

2009

A Scholar–Practitioner Stance: Practices of Social Justice and Democracy

Patrick M. Jenlink
Stephen F. Austin State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

[Tell us](#) how this article helped you.

Recommended Citation

Jenlink, Patrick M. (2009) "A Scholar–Practitioner Stance: Practices of Social Justice and Democracy," *School Leadership Review*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr/vol4/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School Leadership Review by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu.

A Scholar–Practitioner Stance: Practices of Social Justice and Democracy

Patrick M. Jenlink, Stephen F. Austin State University

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. (King, 1963, p. 77)

Crossing the threshold into a new millennium has been hallmarked by a series of defining events, which have shaped, irrevocably, society and its educational system. These events include the standards and accountability movement, the federal mandate of No Child Left Behind of 2001, the fifty-year anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education and the realization of how far we are from obtaining its promise, and the demographic shifts in population density and racial makeup nationally and particularly in urban centers, to mention a select few of the more profound historical events. Issues of diversity, both inter and intragroup, further illuminate the complex and problematic nature of education, reflecting a deeply embedded, historical concern for equity and equality. Increasingly, the attention drawn to standards and accountability in the American educational system illuminates the problems inherent in a system animated by technical standards and focused on codification of knowledge; a system that works to standardize teaching and learning, discrediting difference in the process. The implications for education, of these defining events and social issues, draws attention to the very meaning of democracy, freedom, and social justice.

A fundamental concern for social justice and democracy is a defining principle of leadership preparation that serves to prepare educational leaders for ensuring that schools are

more just and more democratic. Likewise, at the heart of scholar–practitioners’¹ work in schools is a fundamental concern for social justice. Inseparably linked with this concern is the question of whether schools are to serve and reproduce the existing society or to adopt a more critical role of challenging the dominant social order so as to develop and advance society’s democratic imperatives (Giroux, 1992a, 1992b, 1994; Kincheloe, 1999). The educational leader recognizes, as Niebuhr (1946) argued, that as a society our “capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but [our] inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary” (Niebuhr, 1946, p. xi). A more passive role lends to reproduction of the existing society, with its injustices, whereas a critical active role that challenges dominant social orders leads to transformation and the realization of a just, democratic society.

Within education, and more specifically within schools and classrooms, all too often there are hierarchies of participation ingrained; ideologically dominated forms of social control that dictate to individuals how and whether they are to participate in what constitutes learning and other activities in the educational setting. The scholar–practitioner’s work, in part, is to illuminate and interrogate injustices—such as those created by hierarchies of participation and forms of social control. The scholar–practitioner interrogates social structures and cultural practices that contribute to injustice, bringing democratic practices to bear so as to mediate cultural dominance, political ideologies and asymmetries of power that work to reproduce cultures and social structures that foster injustices and inequities in educational settings.

Importantly, the scholar–practitioner understands that s/he occupies objective positions within a variety of contexts, and that from these objective positions s/he must necessarily take a stance on differing social issues. Such distinction is informed by a realization of the interconnectedness of position and stance; acknowledging that a particular stance, critical or

otherwise, is ineffective without accounting for one’s position within different social contexts. Being in a position and taking a stance—position in contrast to position-taking—from that position is concerned with recognizing one’s situatedness within the social issues (Bourdieu, 1992). And at the same realizes that in order to affect justice, equity, or advance democracy, the scholar–practitioner must maintain her/his position within the educational setting in order to bring voice to social issues through one’s stance on justice and democracy.

The scholar–practitioner understands that when social justice and democracy are central to the purpose of education, then schools enable the widest diffusion of teaching and learning as “a model of cultural renewal, in effect, to support something peculiarly consonant with the democratization of culture” (Scheffler, 1960, p. 57); democratization that mediates social inequities and injustices reflective of deeply entrenched social issues in society. The scholar–practitioner recognizes, as did Dewey (1916, 1927), the importance of making political and moral considerations an integral element of their practice, distinguishing between education as a function of society and society as a function of education. A scholar–practitioner stance is grounded in an understanding of theories of social justice and democracy; an awareness of the principles upon which justice and democracy are founded, and the practices through which they are lived.

In this paper, the author argues for a theoretical positioning of educational leaders as scholar–practitioners, and therein theorizes leadership as a social justice practice that must necessarily be mediated by inquiry and scholarly pursuits in and through practice, animated by concerns for equity, social justice, and democracy. The author engages in an analysis of narrative discourse related to social justice practices of school leaders. In this sense, discourses and social practices are seen as structuring mechanisms for social institutions, modes of thought and

individual subjectivities. As example, political issues that work to de-democratize social practice affect socially just practices in schools.

Scholar–Practitioner Leadership—Taking A Stance

The construct of scholar–practitioner leadership² is premised on an alternative epistemology of *inquiry as practice*, wherein the leader as scholar and her/his leadership practice are inseparable from scholarly and critically oriented inquiry. Scholar–practitioner leadership is grounded in a postmodern—post-positivist view of leadership, which seeks to blur boundaries in the knowledge-practice and inquiry-practice relationships.

Historically, the “scholar” has most often been associated with academe and the university setting, and therefore her/his practice was understood as one of formal research and the development of formal knowledge (codified knowledge). Herein the *scholar* may be viewed as having a form of power. Foucault (1980) argued that, by its analysis, the relationship of knowledge and power may be understood.

Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of region, domain, implantation, displacement, transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power. (p. 69)

Challenging the historical notions of “scholar,” recent efforts have been undertaken to reexamine the meaning of “scholar” within the context of educational leadership preparation and practice (Anderson & Jones, 2000; Jenlink, 2001a, 2001b; Riehl, et al., 2000).

Whereas historical notions of knowledge as “formal” or “codified” dominated the epistemological and cultural geography of educational administration preparation and practice, what have been subjugated knowledges³ with respect to leadership, i.e., “the historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functional coherence or formal systemisation”

(Foucault, 1980, p. 69), are now emerging and are being recognized as legitimate and important forms of knowledge, in particular as the relationships of knowledge, inquiry, practice, and theory move to the foreground of discourses on and in educational administration and leadership.

A scholar–practitioner leader is aware of the origins, context, and patterns of the knowledge related to an issue; social problems that interpret as justice and equity issues in school and educational settings. Equally important, the scholar–practitioner leader works from a repertoire of inquiry methods to explore, create, and transform social relations and knowledge within the larger political, economic, and cultural struggles of education and society. This post-formal⁴ way of knowing creates the deep understanding and facilitates the continuous formation of questions that are the essence of scholar–practitioner leadership (Jenlink, 2001b, 2002; Kincheloe, 1999). What being critical implies is that at the same time as the questioning and researching occurs, the knowledge, values, and beliefs that are uncovered must be framed within a consideration of their implications for social justice, caring, and democracy. This framing, questioning, and researching activity is embedded within a continuous critical reflection on what is uncovered.

To accomplish his / her work, the scholar–practitioner necessarily engages in critical inquiry to disembed ideologies that work to control culture and practice. Simultaneously, he or she exhibits an epistemological curiosity necessary to understanding and examining the origin of forms of knowledge dominant in the educational setting, and what other sources and forms of knowledge are necessary to creating learning experiences that are just and equitable for students from social groups of difference.

The scholar–practitioner leader understands the complexity of social relations and in general the complex nature of political and cultural struggles in which education is engaged

within society. Pragmatically, the scholar–practitioner is consciously aware that every action has critical implications for themselves and others. S/he also realizes that reality is not something external to human consciousness that can be discovered through some scientific process. To be a scholar–practitioner leader implies that knowledge, values, and beliefs cannot be given or transmitted to others, but that these other individuals must be allowed participation in the construction of meaning, definition, knowledge, or action. Simultaneously, the scholar–practitioner understands the import of facilitating a critical literacy, for her/himself and for others. The scholar–practitioner leader embodies the values of social justice, caring, equity, self-criticality, and democracy and they understand that their role as leader is equally one of cultural worker and scholarly practitioner within the classroom, school, educational community, and in state and regional/national policy making contexts.

A Scholar–Practitioner Stance

Stance suggests an interrelatedness of both positional (position *in situ*) and orientation (position-taking) to convey physical positions of the person and the intellectual activities and perspectives carried over time and across different contexts. In this sense, stance makes visible and problematic the various perspectives through which scholar–practitioners frame their questions, illuminations, interrogations, and actions. A scholar–practitioner stance is, in part, a disposition through which the scholar–practitioner reflects upon her or his own actions and those presented by others. Rather than passively accepting information or embracing a false consciousness instructed by dominant ideologies, the scholar–practitioner takes a much more active role in leading, learning, and reflecting upon her/his relationship with her/his practice and the social context in which the practice is situated.

A scholar–practitioner stance on social justice and democracy is an ethical, moral, and political position-taking (Bourdieu, 1992) within a larger complexity of social, political and cultural contexts. Such position-taking on the part of the scholar–practitioner is concerned with Dewey’s (1916) argument that “the conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind” (1916, p. 97). If what we want is a democratic society, we must work to define that society, in part through our education systems and schools; through the social practices that animate the educational system and schools on a daily basis. A scholar–practitioner stance observes, as Maxine Greene (1986) explains, that the type of community, society, and world that

we cherish is not an endowment, . . . it must be achieved through dialectical engagements with the social and economic obstacles we find standing in our way. . . . We cannot neglect the fact of power. But we can undertake a resistance, a reaching out toward becoming persons among persons. (p. 440)

In this sense, scholar–practitioners must be *transformative intellectuals*, working within the cultural-historical contexts in which schools are situated; intellectual and cultural workers seen through the “ideological and political interests that structure the nature of discourses, classroom social relations, and values that they legitimate in their teaching” (Giroux, 1988, p. 127). This requires that the scholar–practitioner take a critical stance; a further definition of stance through concerns for social justice, equity, diversity, caring, and democracy.

A critical stance for the scholar–practitioner is undergirded by a perception of reality that considers the world and our place within it as incomplete, becoming, and subject to our own projections. It is a critical encounter in which such issues as what counts as knowledge or practice becomes subject to individuals’ own histories, ideals, practices, and perceptions (Freire,

1998, pp. 73-80). The critical stance does not simply acquiesce in or absorb new knowledge or practice but rather encounters it as a claim that exists alongside many alternative possibilities and therefore must struggle to retain its legitimacy (Curzon-Hobson, 2003). A scholar–practitioner who embraces a critical stance subjects her or his knowledge and practice to a variety of frameworks that he or she has encountered and reflects upon this practice or knowledge in social contexts characterized by tensions and conflicts.

The notion of scholar–practitioner stance is underpinned by a sense of fragility and openness in the social context, the positions one has in contrast to the position-taking one engages in gives way to the fragility and openness. Importantly, the scholar–practitioner recognizes the value that is gained within a social context that is exploited by all in order to reflect upon and imagine anew what is presented and the perceptions of our interrelationships (Freire, 1985, p. 44). The scholar–practitioner often brings to question and introduces conflict to bear on the object of inquiry through her or his practice. Freire (1972) explains this process as “epistemological encircling” in which new ideas—through dialogical inquiry—conflict with and challenge what is considered absolute and show the learner that things can be different” (p. 53).

Thus, in mediating injustices and inequities within the educational setting, the scholar–practitioner works to create a more democratic culture while fostering a sense of becoming, both in her or himself, as well as in others with whom s/he interacts. This creates a symmetry in the relationships and practices, participation and power, wherein the scholar–practitioner is working alongside others toward defining a socially just and democratic society. Defining a socially just society requires that the scholar–practitioner know what stance to take on social justice.

A Scholar–Practitioner Stance and Democracy

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916) identified the “widening of the area of shared concerns, and the liberation of greater diversity of personal capacities” (p. 87) as hallmarks of democracy. He noted that only after “greater individualization on one hand, and a broader community of interest on the other have come into existence,” (p. 87), only could these characteristics be sustained by voluntary disposition and interest, which must be made possible by means of education. Dewey (1916) further stated that a democratic society “makes provision for participation for the good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through the interaction of the different forms of associated life” (p. 105).

The scholar–practitioner understands that democracy is not an all-or-nothing affair, but a definition of degree; societies and institutions can vary in both the extent and the intensity of their commitment to democratic practice. Therefore, there are many degrees and definitions of democracy, each marked by an idiosyncratic nature within particular cultural-political contexts. The scholar–practitioner recognizes that the “foundation of democracy is faith in the capacities of human nature; a faith in human intelligence” (Dewey, 1937, p. 458). Democracy is belief in freedom, “the basic freedom of mind and of whatever degree of freedom of action and experience is necessary to produce freedom of intelligence” (p. 459).

A scholar–practitioner stance on democracy reflects an ethical, moral, and political position-taking that ensures freedom of “ expression, general diffusion of knowledge, the marketplace of ideas, and open pursuit of truth so that citizens continuously educate themselves to participate, learn, and govern beyond the limited ideas of individuals” (Glickman, 2003, p. 274). Importantly, the scholar–practitioner works to mediate the “politics of reality” for many

individuals (Scheurich, 2003); politics that marginalize and distance her/him from authentic participation and at the same time silences her/his voices from being heard in decisions that affect her/his lives.

The scholar–practitioner’s work, then, in part, is to foster a sense of freedom of mind and freedom of actions. In part, the scholar-practitioner’s work is also to invoke in others in the educational setting to retain a sense of incompleteness and becoming; democracy is never achieved, rather it is in a continuous process of becoming. Maintaining a sense of incompleteness and becoming a just and democratic society is the result of the individual’s will—teacher and student—and the scholar–practitioner’s encouragement to critically question, challenge and overcome in full recognition of the imaginative possibilities of a world beyond the human will to objectify individual lives (Curzon-Hobson, 2003).

Social Justice—Three Perspectives

In *Rethinking Social Justice in Schools: How Will We Recognize it When We see it?*, Gale (2000) articulates a plural conception of social justice by identifying three categories: distributive, redistributive, and recognitive justice. It is important to fostering a scholar–practitioner stance, that the distinctions be explored between the three categories; knowing how each works in relation to whether a stance on distributive, retributive, or recognitive justice is better aligned to fostering a more democratic educational setting. This is particularly important in relation to the scholar–practitioner’s concern for social justice and democracy as central to transforming society and creating a more democratic society based on diversity through democratic processes populated by individuals that represent diversity of culture, ethnicity, race, language, economic means, sexual orientation, etc.

Distributive justice. Distributive justice refers to the principles by which goods are distributed in society. Rawls (1972, p. 7) defined this form of justice as concerning the way in which the major social institutions distributed fundamental rights and duties, and how they determined the distribution of advantages from social cooperation. Rawls argued that social justice involves two central principles: liberty, or individual freedom; and the equal distribution of material and social goods. The exception to the principle of freedom was the extent to which an individual's freedom was compatible with the freedoms of others. The exception to equal distribution was when unequal distribution would contribute to the well-being of those who have unfavorable starting positions. This notion of social justice invokes what is often termed a 'deficit model' of social justice, based on the idea that all individuals have the same basic needs.

Relatedly, a liberal-democratic solution to an equality imbalance suggests the need to normalize disadvantaged individuals by providing them with basic material and social goods. From this perspective, the disadvantaged are those who are viewed as wanting in what society claims to be the educational, social, and cultural basics. In contrast, Walzer, (1983) has argued social justice from a 'complex equality' position, which takes the position that individuals do not have the same basic needs or the same resources at their disposal. Argued here is the need not for unequal distribution of social goods, but rather a distribution of different social goods for different people. These two opposing views of distributive justice present competing guidelines for educational practice (Gale, 2000, pp. 254-255).

Retributive justice. Retributive justice is primarily concerned with fairness in the competition for social goods (capitalist markets provide a referent example). In educational settings, academic merit is an example of "just desserts" or entitlements premised on academic performance. Here the translation may be made to students whose high performance equates to

entry to privileged positions in schooling, employment, and access to positions of status within society. This view of social justice, as Apple (1988) notes, favors 'property rights' over 'person rights', thus creating a narrow sense of liberty. In a market economy, the extent to which individuals have power in social relationships is a function of their property holdings rather than their membership in society (Gale, 2000, p. 257, Nozick, 1976). Hierarchical participation as a form of social control within schools evidences how students are positioned in relation to their cultural and social capital. Limited property rights therefore results in limited power to participate, working to silence voice and marginalize individuals and groups.

When individuals attempt to cross boundaries established by forms of social control, this may be interpreted as illegitimately infringing on the rights and freedoms of others'. When a negative influence on social justice exists, such as punishing those who infringe on the rights and freedoms of others, this translates as retribution. Retributive justice is useful in naming the implicit perspectives that legitimization of the retribution meters out to individuals. Narrow liberties of some fosters inequities and injustices, ensuring that hierarchies of participation remain and that equity in participation is distorted (Gale, 2000, p. 257).

Recognitive justice. Recognitive justice is concerned with rethinking social arrangements thought to be just, valuing a positive regard of group differences and acknowledging democratic processes based on group representation. It is a social justice premised on recognizing diversity and how social justice contributes to a recognition of difference, enabling the formation of individual and collective identities through democratic processes; processes that recognize the individual as having value. A recognitive stance on social justice necessarily requires that one rethinks what is meant by social justice in relation to acknowledging the place of social groups within the positioning of social justice in society.

Relatedly, Berlin (1969) is instructive in understanding recognitive justice, advocating three necessary conditions: 1) fostering respect for different social groups through self-identification; 2) opportunities for groups' self-formation; and 3) the participation of groups in decision making that affects their lives directly. Recognitive justice is concerned with cultural domination, being subjected to patterns of interpretation and communication associated with another culture that conflicts with one's own culture. Recognitive justice is also concerned with non-recognition, being rendered invisible by means of authoritative and normative practices that distance and silence. Equally important, recognitive justice is concerned with how individual and group identity may be controlled and/or shaped through asymmetries of power and ideological dominance; scripting the identity of individuals and groups in such way as to socially position them into social categories that marginalize or otherwise disadvantage.

The distinctions. Distributive justice appears to be more concerned with individuals' material wealth; demonstrating a confinement of perspective to economic rather than cultural politics of social institutions, such as schools (Gale, 2000). Retributive is concerned with wealth defined by social and cultural attainments or perceived entitlements. However, retributive interprets as punitive, that is, punishment appears to be the basis of this form of justice rather than concern for social responsibility. Distributive and retributive perspectives of social justice share characteristics that narrow their foci, including a concern for what individual's have (assets or lack thereof) and only minimally with how such assets are reproduced. Relatedly, the emphasis on material goods extended to social goods such as opportunity, position, power, etc., limits concern for social justice in distribution of goods (Gale, 2000, 260). Finally, the impartial treatment of distributive and retributive justice at best regards all people the same, i.e., a

tendency toward equal treatment of unequal individuals, thus falling to a hegemony of dominance resulting in an assimilation of group differences (Lummis, 1996).

Recognitive justice, in contrast, is concerned with cultural politics and the participation of individuals and groups in decisions and activities that affect their lives and/or impact on their social wellbeing. Taking a recognitive stance on social justice, while concerned with a constant and ongoing application of justice, is also concerned with moral worth of all individuals. Such concern interprets as redirecting one's practice by moving from a primacy on material or social goods to a primacy on the reproducing or "doing" that creates the goods; embracing a concern for the moral worth of individuals and social groups defined by their difference. Herein social justice becomes problematic for the scholar-practitioner, as s/he struggles with identifying with a perspective and its role in the construction of one's stance; defining one's identity as a socially just leader through socially just practice.

Importantly, if the image of the society we seek is that of a democracy, then the stance on social justice, as a principle of leadership practice, must necessarily align with more democratic practices, benefiting all individuals. Here Dewey's (1908, 1909) moral theory is instructive, in that he explicitly connects the responsibility of any person with the responsibility of others to sustain and enhance future moral conduct. For Dewey, a stance on justice that concerns punishment from a retrospective view—i.e., punishing the act without concern for future responsibility—is antithetical to the responsible moral treatment of persons, in particular in the context of understanding the nature of social responsibility in a democracy. As well, a stance that only concerns distribution of wealth falls short in acknowledging the basic social responsibility of individuals in a democracy.

The scholar–practitioner understands that in contemporary society, identity formation of individuals and groups is connected to Dewey’s (1927) notions of the public, and his acknowledgement of how the small publics (schools, parent organizations, etc.) contribute to the development of a larger democratic public. Importantly, the scholar–practitioner stance recognizes a “definite ideal of the place and function of the school in the ongoing process of society, local and national” and requires a “definite point of view, firmly and courageously adhered to in practice” (Dewey, 1985, p. 68). A scholar–practitioner stance on social justice informed by a recognitive justice perspective advances the principles of democracy while engendering a concern for the identity of individuals and groups. From this stance, future responsibility, the capacity to engage in moral conduct as a scholar–practitioner is the overriding moral concern for a democratic society; this necessarily calls in question the nature of social justice that defines leadership practice.

Adopting a Poststructural Inquiry Path

Adopting a poststructural stance interprets as recognizing that research practices themselves are both part of and controlled by the discourses (Foucault, 1978; Rhedding-Jones, 1996). Examining discursive practice—the talk of educational leaders—enables the researcher to understand the power of language in shaping the spatial practices that define the place of school. As Bogotch and Roy (1997) explain, through “the power of talk, leadership emerges, in an ongoing sense, as it both reinforces existing institutional patterns and reconstructs new patterns of interacting” (p. 234). Important in the poststructural inquiry is an understanding that the researcher is situated in the discourses he or she is researching. Segall (2001) explains, as researchers we are “inherently embedded in the text we read before, throughout, and after our field-research has ended” (p. 583).

Participants

A narrative inquiry guided by poststructural considerations was conducted with 27 practicing educational leaders, including central office, building level, and teacher leaders. Participation in the study solicited through doctoral courses and an informed consent form was administered prior to data collection.

Narrative Inquiry

The intent of the inquiry was to generate discourse text that was representative of the type of social justice stance (or the lack thereof) practiced in each practitioner's school, social justice as theorized through a distributive, retributive, recognitive justice stance. An inquiry protocol was constructed that enabled participants to respond freely to each question. The narrative discourse was recorded electronically, with participants being provided an opportunity for revisiting the narratives for clarification. Specifically, the poststructural inquiry was focused on the pragmatics of social justice, which shaped the identity of the school leader as a socially just leader.

Analysis of Narrative

The practitioners were queried concerning issues of equity, social justice, and democracy. Narratives were examined for democratic justice stance patterns, thus further theorizing social justice. The leadership practices, as social just stance, formed patterns of spatial practice that shape the nature of social justice within and through social texts. The narrative texts also reflected the ethical and moral practices of each practitioner's school and district. The narratives as "social justice practice" text were analyzed, looking specifically for language and action within and across discourse, illuminating patterns and relationships.

Educational Leaders' Speak on Social Justice

The *social justice question*, that is, what is an educational leader's what is the scholar–practitioner's stance, has to do with ideals, values, and assumptions informed by experience and embedded in social contexts in which experience is takes place. This question is one of ideology: What is the purpose of schooling, what is the role of public education in a democratic society, and what historically has been the role of schooling in maintaining or changing the economic and social structure of society? In particular, this set of questions has to do with what images of American society as well as what notions of social justice do we want to define us as a society (Dewey, 1916). These questions have to do with what images are assumed in our practices; images of justice, equity, caring, community, democracy.

In exploring the social justice question, school leaders were asked: What is social justice, what is socially just practice, what do you see as the role/relationship of your work in defining what society is as a democracy, what perspective best fits who you are as an educational leader, and what perspective is better aligned to fostering a more democratic educational setting? The first three questions frame the sections that follow, respectively. The two questions provide a heuristic for analyzing responses to the first three questions.

What is Social Justice?

The answer to the question of social justice that underlies leadership practice, that is, what is your ideology, often remains unstated in the day-to-day work of school leaders. The ideals, values, and assumptions one holds concerning social justice never consciously examined or made public. An analysis of the responses to What is social justice?, renders a common set of terms that scholar–practitioners use to define this concept. Common terms include equal or equality, equity, fair or fairness, and relatedly how each of these terms works to mediate issues

associated with race, ethnicity, language, age, gender, class, sexual orientation, or faith. The discourse patterns reflect a commonality in stated beliefs, but they also reflect underlying values and assumptions concerning social justice that extends the answer to the social justice question in important ways.

Sally⁵, a White female central office administrator, extends an important consideration, noting that to “enact social justice requires more than a definition. One must possess a deep understanding of the concept in order to incorporate this practice into day-to-day interactions.” She also expresses her belief that social justice can be defined as the right thing to do for everyone regardless of ethnicity, gender, academic or socio-economic level.” Juxtaposing her thoughts to those of Sally, Iris, a White female administrator, shares that for her, “social justice is a system of equity for and acceptance of all races and creeds, which promotes the welfare of other members of the society. This is not the same as unilateral freedom from constraint, rather is tempered with protection of human rights.” Mary, a White female administrator, notes that “all people have a birthright to be treated fairly and are therefore, entitled to equal rights and responsibilities regardless of their race, religion, ethnicity, sex, age, class, sexual orientation or other identifiable trait, characteristic, or position of birth.” The ideals of freedom and birthright shared by Iris and Mary reflect basic ideals and beliefs integral to a democratic society.

Grace, an African American female principal who has been in her current position 8 years, explains that social justice is the “act of re-addressing institutionalized inequality and systemic racism.” Toni, a White female director of educational renewal, furthers this discussion by noting that “social justice involves the equal treatment of all members of society, all people being regarded as individuals, all members having a fair chance, and all members enjoying social and economic benefits, even those considered to be disadvantaged.” Whereas Grace focuses

more on issues commensurate with a recognitive perspective of justice, Toni incorporates notions of distributive and recognitive justice. For Wanda, a White female principal, social justice “is an intervention against power over and the mistreatment of others because of race, gender, poverty, or because of anything that makes that individual different from others.” Clark, a White male assistant principal working in an urban center, takes the position that social justice is “equality of access to both distributional and relational justice. In other words, social justice is the ability for all members of society to have fair and equal access to the material possessions of society as well as the non-material items such as respect, dignity, and value.” The tenets of social justice introduced by Clark reflect the those found in the theoretical perspective of distributive justice, but also extends his belief that the process of acquiring social goods is important as a defining element of social justice. Deidra, an African American female principal, reflects that in her school, populated with Hispanic and African American students, she social justice means “being fair and equal to all ethnic groups, promoting democracy, so that all races have a fair and equal opportunity to succeed.” She explicitly states her belief that social justice is connected to democracy.

In reflection, the common threads of equity, equality, and fairness run through the scholar–practitioner’s understanding of social justice. Defining elements of the ideological statements reflect implicit and explicit concern for democracy, and the distribution of material goods as well as social goods against a backdrop of difference. What appears to surface in this discourse is a gravitation of the discourse towards distributive and recognitive justice perspectives, with the latter more pronounced in answer to the ideology question and in relation to defining a social justice stance for the scholar–practitioner.

What is Socially Just Practice?

Extending the examination of ideology into the defining socially just practice, brings into relief how scholar–practitioners understand social justice that is interpreted through their practice. Reading across the responses to what is socially just practice, common terms emerge that define the nature of or characterize the doing of socially just practice. Included is equity in treatment, interaction with others, ethnic groups, concern for well-being, being sensitive to culture, recognizing and eliminating prejudice, increasing awareness, facilitating change, and to building inclusive communities. Carrie, a White female high school principal, who states that a socially just practice “involves all individuals in the education of students, staff and community”, exemplifies what distinguishes the scholar–practitioner perspectives on socially just practice. She then deconstructs the “doing of” socially just practice by explaining that you “first step in, providing a socially just environment to parents and students is to recognize the culture they bring to your school.” Her explanation that “failure to recognize this fact means” that parents and students “are not important.” Importantly, Carrie notes that the “language used in this process is an integral step in the formation of a just practice.” She then explains that the “second step is what you do with specific programs to meet the needs of the learning community. Identifying the needs of specific students and providing instruction to meet those needs is providing a positive environment to learn.” Following, Carrie shares that the “third step is to empower the individuals within the learning community.” Explaining that “empowerment comes with the acquisition of knowledge and then using that knowledge to educate self or others and have a voice in the processes of schools True learning occurs in socially just environments.” Carrie’s discussion of socially just practice reflects a pragmatic perspective, one concerned with recognition of others.

Joanna, an African American female principal in a large urban school, explains, from her experience, that socially just practice requires “looking at all situations through an adjustable lens.” There is no one best perspective. She explains that, “one is socially just when prejudices are put aside so that the most appropriate solution is derived based upon individual differences and needs.” In contrast, Joanna explains that one “is not socially just when he/she has not taken the time nor made an effort to deal with people and the situations they face any differently than mainstream problems.” Wanda, a White female principal in an urban school, explains that for her, socially just practice means “ensuring that all individuals and groups voices are heard. It is being a democratic leader. When practicing social justice, you will not always be the most popular individual.” For Wanda, as a scholar–practitioner, she believes one knows when one is engaged in socially just practice “when you begin to question why we allow injustices to take place and then begin to do something about it.” As she further explains, “you do not just stand by watching injustices take place, but look to see how to inform others and end the injustices taking place.” Both Joanna and Wanda bring relief the importance of seeing the world and questioning actions in relation to socially just practices. Focusing on the work of democratic leader, Wanda acknowledges the often difficult nature of leading a school through socially just practice. The language used by both principals suggests a recognitive justice stance, in part.

Donna, a White female high school principal, notes that in educational settings, “socially just practice implies that the policies of the school and the actions of educational leaders promote and foster a climate of justice and ethicality. Socially just practice promotes equal opportunity, democratic governance in a forum where all participants have a voice.” Toni (White female director of Educational Renewal), contributes to this discussion of the leaders actions by noting, “ socially just practice is an on-going action that involves the general safeguarding of all

individual rights, as well as the personal examination of each action and any self-correction needed in light of inequitable deeds.” As she explains, actions “should not be left to a select group of individuals elected to serve in some political office; but is a personal responsibility of all citizens.” Kelley, a White female principal in an urban school, adds a new dimension to the discussion by noting that practice is socially “in which respect is given to each individual, every voice is heard and advocacy for a democratic society is evident represents a socially just practice.” As she further explains, “one knows that they are socially just when change begins to take place, people become aware of their biases through their own reflection and acknowledgement in attitudes of superiority and the prejudices towards others are eliminated.” In contrast, Kelley notes that, “one is not socially just when they continue to accept the status quo, silence the voices of minorities and disadvantaged and do not speak up when others exhibit socially unjust attitudes.” Here we find Donna, Toni and Kelley sharing beliefs and values of democracy and leadership, accentuated by the importance of “voice” and the need for all participants to be involved. Characteristics of a cognitive justice perspective emerge in the analysis of participant’s responses and the discussion concerning socially just practice.

Extending the discussion, Iris (White female administrator) explains that socially just practice requires “putting action with philosophy: acting on a philosophy of equity and democracy. Speaking out about inequity, instituting policies of social justice,” then taking action. Iris notes the importance of continuing “to utilize a lens of criticality in all thoughts and actions, continually overturning layer upon layer of judgment and bias.” Sharing a similar belief concerning criticality, Sally (White female central office administrator) explains that to “know one is being socially just requires evaluating situations and one’s placement in the situation; as well as knowledge and understanding of the core precepts of social justice.” The scholar–

practitioner, Sally adds, who has the ability “to peruse a situation, synthesize the setting and the implication of action will be able to act/react in a socially just manner.” Iris and Sally both denote the importance of a critical lens, and implicitly recognize the need for inquiry to examine the nature of injustices and inequities.

In reflection, the poststructural analysis suggests that common threads of democracy, community, voice, participation, criticality, and difference connect the discussions of socially just practice. The scholar–practitioner perspectives shared suggest a strong affiliation with a recognitive stance on social justice, tempered by a sense of distributive justice that is concerned with fostering processes that distribute access to social goods.

What Do You See as the Role/Relationship of Your Work in Defining What Society is as a Democracy?

When the ideological question is extended to the larger project of democracy, the scholar–practitioner perspectives reflect values, beliefs and assumptions about the function of education in a democratic society. As well, the perspectives reflect the practitioners’ beliefs about the positionality in the process of making schools democratic through socially just practices. Positionality interprets as leader identity as defined by the scholar–practitioner’s work. This question concerns the stance on social justice one takes in relation to moving the democratic project forward in society. Analyzing the discourses shared, what emerges as common elements of language include, democracy, diversity of individuals, working together, dialogue, tools of democracy, politics of difference, caring, equity, learning as a scholar–practitioner, educate students, teachers, parents about democracy, self-criticality, and research practices. What seems to extend the theorizing of a scholar–practitioner stance on social justice is the importance of realizing that democracy is an unfinished project, and therein the scholar–practitioner must be

continuously at work to understand her/himself in relation to fostering change, guided by practice that is socially just.

Kelly (White female principal) explains that her “first responsibility as a leader is to critically reflect” on her own practice as a leader, “especially in relation to social justice, equity and democracy. It is important that I am critically aware of my own biases. As a leader one of the most important ways to have an impact with others is to lead by example.” She goes on to note that another responsibility in relation to democracy and social justice, as a leader, “is to create an environment that respects each person as an individual and advocates moving beyond the status quo toward change and renewal. Communicating to staff that injustices will not be tolerated and that it is vital that we strive toward a social justice school environment and society and the benefits that it will provide to students is another responsibility as a leader.” Clark (White male assistant principal) further explores the responsibility of reflection, explaining that for him, “constant reflection of my own practices as well as critical inquiry into the policies of the school, district, state, and nation” are important. He explains that with a “heightened sense of ‘critical consciousness,’ I will act once I perceive social oppression.” He also believes that “formal educational leaders should create policies/practices that eliminate social injustices and hone teachers’ abilities to incorporate socially just practices within their classrooms” as part of fostering democratic citizenship.

Grace (African American female principal) sees her role as that of “an advocate for change and growth.” She explains further, noting that “Education shapes America. How America looks in the future will depend on how educators advocate for social justice and democracy.’ For Grace, her work responsibility is to “impact of education in her community and school, contributing to the larger project of a democratic society. Carrie (White female principal), in

concert with Grace, sees her role as being “more along the lines of the educational system in a democratic society.” She explains, “I am still not sure we are living in a democratic society. I think that democracy is a construct that we are continually striving to achieve. At this point and time I see some tremendous power structures that are not working toward democracy and equity.” Carrie has deconstructed the nature of America’s democratic society, recognizing that democracy is never complete. She further shares, “the idea that students can walk into our campus and see and feel the democracy in action is always a goal.” However, she knows understands that she will have help students understand “that when they walk out of school they will not always” experience “equity, justice and ethics of care. The key is teaching them that they can make a difference in that society.”

Expressing a slightly different perspective, Janet (White female principal) explains that as scholar–practitioner, she “must be aware of social inequities, and must remain educated about these issues.” With respect to the project of democracy, Janet reflects, “we know the shortcomings of a democratic society where injustices exist, and we know the opportunities democracy can provide for people.” In this sense, Janet sees the educational system as a tool, “it is perhaps the most profound and important tool for students to use. It is the catalyst that can propel them to success, but it can also doom them to failure if not utilized correctly.” Janet understands education’s function in society, explaining that for her, education “is powerful, and the scholar–practitioner must educate others to maintain the importance of education in our society.” Wanda (White female principal in an urban school) also understands that democracy is an ongoing project, sharing “I believe that although we say that we live in a democratic society, this is not always true in education. Educators, often times, silence students and do not listen to their individual voices.” This requires, as Wanda explains, that as “scholar–practitioners, we

must educate others and ensure that voices are heard. We must encourage others to also become scholar–practitioners by our example. If we become more democratic in our own leadership, this will extend down to others.” In concert with Janet and Wanda, Mary (White female administrator) furthers the discussion by stating that the “scholar–practitioner has the obligation to formulate their own understanding of democracy and to be true to their belief and convictions that guide their decisions and personal actions.” Concerning responsibility, Mary notes that it “is important that the scholar–practitioner continue to grow as a scholar and to refine their beliefs and conviction and to have the courage to challenge injustice and undemocratic societal conditions when they are encountered.”

Toni (White female director of Educational Renewal) carries the discussion forward, explaining the challenges aligned with connecting the work of a scholar–practitioner and that of defining the educational system in a democratic society. She further explains, “I believe that successful schooling is impossible without social justice; and without an adequate educational experience, our country hinges on extinction.” She sees as necessary the work ahead as a scholar–practitioner, “to develop and grow young minds . . . encourage them to question and entertain ideas, to seek out new knowledge and to look at existing problems with a fresh lens.” Toni brings the focus direct on the challenge of the scholar–practitioner, “If our country is to strengthen its conceptualization of democracy, the foundation must be strong and solid, and be representative of all races and cultures that comprise it.”

Importantly, the discourse provided by the scholar–practitioners directs us to the importance of continuing to grow with respect to understanding one’s work as a scholar–practitioner, and in particular with respect to engaging in forms of inquiry that shape their practice and equally important, that shapes the work of creating a more democratic society

through education. Implicitly, the underpinnings of distributive justice surface in the discussions, however, explicitly, the underpinnings of recognitive justice define the practice of the scholar–practitioner. Interestingly, the underpinnings of retributive justice seem removed from the larger discourse.

Conclusions

The notion of scholar–practitioner leadership as taking a social justice stance offers a positioning of leadership practice that illuminates, in varying degrees of definition, the politically and culturally bound nature of leadership and education. More specifically, it illuminates how theories of distributive and retributive social justice, while important to furthering democratic cultures in schools, are not sufficient to the social justice agenda. The theorizing resulted in illuminating values and beliefs of recognitive justice, which is concerned with rethinking social arrangements thought to be just, valuing a positive regard of group differences and acknowledging democratic processes based on group representation. That is, the educational leaders who participated in the study noted that to offset the de-democratizing affects of existing cultural practices, they must engage in forms of social justice practices that work to recognize individual and social group and mediate politics of identity. In particular, they point to politics that have historically produced marginalization, oppression, and limit opportunities for sub-group identity self-formation.

A theorizing of leadership as social justice practices makes public, importantly, issues of power and control. Making public such issues is necessary to a working democracy. Importantly, such theorizing recognizes that many discourses shape and are shaped by the political and cultural affiliation and historical reasoning that instruct social practices within the school. Making the school a democratically practiced place requires practices animated by concern for

social justice and equity. As reported in this paper, theorizing and understanding scholar–practitioner leadership, through a poststructural positioning, acknowledges the intersections of language and social actions that shape the social justice stance of educational leadership. Importantly, as the participants acknowledged in this study, we necessarily need new positionings of educational leadership that enable us to take a stance on social justice that reflects democratic beliefs that mediate racial, ethnic, cultural, and social boundaries, thus leading to a democratic society.

Final Reflections

A scholar–practitioner stance impels the scholar–practitioner to search for new and alternative possibilities, working to imagine and create socially just, democratic educational settings. The scholar–practitioner stance is a position taking on what we believe ought to be—not merely where moral frameworks are concerned, but in material arrangements for people in all spheres of society. The educational leader as scholar–practitioner, who is concerned for social justice as a principle of democracy, necessarily engages in practices for the sake of arousing the kinds of reflective, authentic, experiential responses that might move individuals—teachers and students—to come together in serious efforts to understand what social justice actually means and what it might demand and to explore how social justice works in relationship to democracy.

The scholar–practitioner stance embodies a concern for conditions that affect just and democratic practices, which fosters conditions necessary to self-identity and self-respect, self-development and self-expression, and self-determination and self-democratization. This means the scholar–practitioner’s work is that of arousing a consciousness of democratic membership, a consciousness of socially just membership that recognizes all individuals as valued and contributing members of society.

END NOTES:

¹ The scholar–practitioner construct, as used throughout this paper, is based on the author’s work, conjoined with colleagues, over eight years in developing and implementing a doctoral program in educational leadership. Scholar-practitioner connotes a professional practitioner who moves beyond the casual consumer level of research, scholarship, and knowledge (inquiry and knowledge for practice) to practitioner level of inquiry, scholarship, and knowledge (inquiry and knowledge of practice) are integral to the leader’s practice, concerned with creating just, equitable, caring, democratic schools (including the administrator and the teacher-as-leader) on a day-to-day basis. For a comprehensive examination of scholar-practitioner leadership see Jenlink (1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b), Horn and Jenlink, (Forthcoming).

² Leadership has been variously researched and written about for decades and therefore will not be explored within this paper in that such an activity in and of itself would fill volumes. However, for purposes of this paper, leadership as used throughout will connote the practices and activities of individuals at all levels of the school and educational system that, through their actions, demonstrate an understanding of purpose and moral imperatives that guide and facilitate the practices and activities of others. Leadership, as used in this paper, is premised on making permeable traditional role boundaries often associated with the authoritarian figure of the person in leadership roles in the school or educational setting. As well, leadership as used herein is understood as transcending the differentiation of traditional roles/responsibilities that set hierarchical structures in schools and define leadership identity, such as principal and teacher. As used in concert with scholar-practitioner, leadership denotes the processes and actions of any person (teacher, principal, parent, or student) who seeks cultural and social change through social critique and praxis. Leadership also connotes symmetry with respect to distribution and use of power and acknowledges that teachers as well as principals and parents are responsible for leadership within the school and educational systems.

³ Knowledge domains that fall outside of the codified or formal knowledge accepted by positivistic and traditional orientations to administration and leadership preparation and practice, such as cross-disciplinary (Kincheloe, 2001), indigenous, and practitioner-based inquiry as discussed by Anderson and Herr (1999).

⁴ Post-formalism takes a “middle ground that attempts to hold onto the progressive and democratic features of modernism while drawing upon the insights postmodernism provides concerning the failure of reason, the tyranny of grand narratives, the limitations of science, and the repositioning of relationships between dominant and subordinate cultural groups” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1999, p. 55). Post-formal inquiry, as a recent theoretical current in the post-modern stream, helps to “to mediate between the modern and postmodern” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994, p. 283), acknowledging the antecedental roots of inquiry in post-formal thought while also acknowledging the importance of “the inclusion of an understanding of the postmodern context of current human activity” (p. 283). Applying a post-formal lens of criticality provides the scholar-practitioner the ability to engage in ideological disembedding, which is the act of recognizing and critiquing the values that are buried (embedded) in all of our social constructions (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1999). The post-formal task is to unmask and understand how power is manifested in the socially constructed experiences being researched; the social phenomenon.

⁵ Pseudonyms are used for all participants and educational settings.

References

- Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher*, 28(5), 12-21.
- Anderson, G. L., & Jones, F. (2000). Knowledge generation in educational administration from the inside out: The promise and perils of site-based, administrator research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 428-464.

Bogotch, I. E., & Roy, C. B. (1997). The contexts of partial truths: An analysis of principal's discourse. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(3), 234-252.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). The purpose of reflexive sociology (the Chicago Workshop). In P. Bourdieu & L. Wacquant (Eds.), *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curzon-Hobson, A. (2003). Higher learning and the critical stance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 201-212.

Dewey, J. (1909). *Moral principles in education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Dewey, J., & Tufts, J. H. (Eds.). (1908). *Ethics*. New York, H. Holt and Company.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: H. Holt.

Dewey, J. (1935). Toward administrative statesmanship. *The Social Frontier*, 1(6), 9-10.

Dewey, J. (1937). Democracy and educational administration. *School and Society*, 45(1162), 457-462.

Dewey, J. (1985). *Philosophy of education: Problems of men*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Freire, P. (1998). *Politics and education* (Trans. P. Wong). Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Latin American Publications.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1*. New York: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992a). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1992b). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Researcher*, 2(4), 4-11.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). Educational leadership and school administration: Rethinking the meaning of democratic public cultures. T. A. Mulkeen, N. H. Cambron-McCabe, & B.J. Anderson (Eds.), *Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation* (pp. 31-47). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Glickman, C. D. (2003). *Holding sacred ground: Essays on leadership, courage, and endurance in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Horn, R. A., Jr., & Jenlink, P. M. (Forthcoming). *Developing Scholar-Practitioner Leaders: The Empowerment of Educators*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Jenlink, P. M. (1999, August). *Educational leadership as scholarly practice: Considerations for preparation and practice*. Paper presented at the 53rd annual conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2001a, April). *Scholar-Practitioner Leadership: A Critical Analysis of Preparation and Practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2001b). Beyond the knowledge base controversy: Advancing the ideal of scholar-practitioner leadership. In T. J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st century challenges for educational administration* (pp. 65-88). Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

- Jenlink, P. M. (2002, November). Leadership as a *Bricolage* of scholarly practice: A critical examination of disciplinary discourses and practices. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Pittsburgh, PA.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2003a, April 21-25). Conceptualizing leadership as a bricolage of scholarly practice: A critical examination of expanding disciplinary boundaries in preparation and practice. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, session 41.022, Chicago, IL.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2003b). Freedom to act: Teachers as scholarly practitioners. *Teacher Education & Practice*, 16(1), 5-12.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). Critical democracy and education. In J. G. Henderson & K. R. Kesson (Eds.), *Understanding democratic curriculum leadership* (pp. 70-83). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-692.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1999). A tentative description of post-formal thinking: The critical confrontation with cognitive theory. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, & P.H. Hinchey (Eds.), *The post-formal reader: Cognition and education* (pp. 55-90). New York: Falmer Press.

King, M. L. (1963). Letter from Birmingham jail. In *Why we can't wait* (pp. 76-95). New York: Mentor.

Lummis, C. D. (1996). *Radical democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Neibuhr, R. (1946). *The children of light and the children of darkness. A Vindication of democracy and a critique of its traditional defence*. New York: Charles Scribner's sons.

Nozick, (1976). *Anarchy, state and utopia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rhedding-Jones, J. (1996). Researching early schooling: Poststructural practices and academic writing in an ethnography. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(1), 21-37.

Riehl, C., Larson, C. L., Short, P. M., & Reitzug, U. C. (2000). Reconceptualizing research and scholarship in educational administration: Learning to know, knowing to do, doing to learn. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 391-427.

Scheffler, I. (1960). *The language of teaching*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Scheurich, J. J. (2003). Commentary: The grave dangers in the discourse on democracy. In C. D. Glickman, *Holding sacred ground: Essays on leadership, courage, and endurance in our schools* (pp. 286-293). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Segall, A. (2001). Critical ethnography and the invocation of voice: From the field/in the field – single exposure, double standard? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 579-592.

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.