

School Leadership for Social Justice

¹Steinunn Helga Lárusdóttir

²Eileen O'Connor

Abstract:

This paper explores the role of school leaders in facilitating Social Justice (SJ) leadership practice in schools. Ethical, Transformational and Distributed leadership theories together with School Leadership Development initiatives are examined. What emerges is that leaders need to bring SJ to the centre in their work and actively lead from an ethical value base towards equity and excellence across diverse contexts. Furthermore, School Leadership Development initiatives need to focus not only on Distributed Leadership, the current dominant leadership theory, but also on both Transformational and Ethical Leadership theories with a view to enabling school leaders to commit to SJ aims.

Keywords: Social Justice; Leadership Theory; Leadership Development.

Corresponding Authors:

¹Steinunn Helga Lárusdóttir

Professor Emerita at the School of Education, University of Iceland

Email: st.helga49@hotmail.com

²Eileen O'Connor

Lecturer, School of Education, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland

Email: emtoc52@gmail.com

School Leadership for Social Justice

Introduction

Since the beginning of the 21st century, social justice (SJ) has become a major concern for educational scholars and practitioners (Marshall, 2004; Grogan, 2010; Lumby & Coleman, 2007; Jean-Marie, Normore & Brooks, 2009). The role and importance of education in facilitating SJ is highlighted by Lumby and Coleman (2007), who assert that:

Education is at the heart of hope for change, for it is in our schools, colleges and universities above all that society has the right to expect a model of social justice to be embedded and to be renewed for each generation (p. ix).

In recent decades, there has been a growing awareness of how the rapid pace of change in education has significantly impacted schools and their leaders. This change is driven by a range of diverse global and local factors such as the cultural transformation and demographic shift of Western society, the expanding poverty gap and in-school factors, such as accountability pressures and high stakes testing. Davies (2002) argues that the many changes in society, particularly employment patterns, together with the breakdown of traditional family groupings and the growth of consumerism, have all impacted schools and school leadership. Many school communities now also reflect a society which is increasingly multicultural, multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multinational. This applies to the student cohort in Iceland and Ireland where immigrants constitute 15.2 % and 13% of the national population, respectively (Statistic Iceland 2020; CSO.ie, 2016). It is also reflected in the schools and colleges where 11.6% of Icelandic school children (Statistics Iceland, 2019) and 18% of students in Ireland are of foreign origin (CSO.ie, 2016). However, while school conditions reveal that the

responsibilities and experiences of school leaders have shifted substantially, we continue to prepare them for traditional roles in what are no longer traditional school settings.

Lumby & Coleman (2007) have argued that in our increasingly pluralistic societies there is a need to place greater emphasis on the importance of school leadership in matters relating to SJ. They further contend that a key requisite in the quest for SJ in education is a greater diversity of those occupying leadership roles in schools, so that they more accurately reflect the current pluralistic nature of Western society. However, the teaching staff in many of our schools, at all levels, continues to be a heterogeneous group. Indeed, the composition of the staff, whether teachers or leaders, does not reflect the situation in society at large. Schools, Lumby (2013) argues, “appear to be staffed by [the] gender-free, race-free, age-less, sex-less and un-embodied” workers (p. 583).

The recent interest in SJ scholarship is evident in the growth of articles, special issues and books published, and conferences held, particularly in the United States, but also more widely. The majority of the publications focus mainly on two issues; students and preparation programs for school leaders (Cambron - McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; Grogan, 2010; Lumby & Coleman, 2007; Marshall, 2004; Norberg & Johansson, 2007; Jean-Marie, Normore & Brooks, 2009). The emphasis is on developing socially just practices within schools and the preparation of school leaders for SJ leadership within the school community (Cambron -McCabe et al., 2005). Consequently, the need for a greater awareness of SJ issues also applies to leadership theories, which rarely address power, SJ or the many individual different variables such as race, class, ethnicity, age or gender (Fletcher, 2004; Lumby, 2013). Fletcher (2004) argues that although most theories emphasise leadership as a social process, the concepts are often presented as gender, and to a lesser degree, power neutral.

Similarly, Lumby (2013) asserts that most writing on educational leadership theory ignores issues of SJ.

We acknowledge the contention of Lumby and Coleman (2007) that while there is considerable research on equity for learners in schools (Jansen, 2006; Theoharis, 2008; Holloway & Keddie, 2019), there is less literature on equity for staff. As a result, this paper will focus on the role of education in facilitating SJ leadership practice, and in particular, the role of school principals in this regard. Of key interest to us in this context is which leadership theory/ies might be best suited to enabling SJ leadership practice in schools. We examine ethical, transformational and distributed leadership theories with a view to highlighting what, if any, elements they may contain which might support and sustain principals in such an effort. While acknowledging the complexity of leading for SJ, we also explore the issue of school leadership development and offer suggestions as to how it may assist current and aspiring principals in pursuing a SJ agenda in schools.

Defining Leadership for Social Justice

The definition of SJ cannot be separated from the practices of educational leadership. Indeed, Bogotch (2002) suggests that there are no fixed or predictable meanings of SJ prior to actually becoming engaged in educational leadership practices. Contrary to the dominant concerns in relation to technical competences, bureaucracy, and efficiency, Tillman et al. (2006) argue that school leadership which embraces the ideal of democracy places SJ front and centre in schools. SJ scholars emphasize constructs such as justice, respect, care, and equity while acknowledging the impact of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and other difference variables, on schools and students' learning (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Marshall (2004) argues that SJ leadership enables questions to be asked about how social, political, and economic advantages and disadvantages are replicated in organizational structures in schools

and cultures. Furthermore, Zembylas (2010) suggests that SJ leadership focuses particularly on leadership that disrupts and subverts unjust teaching practices and policies by promoting inclusion and equity for all students. For the purposes of this article, we contend that that these SJ practices also apply to school staff.

In a school-based study which examined participants' meanings and perceptions in relation to distributed leadership and SJ, Woods & Roberts (2016) define SJ as the lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities in a number of areas across the school. In terms of staff, this specifically includes fairness with regard to the distribution of resources (distributive justice), participation in decision-making (participative justice), respect for identity and beliefs (cultural justice) and opportunities for learning and personal development (developmental justice). The authors emphasise the importance of the distribution of opportunities to take on leadership roles across the school staff, of having an equal 'voice' within the school community and of feeling valued and respected, as well as a sense of 'belonging'. It is this definition that we use as a touchstone for our discussions in this paper.

Leadership Theories and Social Justice

The theories discussed, namely ethical, transformational and distributed theories, are chosen because they have been prominent in research literature, and in some instances heavily promoted, in the past 20-30 years. Although it is over forty years since Burns (1978) claimed that ethical leadership (EL) theory was his greatest concern, two of them, transformational leadership (TL) theory and distributed leadership theory (DL) have dominated much of the writing on educational leadership into the 21st century (Lumby & Coleman, 2007).

Ethical Leadership (EL)

The discussion on leadership practices, in both the private and the public arena, has increasingly made reference to the importance of ethical behaviour (Branson, 2014; Jónsson, 2009). In the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis there has been a revived interest in EL worldwide. As Branson (2014) contends: “[T]he global financial crisis brought the concept of EL into the international spotlight” (p.1). Much has been written about ethics and leadership but, according to Brown & Trevino (2006), the focus has mainly been from a normative perspective and “remains largely unexplored” (p. 595). EL has been defined as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120). This definition seems to suggest an emphasis on the common good and that ethical leaders set an example to others by behaving appropriately in their own relationships. It also implies that ethical leaders are aware of their own values (Avolio et al., 2004; Branson, 2007) and are true to them (Erickson, 1995; Ilies et al., 2005). In their study of industrial leaders’ understanding of EL, Brown & Trevino (2006) found that ethical leaders were thought to be honest and trustworthy in their role as fair and principled decision-makers who cared about people and the broader society. An ethical leader has also been described as someone whose values closely guide her/his actions. They are leaders who have a “deeper understanding of their personal values” (Duignan, 2003, p. 22).

As Evans (2007) observed (cited in Jean-Marie et al., 2009), the scholarship on SJ supports the notion that educational leaders have a social and moral obligation to foster equitable school practices, processes, and outcomes. Blackmore (2006) suggests that an ethical leader is someone who adopts a critical approach to their leadership practice. Similarly, Begley (2003) talks about leaders auditing their views and encouraging others to do the same, while

Capper et al. (2006) discuss the importance of developing a ‘critical consciousness’. The authors all argue that it is through self-reflection, critical discourse and dialogue that clarity about values can be established. These values then need to be clearly articulated, implemented and made evident in the everyday leadership practices in schools. Coleman (2011) contends that identifying and communicating the views and values of individual leaders can affect the culture of the whole school. Consequently, and given that individual school leaders hold a powerful position in relation to influencing school culture and structures, it is essential that they examine their own deeply held attitudes and values as well as any prejudices they may have so that the messages they communicate to the school community set a tone that is inclusive and respectful of others, thereby enabling and empowering staff.

It needs to be noted that much of the work on EL focuses mainly on Western-based leadership and ignores viewpoints and values of different cultures (Göcen, 2020). Recent work, however, highlights the need to expand the discussion and apply a cross cultural perspective in order to reach a more accurate comparison of values and cultures (Sotirova, 2018). It has also been noted that in order to lead in an ethical manner the educational leader needs to understand ethics not just from the perspective of her/his culture but rather from a cross cultural point of view (Göcen, 2020).

Implications for SJ Leadership Practice

Scholars argue that leadership is inherently an ethical endeavor (Evans, 2007; Coleman, 2011). As already established, Woods & Roberts (2016) define SJ as the lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities in a number of areas across the school. Our earlier discussion on EL highlights how an approach based on EL meets the general criteria of Woods & Roberts (2016) for SJ leadership in schools. EL moreover incorporates most of the SJ elements emphasised by

Theoharis (2007), Coleman (2011) and Gocen (2020), such as equitable, just, socially inclusive, fair and respectful leadership practices. Similarly, *values* and *ethics*, which are key SJ concepts, are prominent in scholarly writing on EL. For instance, many authors writing on EL (Begley, 2003; Blackmore, 2006; Branson, 2007; Coleman, 2011) encourage school leaders to establish clarity in relation to their values through critical self-reflection and dialogue and then make them evident in everyday leadership practices in schools. ‘Value’ awareness, openness and an emphasis on the common good (Gumus, Bellibas, Esen & Gumus, 2018; Gocen, 2020) are seen as a necessary prerequisite for ethical leadership practices.

It may be assumed that an emphasis on equitable, respectful and inclusive leadership practices across the school incorporates the main elements of SJ leadership practice as defined by Woods & Roberts (2016) and supports the lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities in a number of areas across the school. Therefore, given that the school leader is aware of her/his values, communicates them and encourages a critical dialogue within the school, an EL approach is likely to facilitate SJ.

Transformational Leadership (TL)

Burns (1978) describes TL as a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. Bass (1985) further expanded Burn’s theory by dividing transformational leadership behaviours into four categories: Idealised influence, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration and inspirational motivation. He described ‘*idealised influence*’ as the ability to clearly articulate a vision which followers are happy to espouse. The ‘*intellectual stimulation*’ component of transformational leadership refers to the ability to play a healthy and beneficial role in organizational learning, in which leaders place value in learning for both themselves and their followers. ‘*Individualized consideration*’ includes behaviours which offer support,

encouragement and coaching for followers. Finally, '*inspirational motivation*' invokes the concepts of ethics and refers to leaders who show concern for the organizational vision and follower motivation, and where they are more inclined to make ethical decisions.

Similar to ethical leadership, TL theory is value-based and appears to be centred on people and morality (Lumby & Coleman, 2007). It offers a framework that redistributes power by calling everyone to leadership, by valuing everyone regardless of their official role, and it fosters environments in which relationships are reciprocal, engaging and supportive. In a school setting, TL aims to widen commitment to school-wide objectives through the development of a shared vision and to empower followers to achieve these objectives (Bush & Glover, 2014; Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Transformational leaders aim at raising the awareness levels of followers and helping them achieve high performance outcomes. They show conviction about important issues, exhibit high standards of ethical conduct and consider the needs of others over their own. As a result, they are respected and trusted (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In a review of a large number of studies on transformational leaders, Hackman & Johnson (2009) found that all the studies they looked at identified similar characteristics. All of the leaders were recognised as creative, visionary, empowering and passionate (p. 105). As to developing commitment to a shared vision, research has clearly indicated that transformative leadership can encourage followers to exceed performance expectations.

TL and EL overlap in their focus on leaders' personal characteristics and value-based leadership practices. In their review of relevant literature on ethical leadership, Brown and Trevino (2006) compared the construct with related concepts such as authentic and transformational leadership, both of which share a concern for the moral dimension of

leadership. They concluded that ethical and transformational leaders care about others, act consistently with their moral principles (i.e. integrity), reflect on the ethical consequences of their decisions, and strive to be ethical role models for others.

Implications for SJ Leadership Practice

Similar to EL, using the lens of the Woods and Roberts (2016) definition of SJ, TL practice reveals that it resonates with all four of their concepts. It offers a framework that redistributes power by calling everyone to leadership (Lumby & Coleman, 2007), thereby emphasising the importance of the distribution of opportunities to lead across the school staff as well as affording staff an equal ‘voice’ within the school community. It therefore espouses both *participative* and *distributive* justice in that it underscores the empowerment of staff and the enhancement of both their awareness of, and commitment to, achieving school-wide objectives (Shields & Hesbol, 2020). Furthermore, by implication, it gives staff access to the necessary funds and materials to complete tasks and to develop new ideas. It may also be asserted that by encouraging and ensuring *participative* and *distributive* justice, TL practice resonates with Woods and Roberts’s (2016) concept of *cultural justice*, which highlights respect for individual identity and belief. Finally, through its emphasis on intellectual stimulation and the professional development of followers (Shields & Hesbol, 2020), TL promotes and underpins *developmental justice* which, according to Woods and Roberts (2016), affords followers opportunities for learning and personal development.

However, although TL is value-based (Lumby & Coleman, 2007) and encompasses many of the key elements identified by Woods and Roberts (2016) as essential to SJ leadership practice, it does not specifically address values that aim to “lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities” in schools. What is emerging therefore is that while there is a strong overlap between TL and EL, a transformational leadership approach does not specifically encourage

self-reflection with regard to values and the development of a ‘critical consciousness’ that works towards the elimination of inequalities, which researchers (Capper et al. 2006; Coleman, 2011, Shields & Hesbol, 2020) advocate as a crucial requirement for leadership practice that seeks to bolster SJ.

Distributed Leadership (DL)

Distributed leadership has been described as “the normatively preferred leadership model in the 21st century” (Bush, 2013, p. 543). The origin of DL is often traced back to the publications of Gronn (2000) and Spillane (2004), both of whom emphasised that DL could guide research rather than act as a prescription for leadership practice. It did not, however, take long before DL was promoted as the most desirable approach to leadership practice, described by Lumby (2013) as “the theory of choice for many” (p. 42). Bush (2013) ascribes its popularity partly to the fact that principals have become overloaded with work and need to be relieved of their burden by distributing work and responsibilities to others.

Spillane et al. (2004) describe DL as a perspective which recognises that there are multiple leaders, a distributed model of leadership focusing on the interactions of those in formal as well as informal leadership roles. DL is primarily concerned with *leadership practice* and how leadership influences school improvement (Spillane, 2006). However, Wood and Roberts (2016) have pointed out that recognising the distributed nature of leadership does not necessarily result in democratic leadership, that is, leadership practices that promote SJ and uphold democratic values. In their 2013 case study on leadership practices in a secondary school, Wood and Roberts (2013) found that distributed leadership does not necessarily involve everyone equally. In this regard, Lumby (2013) contends that DL theory does not address the connection between power and inequalities. Distributed theory thus ignores employees’ unequal access to power and power positions in schools. While power can be defined in a

number of ways, Wallace & Hall (1994) have suggested that instead of assuming that an individual has the power to manage people's behaviour, s/he also has the possibility to put restrictions on their behaviour. A principal could thus create an environment where middle leaders and staff in general are allowed to take initiative while it is made sure that the staff does so within boundaries which are defined by the principal her/himself. It is therefore questionable whether power is being distributed to the degree that staff can express their creativity as leaders and managers and take the initiative toward leadership in schools.

Implications for SJ Leadership Practice

When DL theory is examined in light of our working definition there is a resonance between it and some of the main elements in the Woods & Roberts (2016) definition of SJ. DL clearly promotes *participative and distributive justice* with its emphasis on the participation of teachers in decision-making, encouraging interactions of both formal and informal school leaders, and opening up new opportunities for staff who would like to assert influence beyond the confines of their classrooms. It may also be presumed that, by encouraging participation, DL also emphasises *cultural justice*. However, as discussed earlier, DL does not necessarily result in democratic leadership or practices that promote SJ and democratic values (Woods & Roberts, 2016). DL theory neither directly addresses the construct of SJ nor does it indicate in any indirect way that SJ is a paramount issue in relation to leadership. The key words *social inclusion, justice, respect, care and equity*, which Theoharis (2007) encourages school leaders to adopt in the context of SJ, are rarely cited in scholarly writing on DL. Contrary to ethical and transformational leadership theory, *values* and *ethics*, which are key concepts in relation to SJ, do not feature prominently in scholarly writing on DL.

However, while DL does not appear to directly promote SJ, its emphasis on multiple leaders and a distribution of leadership carries some weight and opens up a space in which

individuals, other than those in formal leadership positions, can exert influence and take the lead. The critical issue here is whether these elements of distributed leadership theory guarantee that leadership practice in the spirit of DL captures the essence of SJ. Indeed, Lumby (2013) suggests that this will not be possible unless employees' unequal access to power and positions of power in schools is addressed.

Woods & Roberts (2013) argue that in order to develop DL that seeks to enhance SJ, it is necessary to recognise and address the inequalities and feelings of hurt and marginalisation which they found to be embedded in the day-to-day processes of dispersed leadership. As perceived by study participants, they suggest that, helping distributed leadership become fairer and a benefit to the learning of all requires it to be guided by a broad concept of SJ that encourages schools to ask critical questions about involvement (participative justice), respect (cultural justice), learning (developmental justice) and resources (distributive justice).

Social Justice and School Leadership Development

Research indicates that leadership development initiatives have yet to seriously address the issue of SJ. Preparation programs for school leaders often focus their attention primarily on the effectiveness and efficiency of schools. Cambron-McCabe et al. (2005) argue that this narrow emphasis fails to prepare school leaders for the difficult and emotional work involved in progressing SJ which requires a shift in values, attitudes, and practices and it limits leaders' ability to address fundamental SJ issues.

Tillman et al. (2006) assert that educational leadership programmes must establish learning environments that assist current and aspiring school leaders in challenging their values and beliefs in an effort to unshackle themselves from traditions of entitlement and privilege. Leadership programmes often lack a critical edge as indicated by respondents in Theoharis'

(2008) study who described the leadership preparation programmes they participated in as uninspiring. They suggested that the content addressed was clearly disconnected from issues of equity and justice. Furthermore, while traditional issues of school improvement and change were highlighted and discussed, there was no expectation among participants to challenge many of the dominant norms and practices in schools.

We suggest that perhaps the same could be said of programmes on offer in many other national contexts. Analysing a review of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) programme for middle leaders Lumby & Coleman (2007) noticed that issues of SJ, equity or difference were not raised or discussed. This seems to suggest a real need to address the nature and content of all leadership preparation and education programmes to ensure that both potential and actual leaders are exposed to knowledge and opportunities for growth in relation to SJ issues. Topics should assist school leaders in developing their reflective consciousness, and the knowledge and skill sets required to lead on issues of SJ. Key elements might include subjects such as reflection on one's individual values, perceptions and implicit attitudes, a review of school structures, policies and processes directed at supporting SJ, and also professional development for staff to heighten awareness and develop an approach to advancing fairness, equity and inclusiveness in all practices across the school community. In a recent study, Drago-Severson & Blum-DeStefano (2019) argue that pursuing a deeper understanding of leaders' developmental diversity, using constructive development theory, can help expand and support SJ leadership throughout the educational system. Their initial findings, from the first phase of a larger, qualitative and developmental study with 50 educational leaders, suggests that educational leaders' qualitatively different developmental orientations (i.e. their ways of knowing or making sense of the world) influence their thinking

about, and practice of, school leadership for SJ. This research adds an important dimension to the literature and conversation about both SJ leadership and adult developmental theory, as it explores how educators' internal and often unconscious orientations to difference and diversity may influence their educational practice and how understanding these qualitative differences may be significant both for leadership professional development and leadership development.

The emerging SJ discourse signals a need for school leaders first of all to be aware of and understand the issues and the complexity of leading for SJ in schools, and secondly, to develop strategies to approach their professional work in more effective and renewing ways. Foster (1986) maintains that leadership must be critically educative in a way where school leaders not only look at the conditions in which we live, but they also must decide how to change them. His call for activism that seeks to challenge entrenched institutional structures reproduced by the dominant culture has been espoused by a number of other scholars (Bogotch, 2002; Marshall, 2004; Berkovich 2014; Shakeshaft, 2015. Marshall (2004), for instance, calls upon the field of educational administration to take an activist and pro SJ stance. Shakeshaft (2015) recalls the significant role played by 'activist research' and an activist perspective set to changing organisations and hierarchies that aimed at bringing about a change in the disparity between male/female leadership positions in schools in the 1970s/80s. Furthermore, Berkovich (2014) asserts that the success of SJ efforts in education depends on creating a critical mass of committed professional activists, learning from each other and operating in coordination. We concur with scholars who have called for collective 'activism' with regard to school leadership. The golden thread in their argument is that, in order to change organisations, hierarchies and structures and overcome systemic injustices, an activist perspective and a joint effort of

“professional activists” is necessary. Furthermore, this thinking and approach to SJ practice needs to be both incorporated and supported in all leadership development initiatives.

Perhaps there is also a need to refocus teacher education programs to ensure that both teachers and leaders have a heightened sense of SJ issues, where they are able to accept the different perspective that this might bring (Theoharis, 2007). It is imperative that such programmes, both at the university and national level, include a relevant component relating to SJ leadership and to leading a multicultural school. There is also a need for a heightened awareness of SJ issues across education systems. In his call to ‘activism’, Berkovich (2014) suggests that individual leaders’ actions by themselves are unlikely to overcome cemented collective injustices unless the actions are grounded in a joint effort. There is therefore a need to establish networking forums such as conferences, in tandem with leadership development programmes, to further enable leaders to share ideas and experiences and to support, encourage, inspire and learn from each other. Cameron-McCabe and McCarthy (2005) argue that, at both local and system levels, processes need to be established to facilitate conversations which could lead to a reconceptualisation of leadership for social justice.

The key finding from our critique and discussion suggests that if there is to be a growth in leaders’ understanding of the need for the *lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities* in schools, all school leadership development initiatives need to focus not only on DL (the current dominant theory in relation to school effectiveness and improvement) but also on TL and EL. Our critique suggests that while DL may currently be gaining traction in the literature on leadership practice in schools, by itself it does not address some of the most significant issues which are central to ensuring a SJ leadership agenda. This, we believe, demonstrates a need to ensure that both aspiring and in-role principals are exposed to, and encouraged to explore,

critique and engage with, both EL and TL approaches to leadership in addition to DL as they attempt to promote SJ practice in schools. An emphasis on sharing a vision and encouraging followers to achieve common objectives has also figured heavily into recent scholarly writing (Bush & Glover, 2014, p. 567; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Sergiovanni, 2006). It is however questionable whether this is achievable or even desirable in contemporary multicultural societies (Begley, 2004). For the leader in such an environment a more important role is to create a safe and fertile environment for staff and students where different beliefs and values are respected, openly discussed and debated (Hansen and Lárusdóttir, 2018). Moreover, in such an environment diversity could be embraced (Lumby and Coleman, 2007). It would also facilitate “the lessening or elimination of unfair inequalities” which Woods and Roberts’s (2016) see as the essence of SJ practice.

Conclusion

It is important to recognize that creating more just and equitable schools is possible and there is a growing need for school leaders to commit to SJ aims. The discussion in this article highlights the importance of a range of approaches to leadership practice in working towards this goal. Leadership for SJ requires individual reflection on personal and professional values and attitudes, and the sharing of these among the broader school community. With a view to altering and transforming institutional cultures and structures, both aspiring and in-role principals need to explore, critique and engage with EL and TL approaches to leadership in addition to the current dominant DL. As a result, leaders must bring SJ to the centre in their work and actively lead from an ethical value base toward equity and excellence across diverse contexts. It also has significant implications for leadership development programmes and policy, to ensure that leaders are sufficiently supported in this endeavour. The journey towards

SJ is a never-ending process of refinement and improvement and cannot be accomplished in isolation. School leaders need the ongoing support of external national agencies and national policies together with that of the school community in which they work.

References

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O.; Luthans, F., May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact followers' attitudes and behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 15(6), 801-823.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Begley, P. (2003). In pursuit of authentic school leadership practices. in P. Begley and O. Johannsson (Eds). *The ethical dimension of school leadership*. London: Kluwer.

Begley, P. (2004). Understanding valuation processes: Exploring the linkages between motivation and action. *International Studies in Educational Administration*. 32(2), 4-17.

Berkovich, I, ((2014). A socio-ecological framework of Social Justice leadership in education, *Journal of Educational Administration*. 52(3), 282-309.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Social Justice and the study and practice of leadership in education: a feminist history. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. 38(2), 185-200.

Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and Social Justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*. 12(2), 138-156.

Branson, C. M. (2007). Improving leadership by nurturing moral consciousness through structured self-reflection. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 45(4), 471-495.

Branson, C. M. & Gross, S. (2014). Introduction: Why ethical educational leadership? In C. M.

- Branson and S. J. Gross (eds). (2014). Handbook of ethical educational leadership (pp. 1-12). New York: Routledge.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*. 97(2), 117-134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002
- Brown, M. E. & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 17, 595–616.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (2013). Distributed leadership: The model of choice in the 21st century. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*. 4(5), 543–544.
doi:10.1177/1741143213489497
- Bush, T. & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: what do we know? *School Leadership and Management*. 23(5), 553-571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, (2005). Educating School Leaders for Social Justice. *Educational Policy*. 19(1). 201-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904804271609>
- Capper, C.A., G. Theoharis, and J. Sebastain. (2006). Towards a framework for preparing leaders for Social Justice. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 44(3), 209-224.
- Central Statistics Office: <https://www.cso.ie>, Census 2016.
- Coleman, M. (2011). Educational Leadership for Diversity and Social Justice: Implications for Ethical Practice. Paper delivered at the ENIRDELM Conference, Reykjavik, 2011.
- Davies, B. (2002). “Rethinking schools and school leadership for the 21st century: changes and challenges”. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 16(4), 196-206.
- Davies B (2003) Rethinking strategy and strategic leadership in schools. *Educational*

Management Administration & Leadership. 31(3),295–312.

- Drago-Severson, E., & Blum-DeStefano, J. (2019). A developmental lens on Social Justice leadership: Exploring the connection between meaning making and practice. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Special Issue #1 on Educational Leadership and SJ*. 3(1).
- Duignan, P. A. (2003). *Authenticity in leadership: Encouraging the heart, celebrating the spirit*. Australian Lutheran Education Yearbook. National Lutheran Conference Publication.
- Erickson, R. J. (1995). The importance of authenticity for self and society. *Symbolic Interactions*. 18(2), 121-144.
- Evans, A. E. (2007). Horton, Highlander and Leadership Education: Lessons for preparing educational leaders for Social Justice, *Journal of School Leadership*. 17, 250-275.
- Fletcher, J. K. (2004). The paradox of post-heroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 15, 647–661.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of Social Justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 40(1), 49-78.
- Göcen, A. (2020). Ethical leadership in educational organizations: A cross-cultural study. *Turkish Journal of Education*. 10(1), 37-57. doi:10.19128/turje.811919
- Grogan, M. (2010). Foreword in *Bridge leadership: Connecting educational leadership and Social Justice to improve schools*. In K. Autumn, A. K Tooms & C. Boske. (Eds.), Information Age Publishing, Inc. Charlotte, (P. ix-xiv).

- Gronn, P. 2000. Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration*. 28(3), 319-338.
- Gumus, S., Bellibas, M. S., Esen, M. & Gumus, E. (2018). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 46(1), 25–48.
- Hackman, M.Z. & Johnson, C.E. (2009). *Leadership: A communication perspective* (5th.ed.) Long Grove, Il.: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Hansen, B. & Lárusdóttir, S. H. (2018). Tímarit um uppeldi og menntun. *Icelandic Journal of Education*. Grunnskólastjórar á öndverðri 21, öld. Hlutverk og gildi. [The Role and Values of Icelandic compulsory school principals].
- Hartley, D. 2010. Paradigms: How far does research in distributed leadership 'stretch'? *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*. 38(3), 271-285.
- Holloway, J. & Keddle, A. (2019). Competing locals in an autonomous schooling system: The fracturing of the 'social' in Social Justice. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*. 48(5), 786-801. doi: 10.1177/1741143219836681
- Hoy W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration. Theory, research and practice* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P. & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 16(3), 373-39.
- Jansen, D.J. (2006.) Leading Against the Grain: The Politics and Emotions of Leading for Social Justice in South Africa. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. 5, 37–51.
- Jean-Marie, G., A. Normore, & J. Brooks. (2009). Leadership for Social Justice: Preparing 21st

Century School Leaders for a New Social Order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education* June.4(1).

Jónsson, Ó. P. (2009). Lýðræði, réttlæti og haustið 2008. [Democracy, justice and the autumn 2008]. *Skírnir. Tímarit hins íslenska bókmenntafélags*, 183, 281-307.

Lumby, J. (2013). Distributed Leadership; the uses and abuses of power. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. 41(5), 581-597.

Lumby, J. & Colman, M. (2007). *Leadership and diversity. Challenging theory and practice in education*. London: Sage Publication.

Marshall, C. (2004). Social Justice challenges to educational administration; Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 40 (1), 5 – 15.

Norberg, K. & Johansson, O. (2007). Ethical dilemmas of Swedish school leaders: Contrasts and common themes. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*. 35(2), 277–294. doi: 10.1177/1741143207075393b

Shields, C. M. & Hesbol, K. A. (2020). Transformative leadership approaches to inclusion, equity, and social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*. 30(1), 3-22. doi: 10.1177/1052684619873343

Sotirova, D. (2018). Ethical leadership in cross-cultural business communication. *Acta Prosperitatis*. 9, 51-88.

Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 36(1), 3-34.

Spillane, J.P. 2006. *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
(www.sesp.northwestern.edu/docs)

Statistic Iceland. (2020). Innflytjendur 15,2% íbúa landsins [Immigrants are 15.2 of the total

Population of Iceland]. Retrieved from

<https://hagstofa.is/utgafur/frettasafn/mannfjoldi/mannfjoldi-eftir-bakgrunni-2020/>

Statistics Iceland. (2019). Grunnskólanemendur aldrei verið fleiri [School children of foreign origin have never been as many]. Retrieved from

<https://www.hagstofa.is/utgafur/frettasafn/menntun/nemendur-i-grunnskolum-haustid-2019/>

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 43(2), 221-258.

Theoharis, G. (2008). At Every Turn: the resistance that Principals Face in their Pursuit of equity and justice, *Journal of School Leadership*. 18(3), 303-343.

Tillman, L., C. Brown, K. Jones, F. Campbell, M. L. Gonzalez (2006). Transformative Leadership for Social Justice: Concluding Thoughts. *Journal of School Leadership*. 16(2), 207-209.

Wallace, M. and Hall, V. (1994). *Inside the SMT: Teamwork in secondary school management*. London: Paul Chapman Publication.

Woods, P. A. & Roberts, A. (2013). Distributed Leadership and Social Justice: A case study investigation of distributed leadership and the extent to which it promotes social justice and democratic practices, *Centre for Educational Leadership, University of Hertfordshire, UK*.

Woods, P. A. & Roberts, A. (2016). Distributed leadership and social justice: images and meanings from across the school landscape, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. 19(2), 138-156. doi: 10.1080/13603124.2015.1034185

Zembylas, M. (2010). The emotional aspects of leadership for SJ: Implications for leadership preparation programs", *Journal of Educational Administration*. 48(5), 611-625.

