD programs in which this instrument (given the forgoing cautions) might be used. Leadership training programs are a clear example, since leadership is documented as exerting schoolwide influence (Leithwood & Seashore-Lewis, 2011). The instrument could prove useful, as well, whether social justice concerns are explicit or tacit. Systemic reform efforts (e.g., Fullan, 2011) are another example; too often in such work, the focus is on improved test scores. As some observers suggest (e.g., Blacker, 2013, Howley et al., 2017), equity is an overlooked foundation of academic outcomes and is clearly relevant to systemic reform efforts.

The intended use—that is, the valid use of scores from the instrument—is evaluative. Nevertheless, other related uses, as noted above, do not push too far beyond the intended use specified in our argument. Notably, “pure” research applications resemble the intended use in that they do not deploy scores judgmentally, but only as a matter of inquiry. This instrument might, therefore, prove useful in large- or moderately scaled research efforts that examine school culture.

In addition, locally responsive PD efforts sometimes use school or district data as a provocation for change. For example, some professional development work with a focus on social justice incorporates an equity audit to help schools and districts surface practices that contribute to or detract from equity aims (Frattura & Capper, 2007). Local professional development grounded in improvement science methods also orients to measures that function as indicators of improvement (see e.g., Bryk et al., 2015). The instrument reported here, or perhaps a subset of its items, might be adopted provisionally and tested locally to determine its suitability for use in measuring progress toward implementation of social justice practices.

Author Notes

Craig Howley is senior researcher at WordFarmers, retired from Ohio University. He is retired from Ohio University, where he directed an NSF research initiative and an ERIC Clearinghouse. Address correspondence to howleycb@gmail.com

Aimee Howley is President of WordFarmers Associates, LLC (wordfarmers.com). She is professor emerita at Ohio University, where she served as associate dean and professor in the Educational Studies Department.

Amy Farley is assistant professor at the University of Cincinnati in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Her focus is education policy and research and evaluation methodology.

Marged Dudek consults for WordFarmers, where she leads a variety of evaluation and product-development projects.

Courtney Gilday is a doctoral student at the University of Cincinnati.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to **Craig Howley** at howleycb@gmail.com

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, & Joint Committee on Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (U.S.) (Eds.). (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association.
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852–862.
- Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the south, 1860-1935*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, K. P., & Ritter, G. W. (2017). Disparate use of exclusionary discipline: Evidence on inequities in school discipline from a U.S. state. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(49). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2787>
- Anyon, J. (2005). *Radical possibilities: Public policy, urban education, and a new social movement*. Routledge.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67–92.
- Apple, M. W. (2018) The critical divide: Knowledge about the curriculum and the concrete problems of curriculum policy and practice. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 4(2), 63-66. DOI: 10.1080/20020317.2018.1492692
- Applebaum, B. (2009). Is teaching for social justice a “liberal bias”? *Teachers College Record*, 111(2), 376–408.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Atkins, M. S., McKay, M. M., Frazier, S. L., Jakobsons, L. J., Arvanitis, P., Cunningham, T., & ... Lambrecht, L. (2002). Suspensions and detentions in an urban, low-income school: Punishment or reward? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 30(4), 361-371.
- Balsamo, M. (2020, November 16). Hate crimes in US reach highest level in more than a decade. *AP News*. <https://apnews.com/article/hate-crimes-rise-FBI-data-ebbcadca8458aba96575da905650120d>
- Black, L. L., Stone, D. A., & Hutchinson, S. R. (2007). The development and validation of the Social Privilege Measure. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, 40(1), 16–32.

- Blacker, D. (2013). *The falling rate of learning and the neoliberal endgame*. Zero Books.
- Blair, B., & Bligh, M. C. (2018). Looking for leadership in all the wrong places: The impact of culture on proactive followership and follower dissent. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(1), 129-143.
- Blair, G., Coppock, A., & Moor, M. (2020). When to worry about sensitivity bias: A social reference theory and evidence from 30 years of list experiments. *American Political Science Review, 114*(4), 1297-1315. doi:10.1017/S0003055420000374
- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Harvard Education Press.
- Burns, L. D., & Miller, S. J. (2017). Social justice policymaking in teacher education from conception to application: Realizing Standard VI. *Teachers College Record, 119*(2), 1–38.
- Camburn, E.M., Goldring, E., Sebastian, J., May, H., & Huff, J. (2016). An examination of the benefits, limitations, and challenges of conducting randomized experiments with principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 187-230.
- Capper, C. A., & Young, M. D. (2014). Ironies and limitations of educational leadership for social justice: A call to social justice educators. *Theory into Practice, 53*(2), 158-164.
- Cardichon, J., Darling-Hammond, L., Yang, M., Scott, C., Shields, P. M., & Burns, D. (2020). *Inequitable opportunity to learn: Student access to certified and experienced teachers*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Carr, M. J., Gray, N. L., & Holley, M. J. (2007). Shortchanging disadvantaged students: An analysis of intra-district spending patterns in Ohio. *Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies, 7*(1), 36-53.
- Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2005). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. *Economics of Education Review, 24*(4), 377–392.
- Condrón, D. (2011). Egalitarianism and educational excellence: Compatible goals for affluent societies? *Educational Researcher, 40*(2), 47–55.
- Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political psychology, 23*(4), 703-729.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2021). 2022 initial level standards. <http://www.ncate.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/2022-initial-standards-1-pager-final.pdf?la=en>

- deCarvalho, M. E. P. (2001). *Rethinking family-school relations: A critique of parental involvement in schooling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dee, T., & Gershenson, S., (2017). *Unconscious bias in the classroom: Evidence and opportunities, 2017*. Center for Education Policy Analysis.
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED579284.pdf>
- DeMarrais, K., & LeCompte, M. (1999). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. Longman.
- Diemer, M. A., Rapa, L. J., Park, C. J., & Perry, J. C. (2017). Development and validation of the critical consciousness scale. *Youth & Society*, 49(4), 461–483.
- Dorling, D. (2010). The return to elitism in education. *Soundings* (13626620), (44), 35-46.
- Dragoset, L., Thomas, J., Herrmann, M., Deke, J., James-Burdumy, S., Graczewski, C.,...Giffin, J. (2017). *School Improvement Grants: Implementation and effectiveness* (NCEE 2017-4013). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20174013/>.
- Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Naoom, S., & Duda, M. (2013). *Implementation drivers: Assessing best practices*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Flood, L. D. (2019). A new way forward for social justice researchers: Development and validation of the Social Justice Behavior Scale. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 4(2), 303–346.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the “postsocialist” condition*. Routledge.
- Frattura, E. M., & Capper, C. A. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming schools for all learners*. Sage Publications.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Whole school reform: Problems and promises*. University of Toronto. Retrieved from <http://michaelfullan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/13396044810.pdf>
- Gagnon, J. C., Gurel, S., & Barber, B. R. (2017). State-level analysis of school punitive discipline practices in Florida. *Behavioral Disorders*, 42(2), 65–80.
- Gehlbach, H., & Brinkworth, M. E. (2011). Measure twice, cut down error: A process for enhancing the validity of survey scales. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(4),380-387.
- Gewirtz, S. (2006). Towards a contextualized analysis of social justice in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(1), 69–81.

- Gewirtz, S., & Cribb, A. (2002). Plural conceptions of social justice: Implications for policy sociology. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(5), 499–509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930210158285>
- Glass, G. (2007). *Fertilizers, pills, and magnetic strips: The fate of public education in America*. Information Age Publishing.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W.K., & Hoy, A W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Gorski, P., & Swalwell, K. (2015). Equity literacy for all. *Educational Leadership*, 72(6), 34-40.
- Harris, A., & Spillane, J. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education*, 22(1), 31–34.
- Hayek, F. A. von. (1976). *The mirage of social justice*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison? The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12, 79. doi: 10.1177/1362480607085795
- Howley, C. B., Howley, A., Yahn, J., VanHorn, P., & Telfer, D. (2019). Inclusive instructional leadership: A quasi-experimental study of a professional development program for principals. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 31(1), 3-19.
- Howley, C. B., Howley, A., & Pendarvis, E. D. (2017). *Out of our minds: Turning the tide of anti- intellectualism in American schools* (Second edition). Prufrock Press.
- Huber, L. P. (2011). Discourses of racist nativism in California public education: English dominance as racist nativist microaggressions. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, 47(4), 379–401.
- Ikeda, Y. (2013). Friedrich Hayek on social justice: Taking Hayek seriously. *History of Economics Review*, 57(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18386318.2013.11681245>
- Isenberg, N. (2016). *White trash: The 400-year untold history of class in America*. Viking.
- Johnson, H. B. (2014). *The American dream and the power of wealth: Choosing schools and inheriting inequality in the land of opportunity* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kane, M. T. (2013). Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 50(1), 1–73.
- Kane, M. T. (1992). An argument-based approach to validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 527–535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.527>

- Kemp-Graham, K. Y. (2015). Missed opportunities: Preparing aspiring school leaders for bold social justice school leadership needed for 21st century schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(21), 99-129.
- Knoeppel, R. C. (2007). Resource adequacy, equity, and the right to learn: Access to high-quality teachers in Kentucky. *Journal of Education Finance*, 32(4), 422-442.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. Crown Publishers.
- Kupchik, A., & Catlaw, T. J. (2015). Discipline and participation: The long-term effects of suspension and school security on the political and civic engagement of youth. *Youth & Society*, 47(1), 95–124.
- Langhout, R. D., & Mitchell, C. A. (2008). Engaging contexts: Drawing the link between student and teacher experiences of the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 18(6), 593–614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.974>
- Lavery, M. R., Bostic, J. D., Kruse, L., Krupa, E. E., & Carney, M. B. (2020). Argumentation surrounding argument-based validation: A systematic review of validation methodology in peer-reviewed articles. *Educational Measurement: Issues & Practice*, 39(4), 116–130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12378>
- Leithwood, K., & Seashore-Louis, K. (2011). *Linking leadership to student learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Lester, J., Struthers, B., & Yamanaka, A. (2017). Unwelcoming classroom climates: The role of gender microaggressions in CTE. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 178, 67–77.
- Lewis, K. (2016). Social justice leadership and inclusion: A Genealogy. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 48(4), 324–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2016.1210589>
- Lindahl, R. (2008). Shared leadership: Can it work in schools? *Educational Forum*, 72(4), 298–307.
- Lleras, C., & Rangel, C. (2009). Ability grouping practices in elementary school and African American/Hispanic achievement. *American Journal of Education*, 115(2), 279–304. <https://doi.org/10.1086/595667>
- Llopart, M., & Esteban-Guitart, M. (2018). Funds of knowledge in 21st century societies: Inclusive educational practices for under-represented students, a literature review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 50(2), 145–161.
- Ludlow, L. H., Enterline, S. E., & Cochran-Smith, M. (2008). Learning to teach for social justice—beliefs scale: An application of Rasch measurement principles. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 40, 194-214.

- Martin, J. (Ed.). (2008). *The Poulantzas reader: Marxism, law, and the state*. Verso.
- Meier, D. (2003). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization*. Beacon Press.
- Meister, S. M., Zimmer, W. K., & Wright, K. L. (2017). Social justice in practitioner publications: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 13, 90–111.
- Miller, C.M., & Martin, B.N. (2014). Principal preparedness for leading in demographically changing schools: Where is the social justice training? *Educational Management, Administration, and Leadership*, 43(1), 129-151.
- Miller, J.R., Goddard, R.D., Kim, M., Jacob, R., Goddard, Y., & Schroeder, P. (2016). Can professional development improve school leadership? Results from a randomized control trial assessing the impact of McREL's Balanced Leadership Program on principals in rural Michigan schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(4), 531-566.
- Miller, M. J., Sendrowitz, K., Connacher, C., Blanco, S., Muñiz de la Peña, C., Bernardi, S., & Morere, L. (2009). College students' social justice interest and commitment: A social-cognitive perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(4), 495–507.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017220>
- Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2016). Social justice and teacher education: A systematic review of empirical work in the field. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(4), 263–276.
- National Academy of Education. (2020). *COVID-19 educational inequities roundtable series* (Summary Report). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED608441.pdf>
- Nilsson, J. E., Marszalek, J. M., Linnemeyer, R. M., Bahner, A. D., & Misialek, L. H. (2011). Development and assessment of the Social Issues Advocacy Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 71(1), 258–275.
- Oakes, J., Ormseth, T., Bell, R., & Camp, P. (1990). *Multiplying inequalities: The effects of race, social inequality, and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science*. RAND.
<http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED329615>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2011). *Continuum of teacher development: A resource tool for educators*. <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Equity/Ohio-s-Educator-Standards>
- Parke, C. S., Generett, G. G., & de Almeida Ramos, R. (2017). Describing characteristics of Pennsylvania's "Schools to Watch®": Focusing on social equity and developmental responsiveness. *Middle School Journal*, 48(4), 13–26.

- Power, S., & Taylor, C. (2013). Social justice and education in the public and private spheres. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(4), 464–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2013.821854>
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. Belknap Press.
- Riehl, C. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 55-81.
- Rigby, J. G. (2014). Three logics of instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(4), 610-644.
- Rury, J. L., & Hill, S. (2011). *The African American struggle for secondary schooling, 1940-1980: Closing the graduation gap*. Teachers College Press.
- Schilling, S. G., & Hill, H. C. (2007). Assessing measures of mathematical knowledge for teaching: A validity argument approach. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 5(2–3), 70–80.
- Sirotnik, K. A. (1980). Psychometric implications of the unit-of-analysis problem (with examples from the measurement of organizational climate). *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 17(4), 245–282.
- Sirotnik, K. A., & Burstein, L. (1985). Measurement and statistical issues in multilevel research on schooling. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21, 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X85021003003>
- Sleeter, C. (2018). Multicultural education past, present, and future: Struggles for dialog and power-sharing. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 20(1), 5–20.
- Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator*, 39(4), 29–33.
- Torres-Harding, S. R., Siers, B., & Olson, B. D. (2012). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Social Justice Scale (SJS). *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(1/2), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9478-2>
- Tye, B. B. (2000). *Hard truths: Uncovering the deep structure of schooling*. Teachers College Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. State University of New York Press.

- White, B. A. (2017). The invisible victims of the school-to-prison pipeline: Understanding black girls, school push-out, and the impact of the Every Student Succeeds Act. *William & Mary Journal of Women and the Law*, 24(3), 641–664.
- Williams, J. H. (2005). Cross-national variations in rural mathematics achievement: A descriptive overview. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 20(5), 1–18.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Columbia University Press.
- Young, I. M. (2001). Equality of whom? Social groups and judgments of injustice. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 9(1), 1–18.
- Zhang, Y., Goddard, J. T., & Jakubiec, B. A. E. (2018). Social justice leadership in education: A suggested questionnaire. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 3(1), 53–86.

Appendix A: Instruments Reviewed

Instrument	Year	Purpose	#	IC		Construct	Use With	Note
				R				
<i>AOS</i> (Corning)	2002	likelihood to engage in political action	35	.96		2 factors, PCA	adult individuals	concurrent validity studies
<i>CCS</i> (Diemer)	2017	measure SJ response to oppression	22	.93		3 factors, CFA	adult individuals	negative factor correlation
<i>LTSJB</i> (Ludlow)	2008	measure 6 features of learning to teach for SJ	12	.78		2 factors, PCA	K12 teachers	attempted true-scale development
<i>SIAS</i> (Nilsson)	2011	assess broader aspects of SJ advocacy	21	.89 ^a		4 factors, EFA	adult professionals	no CFAs
<i>SIQ</i> (Miller)	2009	explain development of SJ interest & commitment	52	.96		6 related scales	college students	extensive data on model fit
<i>SJBS</i> (Flood)	2019	assess SJ behaviors specific to education leadership	23	.93		3 factors, PCA	K12 principals	nationwide sample
<i>SJLEQ</i> (Zhang)	2018	measure broader features of SJ leadership	32	.78		unexamined	K12 principals	sample sizes <i>tiny</i>
<i>SJS</i> (Torres-Harding)	2012	measure attitudes related to intention to act for SJ	24	.87		4 factors, CFA	adult individuals	demographic comparisons
<i>SPM</i> (Black)	2007	measure social (racial) privilege	25	.92		5 factors, CFA	adult individuals	for counseling programs

^a. coefficient is θ

^a.Note. # = N of items in final scale; ICR = internal consistency reliability (α , except as indicated)

APPENDIX B

Draft Items (n=43)

CLASSROOM DYNAMICS AT THIS SCHOOL

1. Teachers at this school really care about all their students.
2. Teachers at this school are courageous on behalf of students.
3. Teachers at this school believe that working with everyone is an opportunity for learning and teaching.
4. Teachers at this school accept and learn from cultural differences.
5. Teachers at this school help students know it's important to speak more than one language.
6. Teachers here help students with disabilities succeed in general education.
7. Teachers at this school openly discuss issues of racism and inequality with students.
8. Teachers at this school use students' backgrounds and knowledge to inform and enrich instruction.
9. Teachers at this school welcome families from other cultures.
10. Teachers here enjoy learning from students about their families' cultures.
11. Teachers here help students ask questions about government policies and actions.
12. Teachers here help students respect those who seem different from them.

PROFESSIONAL PURPOSE AT THIS SCHOOL

13. At this school, the faculty examines its own attitudes about social differences.
14. How well students do in this school depends mostly on how hard teachers work.
15. Students here know that teachers want to give depth and meaning to academic experiences.
16. Teachers at this school believe that all students are capable of meeting high expectations.
17. Teachers at this school believe their work helps change society for the better.
18. Teachers at this school collaborate to make sure the school's practices aren't unfair to any student subgroups.
19. Teachers at this school speak openly with one another about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate at the school.
20. Teachers at this school speak openly with one another about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate in American society.

FOLLOW-THROUGH SKILLS OF THE FACULTY

21. Teachers here believe in equal access to academic opportunities.
22. Teachers here believe in equal access to extracurricular opportunities.
23. In this school students from impoverished families get a good education.
24. In this school students from all races would get a good education.
25. At this school students with disabilities receive an education equal to that of other students.
26. This school educates everyone well, whatever their family or cultural background may be.
27. Faculty at this school feel safe enough to take a public stand on important issues.
28. Teachers at this school engage with students' views and insights.
29. Educators here work hard to develop rules that are fair.
30. Educators here work hard to apply school rules fairly.
31. Teachers here remind one another that each student has assets.

LEADERSHIP AT THIS SCHOOL

32. I would be (or am) proud to serve on the BLT at this school.
33. Decisions that come from BLTs and TBTs represent many voices.
34. Community members exercise important leadership roles at this school.
35. My input about this school is respected.
36. My voice has influence at this school.

37. My views influence this school's decisions about students.
38. Leadership at this school goes above and beyond the call of duty on behalf of children's well-being.
39. Leadership at this school uses student concerns and perspectives to help guide decision-making.
40. The principal at this school cares about doing the right thing.
41. TBTs are concerned with treating students fairly.
42. The BLT at this school really exercises decision-making power.
43. The BLT at this school discusses students' views and insights.

Appendix C
25 Items Administered in Study 2

Teachers at this school...

- speak openly with one another about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate in American society. (20)*
- believe that working with everyone is an opportunity for learning and teaching. (3)*
- use students' backgrounds and knowledge to inform and enrich instruction. (8)*
- openly discuss issues of racism and inequality with students. (7)
- are courageous on behalf of students. (2)*
- collaborate to make sure the school's practices are not unfair to any student subgroups. (18)
- engage with students' views and insights. (28)
- help students ask questions about government policies and actions. (11)
- help students respect those who seem different from them. (12)*
- speak openly with one another about how race, class, gender, disabilities, and sexual orientation operate at the school. (19)

At this school...

- students get a good education, whatever their family or cultural background may be. (26)*
- teachers' input is respected. (35)
- educators work hard to apply school rules fairly. (30)
- educators work hard to develop rules that are fair. (29)
- teachers feel safe enough to take a public stand on important issues. (27)
- educator teams discuss students' views and insights. (43)
- students from all races would get a good education. (24)*
- students with disabilities receive an education equal to that of other students. (25)*
- the faculty examines its own attitudes about social differences. (13)
- leadership goes above and beyond the call of duty on behalf of children's well-being. (38)*
- educator teams really exercise decision-making power. (42)*
- teachers' views influence decisions about students. (37)
- students from impoverished families get a good education. (23)*

leadership uses student concerns and perspectives to help guide decision-making. (39)
everyone on educator teams has a voice. (33)

Note. Italicized items appear in the 12-item version used in the program evaluation.