

TEACHER SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY FOR CHILDREN:
A SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND PRELIMINARY VALIDITY STUDY

A DISSERTATION IN
Counseling Psychology

Presented to the Faculty of the University
Of Missouri-Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
The requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
DANAH BARAZANJI
M.A., University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2009
B.A. University of Iowa, 2006

Kansas City, Missouri
2012

© 2012

DANAH BARAZANJI

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

TEACHER SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY FOR CHILDREN:
A SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND PRELIMINARY VALIDITY STUDY

Danah Barazanji, Candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree

University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2011

ABSTRACT

Social injustices on the school, neighborhood, societal, and family level can affect certain populations of children and these injustices have been associated with school-related consequences, including: unequal access to education opportunities, decreased academic achievement, grade repetition, expulsions and suspensions, and higher dropout rates (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Brookes-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Evans, 2004; Garcia-Reid et al., 2005; Knitzer et al., 1991; Slavin, 1997; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). In light of this impact, scholars have called teachers to increase social advocacy efforts for students (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008). There is limited empirical research and no known instruments measuring teacher advocacy orientation. This dissertation sought to develop the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS) to measure teachers' social justice advocacy orientation, as well as provide support for the validity and reliability of the self-report instrument.

Six hundred and seven K-12 teachers in the United States participated in the online-survey study. Methodological procedures used to provide evidence of factor structure, validity, and reliability for the scale included: two randomly split samples of principal axis factoring, comparing TSJAS scores with additional survey instruments to assess convergent and criterion validity, and comparing TSJAS scores with specific demographic and

participant data. The stability of TSJAS scores was examined with internal consistency values.

Results supported a 22-item scale and three distinct factors: teacher advocacy orientation, social justice awareness, and student empowerment. Bivariate correlations demonstrated positive relationships between the TSJAS subscales and a measure of general social advocacy and political involvement, supporting convergent validity; and a negative relationship with a measure of just world ideology, also supporting convergent validity. No group differences were found on the scale depending on participants' race/ethnicity or sexual orientation. TSJAS scores also evidenced adequate internal consistency reliability.

Overall, results support the initial psychometric properties of the TSJAS. The primary implication of this research concerns valid and reliable measurement of teacher social advocacy orientation using TSJAS scores. Directions for future application and research of the TSJAS are provided.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the School of Education, have examined a dissertation titled, “Teacher Social Justice Advocacy for Children: A Scale Development and Preliminary Validity”, presented by Danah Barazanji, candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

LaVerne Berkel, Ph.D.
Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

Valerie Blackwell, Ph.D.
Curriculum and Instruction

Chrisanthia Brown, Ph.D.
Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

Jake Marszalek, Ph.D.
Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

Johanna Nilsson, Ph.D., Committee Chair
Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of Teacher Advocacy.....	4
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Underprivileged Children in Schools	10
Teachers as Advocates in the School System	16
History of Social Advocacy	19
Contemporary Guidelines for Social Advocacy	24
Guidelines in education.....	24
Guidelines in the field of mental health.....	26
Empirical Findings related to Social Advocacy.....	32
Predictors associated with advocacy efforts	34
Definition of Teacher Social Justice Advocacy.....	39
Social Justice Advocacy Instruments.....	42
The Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS).....	47
Instrument Reliability and Validity	49
Rationale for Present Study	50
Dissertation Goals and Hypotheses	51
3. METHODOLOGY	53
Participants.....	53

Instruments.....	56
Teacher social justice advocacy.....	56
Social justice advocacy.....	56
Political involvement.....	57
Belief in a just world.....	58
Procedures.....	61
Item Development.....	62
4. RESULTS.....	69
Data Screening and Preliminary Analyses.....	69
Study 1.....	75
Item analysis.....	75
Exploratory factor analysis.....	76
Reliability analysis.....	84
Study 2.....	84
Exploratory factor analysis.....	84
Reliability analysis.....	89
Study 3.....	89
Validity Analysis.....	89
Hypothesis five.....	92
Post-hoc analyses.....	94
5. DISCUSSION.....	98
Hypothesis 1.....	99
Hypothesis 2.....	103
Hypothesis 3.....	104

Hypothesis 4.....	105
Hypothesis 5.....	107
Post-hoc conclusions.....	109
Limitations	111
Sampling methodology	111
Threats to construct validity.....	113
Threats to statistical conclusion validity.....	113
Research Recommendations	115
Implications and Conclusions	117
 Appendix	
A. Table of Original TSJAS items with item-specific citations	120
B. Measures Used in Dissertation.....	127
C. Final TSJAS Items and Subscales after Factor Analyses	136
D. MANOVA and ANOVA Results	140
E. Solicitation and Informed Consent Email.....	148
F. Solicitation Email for Permission to Submit Survey on a Website	151
G. On-line Incentive Form.....	153
H. Permission to Use Instruments.....	155
REFERENCES	158
VITA.....	173

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Scales Used to Measure Constructs related to Social Justice Advocacy	43
2. Original TSJAS Item Stems, Means, Standard Deviations, Score Ranges and Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics	72
3. Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Extraction Communality Values for the TSJAS for Study 1	79
4. Factor Correlations for TSJAS for Study 1.....	81
5. Inter-Item Correlations for final TSJAS Items for Study 1	8
6. Factor Correlations for TSJAS for Study 2.....	86
7. Inter-Item Correlations for Final TSJAS Items for Study 2	87
8. Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Extraction Communality Values for the TSJAS for Study 2.....	88
9. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alpha Values for TSJAS subscales, Validity, and Post-hoc variables for Study 3	91
10. MANOVA for Participants' Race/Ethnicity Group Differences on TSJAS Subscales (TAO, SJA, SE.....	141
11. MANOVA of Equal Sample sizes for Participants' Race/Ethnicity Group Differences on TSJAS Subscales (TAO, SJA, SE	141
12. MANOVA for Participants' Sexual Orientation Group Differences on TSJAS Subscales (TAO, SJA, SE.....	142
13. MANOVA of Equal Sample sizes for Participants' Sexual Orientation Group Differences on TSJAS Subscales (TAO, SJA, SE.....	142
14. ANOVA for Gender on TAO	143
15. ANOVA for Gender on SJA.....	143
16. ANOVA for Gender on SE.....	143
17. ANOVA for School Area on TAO	144

18. ANOVA for School Area on SJA.....	144
19. ANOVA for School Area on SE.....	144
20. ANOVA for School Type on TAO.....	145
21. ANOVA for School Type on SJA	145
22. ANOVA for School Type on SE	145
23. ANOVA for Student Race on TAO	146
24. ANOVA for Student Race on SJA.....	146
25. ANOVA for Student Race on SE.....	146
26. ANOVA for Student SES on TAO.....	147
27. ANOVA for Student SES on SJA.....	147
28. ANOVA for Student SES on SE.....	147

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is hard to believe that I am finally sitting at my computer, typing my Acknowledgments page. Even as I sit here, I feel as though the room is full with the people who are responsible for getting me to this stage in my career. First and foremost, I must thank Johanna Nilsson. Johanna, you have been everything a student could ask for out of a mentor, advisor, chair. When my writing felt chaotic, you provided structure. When I was tired, you provided guidance. When I was overworked, you reminded me to enjoy life. When I seemed lost, you promoted my self-exploration and autonomy. I admire you for all that you give of yourself to your work and advocacy efforts, and I know that we will remain close.

Thank you to the rest of my committee for your help and support throughout the process of this dissertation. I sought you out to be on my committee not only for your research expertise but also because you made lasting impressions on me through my graduate training. When writing and researching issues of teacher advocacy, you were my great models that embodied the population I was trying to study.

Finally, I must thank my family. My parents and sister instilled values of education, perseverance, humility, and loyalty in my upbringing. These values have carried me through the challenges and joys involved with pursuing a doctoral degree. And to my husband, thank you for your unwavering support and sense of humor throughout the process. You have been my unwavering teammate, cheerleader, and best friend. And now, you must call me Doctor.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is commonly agreed upon that a population of underprivileged youth, who experience social injustices such as poverty, homelessness, parental drug use, and unsafe living environments, make up a portion of students in the United States school systems (Evans, 2004; Fibkins, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleisch, 1991; Milner, 2006; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006; Weiner, 2003). Student populations that seem the most affected by these inequities include ethnic minorities and immigrant/refugee students, lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgender students (LGBT), and children with disabilities (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994; Attwood, 2006; Bhui et al., 2003; 2006; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Chung, Bemak, & Wong, 2000; Frieden, 2004; Heptinstall, Sethna, & Taylor, 2004; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Kosciw, Diaz, & Greytak, 2006; Marshall, Schell, Elliott, Berthold, & Chun, 2005; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Milner, 2006; Phillips, 1990; Porter & Haslam, 2005; Robertson et al., 2006; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Sack, 1998; Sack, Clarke, & Seeley, 1996; United States Census Bureau, 2007; 2009; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 2009b). These injustices have been associated with school-related consequences such as unequal access to education opportunities, decreased academic achievement, grade repetition, expulsions and suspensions, and higher dropout rates (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Brookes-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Evans, 2004; Garcia-Reid et al., 2005; Knitzer et al., 1991; Slavin, 1997; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). In light of these injustices and their impact on school experiences, several researchers and scholars have made calls to the teaching and other helping professions to encourage their social advocacy efforts (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Gallagher & Clifford,

2000; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008). The purpose of this study is to develop an instrument to measure social justice advocacy behaviors and attitudes among teachers and to examine that instrument's psychometric properties.

Social justice advocacy has been identified as not only a critical awareness of injustices and inequities for certain populations, but also a dedication and orientation towards creating a more just, equal experience for the individual (via empowering) and for society as a whole (via larger-scale efforts; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Cohen, 2001; Constantine, 2007; Cornelius, 1998; Corning & Myers, 2002; Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006; Garmon, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; House & Martin, 1998; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003; McKenzie et al. 2008; Miller et al, 2009; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Speight & Vera, 2004; Van Soest, 1996; Vera & Speight, 2003). Recently, competencies and guidelines in regards to social justice have been proposed and developed in the field of psychology, counseling, and education (Arrendondo et al., 1996; Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Field & Baker, 2004; Lee, 1997; Lewis, Arnold, House & Toporek, 2003; Lewis & Bradley, 2000; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007; Sue, 2001; Toporek, Lewis, & Crethar, 2009; Vera & Speight, 2003). Competencies and guidelines inform professionals to go beyond their office or classroom to facilitate societal change, and to value collaboration with other professional administrators in the school and sociopolitical forces in the community for students' wellbeing (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Capper et al., 2006; Catapano, 2006; Constantine et al., 2007; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Herrera & Murry, 2005; Lewis et al. 2003). Furthermore, other proponents of teacher advocacy recommended the inclusion of empowering students to become change agents themselves as well the awareness and challenging of the differential power dynamic between teachers and students that can maintain status quo and marginalization (Allen, 1997; Duncan-Andrade, 2005).

Despite the wealth of recommendations in the literature, there are some limitations surrounding the empirical evidence that such guidelines are currently being practiced or upheld in the field (Ivey & Collins, 2003; Speight & Vera, 2004). Furthermore, data suggest that although the percentage of teachers entering the workforce is at its highest, attrition rates among new teachers have been steadily increasing for the last 15 years and attrition is highest in disadvantaged school settings such as urban, rural, and schools with high poverty and ethnic minority student percentages (Greenlee & DeDeugd, 2002; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010; Lane, Lacefield-Parachini, & Isken, 2003). Disparities between the level of need in high-risk school settings and the level of attrition in those areas highlight the critical need for supportive and stable teacher figures for underprivileged students. Furthermore, concerns have been raised regarding the inadequacy of schools' approaches to dealing with at-risk student populations (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Fibkins, 2005), stating that schools tend to maintain the status quo rather than directly challenge it.

The empirical literature suggest that there may be an inconsistent consensus as to how much pre-service trainees engage in or endorse social advocacy efforts or how trainees and professionals define advocacy in psychology, counseling, and education fields (Field & Baker, 2004; Goodlad, 1990; Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Shriberg et al., 2008). Particularly in education, Goodlad (1990) surveyed pre-service students and faculty members in educational programs and reported that only 5% of the large sample identified *change agent* as being an important aspect of the role of a teacher. The sparse research that does exist in this area has examined a small sample of exceptional teachers to understand what factors influence their commitment to advocacy (Duncan-Andrade, 2005), and thus generalizability to teachers at large is limited. Nonetheless, Duncan-Andrade's findings suggested that exceptional advocate teachers

in one urban school identified the importance of empowering students to question injustices, collaborating with administrators and neighborhoods, and working outside of the classroom to implement social change as important factors to advocacy.

It is important to note that conclusions and implications gleaned from the empirical data in this area are limited due to methodological or psychometric limitations such as low power to detect effect sizes, limited generalizability to teachers due to limited sample sizes and homogenous samples, and the use of methods of assessment that lack strong evidence for reliability or validity for measuring advocacy particularly with a teacher population. Of the scales that currently measure social justice, (Chen-Hayes, 2001; Corning & Myers, 2002; Kerpelman, 1969; Miller et al., 2009; Nilsson et al., 2011; Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; Van Soest, 1996) none focused on teacher-specific, nor student/child specific advocacy and only four have been factor analyzed to examine their structure (Corning & Myers, 2002; Miller et al., 2009; Nilsson, Marszalek, Linnemeyer, Bahner, & Hansen, in press; Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009). The lack of teacher-specific advocacy assessment instruments presents a gap in the existing literature marked by a need to quantitatively measure the wealth of competencies and recommendations among the teaching population.

Definition of Teacher Advocacy

The current study seeks to fill this gap by developing a scale based on the literature and construct definition of teacher social advocacy and examining its factor structure and internal consistency for evidence of reliability and a valid and conceptually meaningful factor structure. Scale construction recommendations strongly emphasize the need for item development to be strongly rooted in literature and theory (DeVellis, 2003; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The synthesis of reviewed competencies, guidelines, and the empirical research yielded a

multifaceted definition or picture of the teacher social advocacy construct: (a) an awareness of injustices occurring in the school and other social contexts in which students exist (i.e., poverty, neighborhoods, family, sociopolitical systems); (b) a knowledge of unique needs and risks associated with specific vulnerable student populations (ethnic minority, immigrant/refugee, LGBT, and students with disabilities); (c) empowering their students to also question social injustices and to become change agents themselves (*acting with* the student); (d) a commitment or sense of responsibility for ensuring equal rights for all students, and empowering students in the school and other social contexts in which they exist; (e) a committed effort to representing those underprivileged students where their voice might not otherwise be heard (i.e., political lobbying, school district meetings, faculty meetings, contacting local business for donations) (*acting on behalf of* the student); and (f) taking action within the school context in order to create changes in school climate that will enhance vulnerable students' ability to succeed (i.e., creating after-school activities, involving parents, participating in outreach efforts, donating supplies; (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Catapano, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2004a; Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Garmon, 1996, 2004, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; McKenzie et al., 2008; Moule, 2005; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). This definition highlights knowledge, awareness, a sense of responsibility and commitment, and a belief in empowering students, as well as taking action within school and in other contexts when needed.

Subsequently, this definition was used to create items for the TSJAS which were examined by an expert panel and edited based on the panel's recommendations. The current study also examined preliminary evidence for validity by assessing scores on the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJA) and their relationship to other predictors of high or low social advocacy.

For example, research suggests that individuals who belong to marginalized groups themselves, such as LGBT individuals, may be more attuned to social advocacy efforts than individuals within the majority population (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Additionally, research has been conducted to identify potential predictors of high or low advocacy efforts among graduate students in counseling, school psychology, and social work (Beer, 2008; Lerner, 1980; Linnemeyer, 2010; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Miller et al., 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; 1975; Van Soest, 1996; Van Voorhis & Hostetter, 2006). These studies identified the following factors as relating to level of involvement in advocacy: political interest (Linnemeyer, 2010; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005), belonging to a marginalized group (i.e., LGBT students are more attuned to advocacy needs and efforts than majority population; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005), and preconceived beliefs about the world (i.e. the belief in a just world; Lerner, 1980). In the current study, a measure of general social advocacy orientation, political interest, and the belief in a just world, were assessed and analyzed for their relationships to teacher reports of teacher social advocacy attitudes and behaviors. Potential group differences based on ethnicity (minorities versus Caucasian participants), and sexual orientation (LGBT versus heterosexual participants) were also explored as research questions given the inconsistent or limited findings regarding these potential group differences among the teaching profession.

Specifically, political involvement and interest has been found to be the strongest predictor of actual and desired advocacy efforts among counseling graduate students (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). This relationship between advocacy and political involvement has been replicated with a sample of clinical, counseling, and school psychology doctoral students (Beer, 2008; Linnemeyer, 2009). Additionally, in the initial study I conducted with the first version of

the TSJAS, scores on a two-item measure of political involvement were positively correlated with social advocacy attitudes for pre-service teachers (Barazanji & Nilsson, 2008).

The belief in a just world, or the belief that the world is fair and thus there are no injustices in the world (Lerner, 1971; Rubin & Peplau, 1973, 1975), has been examined for its relationship with advocacy attitudes and general helping behaviors. Research has suggested that the belief in a just world is negatively correlated with attitudes towards innocent victims, helping behaviors, empathy for certain populations, and general social advocacy efforts (Lerner, 1971; Lerner, 1980; Rubin & Peplau, 1973, 1975; Van Soest, 1996). Additionally, in the initial study I conducted with the first version of the TSJAS, scores on a measure of belief in a just world were negatively correlated with social advocacy attitudes for pre-service teachers (Barazanji & Nilsson, 2008).). The belief in a just world has demonstrated negative relationships in relation to attitudes towards innocent victims, helping behaviors, disapproval of the status quo, empathy towards disadvantaged populations, as well as social advocacy in general (Lerner, 1971; Lerner, 1980; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Vansoest, 1996). Furthermore, in a 1973 study, Rubin and Peplau demonstrated an inverse relationship between the belief in a just world and individuals' scores on an activism index, asking for the level to which participants were involved in activism and the degree to which "socially victimized groups" were deserving of their fate (1973, p.91). This led the researchers to conclude, "people who believe that the world is a just place were less likely to be activists," (p. 91). Similarly, conflicting religious attitudes have been associated with a lack of acknowledgment of oppression for LGBT students (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). Additionally, Pohan's study of 492 preservice teachers indicated a significant relationship between personal beliefs or values regarding diversity and professional beliefs or sensitivity (Pohan, 1996). Specifically, participants who endorsed negative

stereotypical beliefs about culturally diverse populations were less likely to endorse multicultural sensitivity on a measure of professional beliefs (Pohan, 1996).

In conclusion, the purpose of the current study was to: (a) develop items for the TSJAS based on the literature; (b) explore the initial factor structure and internal consistency of that scale; (c) examine evidence of validity by examining relationships between TSJAS scores and general social advocacy, political involvement, and the belief in a just world; and (d) to explore evidence for criterion validity by assessing potential group differences on TSJAS scores related to minority status (ethnicity and sexual orientation).

The intention of this research was to add to the limited empirical knowledge regarding social advocacy in the teaching profession and what potential structure might best characterize the definition of social advocacy among teachers. The development of an instrument with strong initial evidence of reliability and validity may benefit the field of education and teaching by informing training program missions to promote social advocacy efforts among their pre-service students. An instrument could also provide training programs and education settings with a method for evaluating their employees' level of advocacy, and potentially identifying which teachers would be best suited for school contexts in the greatest need of advocates. Furthermore, it is hoped that this initial, exploratory examination of the TSJAS could be the first step to a series of steps taken to further confirm the TSJAS factor structure across different populations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is a significant need for teacher social advocates in the school systems (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008). Arguments have been made that teachers are at the “front lines” of intervention opportunities and would greatly benefit from a “road map” for how to improve intervention and justice efforts for students in trouble (Fibkins, 2005, p. 5). I argue that the development of a reliable and valid measure of teacher social justice advocacy may be a necessary initial step to creating such a roadmap for improving justice efforts among teachers. The use of a scale could: (a) identify important factors associated with high social justice attitudes and behaviors; (b) tailor training program curricula and focus on target factors that have been statistically associated with advocacy commitment; and (c) identify teachers that may be best suited as change agents for vulnerable school populations. An initial scale was developed in order to explore ways of measuring teacher social advocacy, the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS; Barazanji & Nilsson, 2008); the results of this preliminary study were presented at the American Psychological Association (APA) Conference in 2009. This initial scale will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. The next step is to now build off the original instrument by creating more items that are strongly grounded in the advocacy literature, to examine the new instrument’s initial factor structure, and demonstrate evidence for reliability, criterion and convergent validity.

The following literature review begins with an overview of the inequities and needs experienced by under privileged youth, a rationalization for why teachers have the potential to play a supportive advocacy role, and a review of the current status of teachers in areas of need.

This section is followed by a review of the ancient and contemporary history of social justice advocacy in mental health fields. Next, the relevant competencies and guidelines for social advocacy outlined in education and mental health fields will be reviewed, followed by a detailed analysis of the limited, but recent empirical literature. These competencies and empirical data will be used to create an operational definition of teacher social justice advocacy. Following this section, relevant social advocacy instruments that are already in use will be reviewed and critically examined in terms of their limitations and how to inform the process of creating the teacher social advocacy scale. This section concludes with a review of how all the presented literature went into scale and item development, followed by a detailed description of the teacher social justices advocacy scale (TSJAS) at this point. Hypotheses for the current study will then be outlined.

Underprivileged Children in Schools

In order to fully appreciate the call for an instrument to identify teacher social advocacy attitudes and efforts, it is important to visit the literature regarding underprivileged youth in the United States' school systems. When considering child and adolescents' development, it is important to examine the role of several ecological contexts (e.g., familial, neighborhood, peer, school) in which children develop, grow, and have needs (Bronfenbrenner, 1989). The school context is a significant system within children's development of self-esteem and ability (Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleisch, 1991). Unfortunately, certain populations of children experience social injustices such as poverty, homelessness, parental drug use, racism and discrimination, lack of access to educational opportunities, unsafe living environments, and oversized classroom environments (Evans, 2004; Fibkins, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Knitzer et al., 1991; Milner, 2006 ; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006; Weiner, 2003). Societal

injustices such as poverty, neighborhood safety, and unequal access to education can affect students' abilities in the school context marked by decreased: academic performance, dedication to graduation, and a sense of perceived safety in school environments (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Evans, 2004; Garcia-Reid et al., 2005; Knitzer et al., 1991; Slavin, 1997; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). Within the literature, I extrapolated a list of vulnerable populations and conditions that tend to be most related to injustices in the school system: (a) poverty, which tends to also interact with the preceding populations; (b) ethnic minorities and immigrant/refugee students; (c) lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgendered students (LGBT); and (d) children with disabilities.

Poverty.

The specific role of poverty among youth has long been examined due to findings that suggest children from lower social classes or lower parental education have fewer social support networks and thus rely more on their peers than children from higher SES and parents with more education (Bo, 1994; Evans, 2004). In an exhaustive analysis of literature, Brooks-Gunn and Duncan (1997) presented a substantial list of significant relationships between poverty and other youth-related outcomes including, but not limited to: developmental delays, learning disabilities, grade repetition, expulsions and suspensions, high school dropouts, parent reports of emotional and behavioral problems, teen pregnancy, abuse, and lower perceived safety. It is cautioned to not make causal links between these outcomes and poverty, as several other factors are not taken into consideration; nonetheless, the relationships between poverty and these factors exist and are more common than among middle-class counterparts. School-related consequences such as behavioral problems, suspensions and expulsions also decreases students' opportunities for access to support from their educators (Fibkins, 2005). For example, a qualitative study

comparing high achieving, suburban middle schools to low achieving, urban middle schools highlighted stark differences in SES, funding availability, and academic testing scores (Brown, Anfara, & Roney, 2004). In addition to these differences, Brown et al. found variations in the effective functioning of institutions, teachers and curriculum.

Ethnic minority and immigrant/refugee students.

Ethnic minorities particularly in urban settings make up a large proportion of the population that experiences inequities and disparities in the school system (Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Milner, 2006; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Slavin, 1997). For example, ethnic minority children who attend urban schools are also more frequently from disadvantaged neighborhoods that experience a higher frequency of stressors such as poverty, unemployment, insufficient resources, high crime, fear of safety, and substandard housing (Attar & Guerra, 1994)

Research has examined the effects of neighborhood and school safety or lack thereof, on ethnic minority children and adolescents' overall and school adjustment (i.e., attendance, avoiding trouble, and performance). Bowen and Bowen (1999) found that males and African Americans reported the highest amount of perceived danger (specifically at the neighborhood level), and the Hispanic student population demonstrated the lowest averages in attendance and grades. Similarly, Attar, Guerra, and Tolan (1994) examined the effects of specific negative life events occurring frequently in disadvantaged neighborhoods (i.e. transitions, circumscribed events, and exposure to violence) on African American and Hispanic elementary school aged boys' and girls' psychological adjustment as measured by self, peer and teacher reports. First, second, and fourth grade African American and Hispanic children from six schools serving disadvantaged neighborhood students were sampled. Findings revealed that first grade African American females reported the highest amount of stress than other age groups. Secondly,

stressful life and neighborhood events were related to concurrent peer and teacher ratings of student aggression. Although the relationship between these negative effects of neighborhood disadvantage and academic achievement did not reach significance, this study shed light on the stark vulnerabilities for students from disadvantaged settings that are less frequently observed among predominantly Caucasian, middle-class elementary school-aged children (Attar et al., 1994).

These findings are further corroborated by data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2009b) and Rogers and O'Bryon (2008) that African American males are almost twice as likely as their White peers to be suspended from school and African American and Latino males are more likely to be expelled. It is important to note that research has suggested that students of color are also more likely to experience more punitive consequences than their White counterparts for the same school infractions (Morrison & D'Incau, 1997 as cited in Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008).

Also, while the educational landscape is constantly adapting and changing, so too is the demographic breakdown of the child population in the United States marked by an increase in foreign born children. According to the US Census Bureau (2004) the foreign-born population was 33.5 million (almost 12% of the US population) in 2003 and almost half of this population originated from Latin America. For families with children under 18, the poverty level is even greater with nearly 70% living below the poverty level (United States Census Bureau, 2007; 2009). Also, regarding school disparities, foreign-born Hispanic students have higher school drop-out rates than their United States born Hispanic counterparts (U.S. Department of Education 2009; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2009b). Although the majority of foreign-born parents' children are considered U.S. citizens or may acculturate easier than adult

refugees (Chung, Bemak, & Wong, 2000; Marshall, Schell, Elliott, Berthold, & Chun, 2005; Porter & Haslam, 2005), research suggests that children of foreign-born parents may struggle with adjustment issues, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, or depression (Barazanji, Nilsson, Heintzleman, Siddiqi, & Shilla, 2008; Bhui et al., 2003; Bhui et al., 2006; Heptinstall, Sethna, & Taylor, 2004; Robertson et al., 2006; Sack, 1998; Sack, Clarke, & Seeley, 1996). Findings have also suggested that these consequences are more associated with post-migration stressors such as separation from culture and family, conflicts related to legal citizenship status and immigration, language barriers, difficulties forming peer relationships, academic difficulties, parental unemployment, financial stress, and negotiating between traditional and westernized cultural values (Guerin, Guerin, Dilriye, & Yates, 2004; Heptinstall et al., 2004; Porter & Haslam, 2005; Sack, 1998).

In terms of school injustices experienced by this population of immigrant and refugee students, culturally or linguistically diverse (CLD) students may be left out of school-wide opportunities due to language barriers and their parents may be isolated from becoming involved in their children's success due to similar barriers, or unawareness of their children's rights to education regardless of their own legal status in the United States (Holmes & Herrera, 2009). Furthermore, immigrant and refugee parents may lack an understanding or familiarity with the United States public school system, and thus experience frustrations or missed opportunities to provide education-specific support for their children (Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Nilsson et al., 2009).

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Students.

Included among student minorities exists the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) population of students in schools (Athanasos & Larrabee, 2003; McCabe & Rubinson,

2008). The LGBT student population can experience several injustices in the school system, including harassment, assault, and social isolation (Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). In fact, one study that surveyed LGBT adolescents revealed that over 90% of the 1,732 sampled reported experiencing verbal or physical harassment based on their sexual orientation, looks, gender expression, as well as other factors, while 62% of their non-LGBT counterparts reported experiencing such harassment (Kosciw & Diaz, 2006). The majority of LGBT youth sampled in the 2006 study reported that they felt unsafe at school and this perceived lack of safety has been linked to more school days skipped, lower aspirations for higher education, and lower grade point averages. Along with these school-related problems, LGBT youth are also 2-3 times more likely than non-LGBT youth to have attempted suicide in the last twelve months, to abuse alcohol and other substances, and engage in precarious sexual behaviors (Garofalo, Wolf, Kessel, Palfrey, & DuRant, 1998 as cited in McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Russell & Joyner, 2001 as cited in McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). These troubling numbers emphasize the critical needs of this particular minority population in schools that often times go unprotected or unmet by school officials.

Students with disabilities.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2009b) rates of children who met qualifications for disability services increased significantly between 2001 and 2007. Although conditions and accommodations have greatly improved since the passing of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1975, children and adolescents with various learning disabilities are often at more risk for “poor self-esteem, low motivation, and depression,” (Phillips, 1990, p. 466). Moreover, students with disabilities are more likely to become victims of social isolation, bullying, and high school

dropout than children with no disabilities (Attwood, 2006; Frieden, 2004; Phillips, 1990). These particular populations and the vulnerabilities associated with them will be addressed in specific items in the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS). Additionally, it is important to measure the extent of teacher knowledge and commitment to these vulnerable students.

Teachers as Advocates in the School System

A need for stronger social support systems has been emphasized for specific populations of students such as LGBT youth (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003), children from low SES, culturally or linguistically diverse (CLD) students (Herrera & Murry, 1999, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009) or behaviorally and emotionally disturbed children (Knitzer et al., 1991; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). In terms of specific populations, this need is further substantiated by literature that suggests the relationship between teachers and LGBT students or children with mental health needs is among the best predictor of positive adjustment in school (Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). Also, research suggests children and adolescents from low social class are less likely to have adequate social support networks or interactive and cognitive stimulation (Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008) and thus rely more on their peers than adults for help (Bo, 1994; Evans, 2004). It is important to identify potential adults (such as teachers) who can be supportive advocates for marginalized children. This section examines the literature regarding teachers and administrators in areas of need, beginning with data on attrition and teacher experience, followed by literature on how well equipped teachers are for advocacy efforts.

Large-scale studies have examined the nature of teacher attrition and retention, because delineating predictors of teacher retention would be important for measuring the likelihood of long-standing advocate role models in school systems (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010; NCATF, 2006;

Shen, 2003). Data suggest that while the number of teachers entering the workforce is at an all time high, the rate of attrition among new teachers has been progressively climbing for the last decade and a half; these rates of attrition have also always been higher in disadvantaged (i.e., high poverty, urban, rural, and high ethnic minority student population) school settings (Greenlee & DeDeugd, 2002; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010; Lane, Lacefield-Parachini, & Isken, 2003).

Ingersoll and Merrill (2010) reported that the rate of turnover for first-year teachers in public school systems increased by 31% between 1988 and 2004. Interestingly, for the first time in 15 years, the rate of turnover differed by race, marked by higher turnover rates among ethnic minority teachers. This is of particular concern considering the importance of ethnic minority role models and advocates for minority students (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010). Furthermore, between 2004-2008 the field of education lost 300,000 veteran teachers (teachers who had worked at least 15 years in the workforce) to retirement and the average amount of years experience for a teacher dropped from 15 in 1987 to 1-2 years in 2007-2008 (NCATF, 2006).

Along with the higher prevalence of student inequities in urban schools, the bulk of available teaching jobs are in such settings (Catapano, 2006; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010). Several articles suggest that most teachers entering the workforce are predominantly Caucasian, middle-class female individuals who may not be equipped or comfortable working with ethnic/sexual minorities or in urban environments (Athanases & Larrabee, 2008; Catapano, 2006; Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Garmon, 2004; Garmon, 2005; Ingersoll, 2010; Lane, Lacefield-Parachini, & Isken, 2003; Milner, 2006). While it is acknowledged that the school setting and a teacher's interventions can play a crucial role in the adjustment of children in need (Knitzer et al., 1991; Mullen, 2002; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006), currently, it has been argued that school systems' method for dealing with at-risk student intervention is riddled with flaws and errors

(Bemak & Chung, 2005; Fibkins, 2005). Despite widely accepted knowledge that teachers' efforts to involve parents in an at-risk child's school adjustment is critical, data suggests that teachers and school systems have limited strategies for involving parents in such processes for their children (Knitzer et al., 1991). Also, despite recommendations for advocates for specific populations, researchers have posited that teachers along with school psychologists and principals are potentially under prepared or trained to advocate for sexual minorities or those with mental health needs in the schools (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). For example, in a study surveying 119 teachers' knowledge and confidence in helping children with mental health needs in six inner-city elementary schools, Walter, Gouze and Lim (2006) found that on average teachers reported a low sense of self-efficacy in their ability to help such children in their classroom. In addition to teachers, it is possible that the education administrators that teachers would hypothetically be approaching for social justice collaboration are also ill-equipped or lack the knowledge of injustices and how to tackle such issues (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Lane et al., 2003; Marshall, 2004).

This disparity between needs and available supportive teachers may perpetuate the vulnerability of underprivileged students. Also, in terms of *who* is responsible for advocating for equality among diverse student populations, opposing views exist in the literature as well. Some have argued that it will not be possible for teachers to be advocates until educational leadership (i.e., faculty, administrators) become more knowledgeable and comfortable tackling issues of gender, power, and privilege (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Marshall, 2004; Rusch, 2004). However, others have argued that in order to offset the potential lack of advocacy among administrators, preservice teachers must be trained with leadership skills to inspire change in school systems (Holmes & Herrera, 2009). Clearly, there is a lack of consistency in terms of who should be

responsible for school reform and advocacy. Thus, it will be important to include items in the TSJAS that measure the extent of teachers' perceived responsibility to advocate for justice.

In summary, the literature suggests that the school system climate is rather bleak for a population of underprivileged children in the United States. Ethnic minorities, children living in poverty or disadvantaged neighborhoods, LGBT students, students with disabilities, and emotionally or behaviorally disturbed children can experience significant adjustment issues in school. Along with adjustment difficulties, they are at a higher risk for suspension, expulsion, or lower academic achievement. Teachers have been identified as an integral role in children's lives insofar as they have the potential to stand as advocates and supportive role models for those who lack such adults in the many contexts of their life (i.e., family, neighborhood, and school). Despite this, data suggest that new teachers are experiencing the highest rate of attrition and turnover in the last decade and a half, and may not be well-equipped to handle the responsibilities of an advocate. These factors highlight the vital need for a means to measure and identify teachers who may be potentially strong social advocates for their student population. The next section of this chapter will examine the history of social advocacy, beginning with the earlier characterizations of *justice* and the evolution of advocacy as it is currently identified in the field of education and other mental health fields.

History of Social Advocacy

As stated, the purpose of the study is to create a reliable and valid scale to measure teacher social justice advocacy; hence, a strong, well-defined construct of teacher social justice advocacy is needed. In order to best define the construct of teacher social justice advocacy, I conducted an extensive theoretical literature review of social justice. Also, this section will take an extra look at the history of social advocacy in the field of counseling psychology due to its

rich emphasis on this particular construct (Miller et al., 2004). It is the hope that this history will help inform the development of a synthesized definition of social justice advocacy for teachers.

When examining the historical roots to the concept of social justice, it may be surprising to find that justice, as it was first defined, did not include a belief of equality for all. Quite the contrary, the roots and philosophical underpinnings of justice seemed to center on maintaining the status quo (Jackson, 2005; Reisch, 2002; Russell, 2004). Reisch traced the roots of social justice as it specifically affected the development of the construct in Western societies and began with a look at Plato and Aristotle's important scholarly works (Jackson, 2005; Russell, 2004). Justice was believed to be accomplished when people found harmony and balance within their socially determined position (Reisch, 2002; Russell, 2004). Aristotle also discussed justice as an issue to be carried out with the legal system assuring the delivery of benefits; however, he was deliberate to distinguish that people were not created equal and his view of justice actually supported slavery and other acts of oppression among groups. This zeitgeist of sustaining the status quo is in direct contrast to what is understood as social justice today. It seems that in these early stages, the advocacy of justice was strongly tied with theology and divine right such that *good* and *bad* was predetermined and thus justice was accomplished when the *good* was upheld in society even if it meant the deprivation of some citizens.

Reisch (2002) argued that the idea of social justice did not begin to change into what we might recognize today until the late eighteenth century during the major American and French revolutions. It was at this time that social justice was used to describe the demand for individual and collective welfare for all mankind (i.e., the American Declaration of Independence). With this new view of social justice, not surprisingly, there would be a slow but steady realization that such a quest for equality was paralleled with an unjust and oppressive reality (Reisch, 2002).

With these political changes and through the twentieth century it became clear that social justice was more of an ideal. In actuality, there were severe inequalities and power differentials in the societies that were founded on a call for social justice. This discrepancy between the idealized definition and actual standards likely led to what we know now as reform efforts. Reform views shaped the idea that one could achieve justice once all individuals' needs were met on the fundamental base of humanity rather than social class. As the idea of social justice began to grow into this concept of individual rights to resources, social workers were at the front lines of advocacy efforts and there seemed to be a discourse between social work's efforts to create a multiracial society and the United States' undeniable sociopolitical view of race and society (Reisch, 2002).

During this Progressive Era, social workers defined social justice as a harmony between religious, philosophical and political views of human rights and racial justice (Reisch, 2002). Social workers strived to join forces with other community groups and fields that were focused on serving underprivileged people and seemed to view social justice as parallel to multiculturalism efforts. Reisch (2002) posited that it was at this time of building coalitions with other organizations in the 1920's that social workers began to advocate for improving child welfare. Social justice advocacy as it pertains to children and vocation or education can also be traced back to the father of vocational psychology, Frank Parsons. Parsons worked with other activists in Boston to help train and subsequently employ boys living in poverty-stricken immigrant neighborhoods in the 1900s (Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). It can be inferred that these efforts paired with the growing prevalence of education in the United States after the Great Depression were the beginning steps of advocacy for children.

Visiting the history of counseling psychology, it was also war and world-wide political climate that influenced advocacy efforts in the counseling psychology field. World War II brought back countless veterans to the United States during the 1940s and 1950s and psychologists began advocating for justice efforts for returning veterans and these efforts extended into the 1970s with promotion of reform in access to education for veterans (Fouad et al., 2004). It was during these decades that counseling psychologists began using their expertise to advocate for change and reform among oppressed populations such as women, African Americans, and the homeless in the form of voting, housing, employment, and desegregation efforts (Fouad et al., 2004; Lewis, Lewis, Daniels, & D'Andrea, 1998). During the 1980s and 1990s, as the mental health care system began to change with managed care, the field of counseling psychology began broadening its focus even more to include advocacy efforts for several populations such as the elderly, children, and ethnic minorities. Furthermore, the identity of the field began to reflect advocacy efforts insofar as the increased inclusion of more women and ethnic minorities in positions of power (Brabeck, Walsh, Kenny, & Comilang, 1997; Fouad et al., 2004).

The efforts made to expand competency in the area of multiculturalism was first observed by the development of the Cross-Cultural Counseling competencies by Sue et al. (1982). These competencies sought to improve the counseling practices and their applicability for ethnic minorities and challenged the field of research for its restricted focus on the ethnic majority for the last several decades (Sue et al., 1982). The competencies were further built upon until eventually the 31 Multicultural Counseling Competencies were presented to the counseling psychology profession in 1992 (Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992). These multicultural competencies were again operationalized in 1996 (Arrendondo et al., 1996) and were centered on

three major components: (a) self awareness; (b) acceptance and desire to understand cultural differences; and (c) skills and knowledge of culturally-practical interventions (Sue et al., 1992). Scholars called to professionals to be knowledgeable on the oppressive inequalities existing in the sociopolitical landscape for particular marginalized groups, but to extend that knowledge into culturally relevant conceptualizations and practices (Constantine et al., 2007; Sue, 2001). In order to implement multicultural competent practices or theories for a variety of populations, social justice advocacy efforts would need to be taken on by practitioners as well as researchers in the field (Vera & Speight, 2003). It was in the late 1990s when social justice advocacy became more of a critical focus of the field of counseling psychology (Ivey & Collins, 2003; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Lewis & Bradley, 2000; Speight & Vera, 2004; Vera & Speight, 2003).

This multiculturalism movement laid the groundwork for extending the focus from the individual (i.e. personality structure and intrapsychic factors) to the culture and other contexts, but also lacked in its focus on specific recommendations for how to influence systematic change (Fouad et al., 2004; Speight & Vera, 2004). Thus, the influence of the environment, culture, diversity, and the importance placed on prevention and outreach also related to the field's focus on social justice (Miller et al., 2004). The social justice focus in this field is now clearly communicated in competencies, research, and guidelines (Constantine et al., 2007; Ivey & Collins, 2003; Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2002; Vera & Speight, 2003) and will be discussed further later in this chapter.

In summary, the history of justice and advocacy provides the current study with an appreciation for the relatively young inclusion of equality efforts in the definition of social justice. This appreciation possibly helps to explain the relatively limited empirical data on this construct as well as helps inform the careful development of items to represent this construct of

interest. It appears clear that the advent of revolutionary wars centered on fighting for equality, paired with the inequalities during the Industrial Revolution's landscape (Ehrenreich, 1985; Reisch, 2002) led to the call for professions to begin addressing these injustices via advocacy (Fouad et al., 2004; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). Specifically, these initial steps were taken by the social workers in the United States and were later taken on by psychologists and counselors who began with efforts to advocate for inclusion of providing services to other populations (Arrendondo et al., 1996; Fouad et al., 2004; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Sue, 2001; Sue et al., 1992; Sue et al., 1982).

Contemporary Guidelines for Social Justice

Although relatively little empirical research exists in the area of advocacy and professional fields, there are theoretical, or "aspirational arguments" (Miller et al., 2009, p. 496) on the topic. First, different sets of competencies that were considered relevant to the current study will be presented, followed by a review of the sparse empirical works within the fields of education, school counseling, counseling psychology, and social work. These competencies and empirical findings provided a foundation for scale and item development for the TSJAS.

Guidelines in education.

Teacher and education literature is conservatively peppered with regards to social advocacy; however, this focus seems to fall almost exclusively under preservice teacher education or addressing the *need* for advocacy or multicultural sensitivity in education (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006; Catapano, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 1995, 2004a; Garmon, 1996, 2004, 2005; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). Proponents of advocacy training models encourage pre-service teachers to: (a) use a critical consciousness to recognize

injustices and empathizing with the oppressed; and (b) identify solutions within the classroom and beyond (Capper et al., 2006; Catapano, 2006; Duncan-Andrade, 2005).

Although their framework was intended for a specific underprivileged population, the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student population, Herrera and Murry's (1999, 2005) framework for advocacy for educators is important to review and could potentially be applicable to all underprivileged populations. The framework is grounded in three main components: (a) currency (defined as an ability to remain knowledgeable of challenges and barriers for CLD students); (b) defensibility (defined as an ability to self-reflect on beliefs and practices); and (c) futurity (described as an ability to extend efforts outside of the confines of the classroom to meet the needs of CLD students or their families) (Herrera & Murry, 1999, 2005). These ideas seem to reflect the more comprehensive competencies in counseling psychology that will be discussed in the next section; however provide an interesting addition of futurity.

In addition to Herrera and Murry (1999, 2005), Gallagher and Clifford (2000) identified necessary steps for one who is committed to advocating for young children. Among their suggestions was to "identify and cultivate various powerful political sources in the states that could be supporters," (p. 20). Such power houses could include governors, legislators, but also business leaders and professional organizations that may have a vested interest in one's proposed ideas for change. Similarly, Russell (2009) suggested that advocates must engage the public with strategic campaigns, media messages, and be willing to initiate partnerships in the private sector for time and resources. These step suggests that an advocate would require some interest or commitment in locating, persuading, and cooperating with political or professional organizations outside of his or her original context or environment (Russell, 2009).

Allen (1997) and Duncan-Andrade (2005) included an interesting component to teacher social advocacy that will be considered for the TSJAS item development. Specifically, Allen argued that empowering and educating students to become aware of social injustices is a critical component to advocating for youth. Secondly, Allen and Cochran-Smith (1995) posited that an awareness of the differential power dynamic between teachers and students is an important component to recognizing one's own privilege and ability to maintain or challenge the status quo for developing children. These two factors parallel aspects of counseling psychology competencies, discussed next, as well (Constantine et al., 2007; Lewis et al., 2003).

Guidelines in the field of mental health.

In other fields, such as counseling psychology, specific guidelines and competencies have been laid forth for psychologists and counselors to take social advocacy initiatives to address client injustices and oppressions (Arrendondo et al., 1996; Constantine et al., 2007; Field & Baker, 2004; Lee, 1997; Lewis et al., 2003; Lewis & Bradley, 2000; Ratts et al., 2007; Sue, 2001; Toporek, Lewis, & Crethar, 2009; Vera & Speight, 2003). The field of school psychology also has some recommendations and guidelines for their professionals (ASCA, 2003; Ratts et al., 2007; Trusty & Brown, 2005). These competencies are reviewed here because items from the TSJAS will be developed based on a compilation of competencies from the fields of education and psychology.

In response to criticisms of the counseling profession's previous focus on individual-level interventions (i.e. individual counseling, focusing on the individuals thoughts or feelings about discrimination experiences) over larger systemic problems (Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007), Lewis et al. (2003) laid forth the task force's advocacy competencies. These competencies were endorsed by the American Counseling Association (ACA) Governing Council as standard

competencies for counselors to help inform their actions. The competencies are organized into three levels: Client/Student advocacy, School/Community advocacy, and Public Arena advocacy. These three levels include specific types of advocacy that can be characterized as either *acting with* or *acting on behalf* of the client, school, or public arena. When *acting with*, professionals are encouraged to: (a) empower; (b) collaborate; and (c) disseminate relevant public information. When *acting on behalf*, professionals are encouraged to: (a) provide access to resources; (b) create systemic plans for change; and (c) actively lobby for social and political reform. Although the competencies help to categorize and identify necessary efforts, no empirical data could be found on how these competencies were being carried out in the field or whether they are measurable skills.

The most important aspect of the ACA competencies (Lewis et al., 2003) as it relates to my study is the multidimensional definition of advocacy. The competencies provide a framework for defining advocacy at three different micro- and macrolevels: the individual, the school, and the public arena. Given that the needs of underprivileged children have been documented at the individual, school, as well as public level, this framework would be appropriate for defining teacher social advocacy efforts and subsequent TSJAS items.

Similarly to Lewis et al. (2003), Constantine (2007) also provided a framework for psychologists with nine social advocacy competencies specified for serving multiculturally diverse populations. These nine competencies include: (a) being knowledgeable about the injustices and oppressive experiences faced by not only individuals but their groups; (b) continuous self-reflection on privilege, power, and multiculturalism, and (c) how one's own privilege may maintain status quo or injustices for others; (d) being critical of interventions that seem exploitative; (e) being knowledgeable of other interventions that may be more culturally

sensitive; (f) being knowledgeable of social injustices that exist on a global level; (g) implementing and then evaluating preventative interventions or programs that may meet the needs of the underprivileged; (h) collaborating with other organizations in a way to reach out to others; and (i) developing interventions and skills to stimulate social change on several microlevels such as institutions, neighborhoods, etc.

These competencies (Constantine et al., 2007) provide a comprehensive definition of what it means to advocate for multiculturally diverse populations. Given that the literature on needs of children seems to be most heavily saturated among those from ethnic, sexual and cognitive minority groups, these competencies provide relevant information for what specific skills would reflect that of a social advocate. In summary, the counseling psychology field and its recent move towards an advocacy approach, gives a take home message that one's profession *can* and *should* extend beyond one's office and must move into the communities, institutions, and societal levels in which injustices marginalize human beings. These competencies were considered during item development for the TSJAS (See Appendix A).

The field of school psychology and counseling has also put forth a great deal of literature regarding advocacy as a critical piece to incorporate into the profession given school counselors' integral role in students' lives (ASCA, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Field & Baker, 2004; House & Martin, 1999; Ratts et al., 2007; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Trusty & Brown, 2005). Recently, Rogers and O'Bryon (2008) discussed school psychology's recent shift towards a public health model insofar as children are viewed from an ecological perspective in order to consider all contexts within which a child lives and to emphasize preventative service rather than remedial aid. Slightly earlier, Bemak and Chung (2005) stated that despite school counselors' history as being "a stationary position in schools," (p. 1), they can be key players in eliminating

injustices and gaps that occur between students from different cultural backgrounds or socioeconomic status. The authors argued that school counselors and other school personnel are sometimes guilty of maintaining status quo and potentially maintaining injustices if they ignore sociopolitical and economic factors inherent of children and families in the school system. Bemak and Chung also stressed in order for a school counselor to move towards an advocate role, they must be willing to challenge administrators and educators who seem to maintain the marginalization of certain groups and thus must be willing to expect negative reactions of other school employees for rocking the system boat. Thus, the authors suggested that an important factor to becoming a school advocate is the ability to maintain professional relationships with school administrators while also challenging and attempting to change the systems within which they manage. These arguments were also considered when developing items for the TSJAS as they seem directly applicable to teachers who have similar contact as counselors do with vulnerable students.

School counseling-specific advocacy competencies and guidelines are of particular interest in this current study due to the focus on student and children's unmet needs in the school, environmental, and systematic context. The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) included Advocacy in 2000 as a general principle for professional practice, stating that school psychologists must "understand the public policy process to assist them in their efforts to advocate for children, parents, and systems" (p. 26). Along with the NASP's inclusion of advocacy as a general tenant to school psychology, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) unveiled the ASCA National Model in 2003, outlining guidelines and advocacy competencies grounded in leadership, collaboration, and system-level change (Schwallie-Giddis, Maat, & Pak, 2003). According to this model, school counselors are expected to demonstrate

advocacy endeavors such as: “eliminating barriers impeding...development, creating [equal] opportunities, collaborating...within and outside the school to help students meet their needs, and promoting positive, systemic change in schools,” (Trusty & Brown, 2005, p. 259).

Ratts et al.’s (2007) framework was considered an adaptation of Lewis et al.’s, (2003) ACA competencies in order to ensure applicability of the model to school counselors working with students (See Figure 1). The framework included specific interventions on the client/student advocacy level such as empowering students to identify ways to protect themselves from bullies, or advocating on behalf of students by collaborating with teachers to ensure culturally diverse literature to help provide minority students with literary role models. At the school level, the authors noted that the “counselor’s primary role is that of an ally,” (p. 93) insofar as counselors pay attention to data or trends at the school and respond accordingly; for example, the authors discussed a school in which LGBT harassment was particularly a problem, so the counselors founded a Gay-Straight Alliance group at the school and advocated for harassment education in the classrooms. Finally, the public arena level included suggestions such as educating teachers via workshops on generational poverty, or seeking out board members to promote a collaborative working relationship to address the barriers in students’ lives caused by poverty. These specific examples of the competencies laid forth by Lewis et al. (2003) are important for the present study because they provide examples of how the competencies can be operationalized as specific behaviors or efforts for teachers and will influence the item development process accordingly.

While these efforts are admirable and needed in the school system, it seems like quite a lofty goal to place all student advocacy responsibilities on the shoulders of school counselors. Specifically, literature suggests school counselors’ are already stretched thin in regards to the multiple roles they are expected to uphold in their profession (Field & Baker, 2004; House &

Martin, 1998; Trusty & Brown, 2005). Thus, these school counseling competencies are included in order to explore how they can be applied to teachers who may have greater access to vulnerable students at large.

In summary, it seems that these aforementioned competencies and theory-driven arguments from the fields of education and mental health can inform our understanding of teacher social advocacy in a number of ways. First, several of the competencies highlight that advocacy requires knowledge of contextual oppression, as well as skills and behaviors. Secondly, the competencies highlight a multidimensional snapshot of the construct such that skills and dedication must occur at the client (or in teachers' cases, student) level, the community level, as well as the public arena (Lewis et al., 2003; Ratts et al., 2007). Namely, this multidimensional definition highlights the need for professionals to take their efforts outside the confines of their office or classroom. Thirdly, social justice advocacy is further broken down as the ability to implement efforts by *acting with* and *acting on behalf* of the client (or student). Next, there seems to be a close tie between social justice advocacy and multicultural competence or working with multiculturally diverse populations (Constantine, 2007) and it is certainly critical to consider the role of ethnically diverse student populations that teachers serve and teachers' sense of social justice advocacy. Moreover, a number of competencies highlighted the importance of personal awareness of privilege or biases and beliefs. Finally, the competencies seem to reflect a trend in the importance of collaborating with other systems (such as administrators, neighborhoods, or political legislators) as well as the importance of empowering the client (or student) to question the status quo and become advocates themselves (See Appendix A for the list of TSJAS items developed based on these competencies).

While these series of competencies and guidelines are crucial in delineating roles and expectations for professionals in the mental health or school setting, it is important to consider their limitations. First, there does not appear to be empirical efforts to directly quantify these competencies as measurable skills or beliefs. Secondly, there are a large number of competencies across a variety of professions and fields; it is possible that this large number is creating a difficulty in synthesizing a definition of social advocacy. Thirdly, it is unclear whether the call for inclusion of these competencies in training and licensure has actually influenced whether or not these behaviors are happening in actuality (Ivey & Collins, 2003; Speight & Vera, 2004). Although competencies are a critical component to the understanding of the progression of social justice movements, they are “but one aspect,” (Ivey & Collins, 2003, p. 294) and do not necessarily reflect an actual active change in the profession. Thus, it is important to not only consider guidelines, but also empirical research may describe the nature of social advocacy in practice. The next section of this chapter visits a review of the available empirical research in the area of social justice advocacy in counseling psychology, social work, and pre-service teachers.

Empirical Findings related to Social Advocacy

Empirical literature regarding social advocacy is concentrated mainly in the psychology and social work fields (Linnemeyer, Hansen, Bahner, & Nilsson, 2005; Miller et al., 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Vansoest, 1996; VanVoorhis & Hostetter, 2006). Research seems to center on two content areas and tends to focus mostly on college populations: (a) empirically examining levels or prevalence of advocacy involvement among certain populations; and (b) examining predictors, personality characteristics, or models associated with the development of advocacy efforts.

Examining prevalence of advocacy involvement.

Three studies, all looking at trainees and/or faculty were found to empirically measure rates or prevalence of advocacy involvement (Goodlad, 1990; Linnemeyer et al., 2005; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). In her dissertation study in counseling psychology, Linnemeyer (2009) found no differences in rates of social justice attitudes or behaviors between 266 doctoral students in counseling, clinical, or school psychology; furthermore, average scores on a social justice questionnaire were relatively high among this population of students. Linnemeyer's data did suggest a significantly larger rate of social justice advocacy behaviors among LGB participants ($n = 30$) in the sample. This group difference in advocacy involvement was further substantiated by earlier research of graduate students. Nilsson and Schmidt's (2005) research study found higher reports of social advocacy desire and commitment among LGB participants. However, Nilsson and Schmidt's study revealed relatively low levels of advocacy among counseling graduate students.

In the field of education, although an older study and thus an older snapshot of the population, Goodlad (1990) surveyed pre-service students and faculty members in educational programs across the United States and found that only 5% of the sample identified *change agent* as being within the role of a teacher. To date, no other empirical data was found to explain the rates of social advocacy commitment or efforts within the preservice or teacher population.

In summary, these three studies seem to suggest that there may be an inconsistent consensus as to how often or how much graduate level students engage or endorse social advocacy efforts; furthermore, no data seems to examine advocacy efforts among professional teachers who have completed their training. Secondly, it is possible that people who belong to marginalized groups themselves, such as LGBT individuals, may be more attuned to social

advocacy efforts than individuals within the majority population. This will be considered when discussing the hypotheses about group differences in the present study.

Predictors associated with advocacy efforts.

This section of the empirical research is by in large the most diverse. The direction of contemporary research in this area seems interested in asking the question *what predicts* or *how* is social justice attitudes or commitment *developed*? Research findings suggest that political interest, education about oppression, desired advocacy, and multicultural competence and empathy have demonstrated positive relationships with social justice advocacy efforts (Barazanji & Nilsson, 2008; Beer, 2008; Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson et al., 2011; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Vansoest, 1996). The belief in a just world, perceived barriers in the workforce, and lack of proactive role models have demonstrated negative relationships with social advocacy (McCabe & Rubinson; Miller et al., 2009; Vansoest, 1996). For the current study, political interest, general social advocacy, and the belief in a just world will be examined for evidence of validity with the teacher social advocacy measure. The rationale behind identifying these particular variables is that education on oppression has demonstrated inconsistent relationships with advocacy (Vansoest, 1996) and perceived barriers in the workforce may not apply to the population of teachers. Secondly, it could be very interesting to identify a relationship between a global worldview, interest in politics and advocacy among teachers. Therefore, empirical studies that had the biggest influence on the current study's hypotheses will be examined in greater depth in this next section. Studies are categorized into subheadings to reflect the potential correlates to the construct of teacher social advocacy, political interest and the belief in a just world.

Political interest.

Using simultaneous linear regression analyses and a nonexperimental design, Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) examined possible predictors of social advocacy efforts among 134 (84% female, age $M = 31$, $SD = 8.4$, 85% Caucasian, 92% heterosexual) graduate students in counseling and counseling psychology. The researchers utilized the Activity Scale (ACT; Kerpelman, 1969) to measure social advocacy. The scale yielded two subscale scores indicating actual amount of advocacy behaviors as well as desired level of advocacy, the ACT-Actual and ACT-Desired. Findings revealed that the strongest predictor of desired involvement in social advocacy (i.e., positive social advocacy attitudes) was a high degree of political interest. Notably, political interest was the only variable that significantly predicted desired engagement and along with desire, was the only other variable that significantly predicted actual advocacy involvement. In terms of group differences, the researchers reported that men and LGB participants reported higher levels of desired involvement, but no differences were found on actual involvement. These findings suggest that political interest may be a key characteristic that influences social justice attitudes and behaviors among students. Also, the findings suggest that a desire to advocate may predict actual advocacy behaviors. One important limitation to note about this study was the homogenous sample that may have limited generalizability to other graduate students. For example, it is possible that there are significant differences between advocacy efforts among African Americans and Caucasians; however, the ethnic minority sample size was potentially too small to detect such an effect. Nonetheless, this study provided one of the only recent empirical investigations of the construct of social advocacy as it relates to other personal characteristics. The strong correlation between political interest and social advocacy has been further corroborated with other studies (Beer, 2008; Linnemeyer, 2009).

Linnemeyer (2009) examined predictors of social justice attitudes and behaviors across a sample of 266 clinical, counseling and school psychology doctoral students. Results revealed that the strongest predictor of advocacy among this population was political involvement (in the form of interest and behavioral involvement). Specifically, liberal or far-left ideologies as well as general political interest were related to stronger commitments towards advocacy. Similarly, Beer (2008) found that general political interest orientation was also the strongest predictor of social advocacy commitment among graduate counseling psychology students. Furthermore, political participation has shown positive relationships with feelings of social responsibility, altruistic attitudes, and activism behaviors (Cole & Stewart, 1996; Fendrich & Lovoy, 1988; Lee, 1997; Smith, 2006). It is important to caution that causation cannot be inferred between political involvement and advocacy given that these studies were all nonexperimental in nature.

These studies lend to the current study by suggesting that political interest is associated with greater social advocacy commitment. Also, the research suggests that group differences on advocacy may exist between marginalized and majority groups if the current study samples a more heterogeneous sample of teachers in order to increase the power to detect a significant effect.

The belief in a just worldview.

Within the field of social work, Vansoest (1996) empirically examined the relationships between receiving an oppression education course, and students' reported advocacy behaviors, belief in a just world, and distress. A quasi-experimental pre-post with control groups design was used for this exploratory study of 222 master's level social work students. Those in the treatment condition completed a semester long oppression course that covered racism, stereotypes, and influences of the dominant culture maintaining status quo. Ninety-three first-

year MSW students were assessed for pre-test measures prior to taking a course on societal oppression in a fall semester and for post-test measures of advocacy and belief in a just world immediately following the course. Ninety-three second-year students who had taken the course in the last 1-2 years completed the same post-test measures at the same time as the other participants, and sixteen participants from a different university in the control condition completed pre- and post measures with no course. Twenty-one second-year students from a different university who did not complete the course also completed post-test measures. The total 222 participants identified as mostly (91%) female and group differences were ruled out for all comparison groups.

Results revealed that: (a) those in the treatment condition reported increased belief in a just world attitudes and decreased social justice advocacy behaviors at post-test; (b) those who took the course 1-2 years ago reported significantly lower BJWS scores than the treatment group; (c) the two control groups who never took the course reported significantly lower BJWS scores and significantly higher SJAS scores than both treatment groups combined; and (d) significant positive correlations between distress and BJWS scores and negative correlations between distress and SJAS scores for those in the treatment condition (Vansoest, 1996). Although this study had critical limitations in regards to internal validity (i.e., small sample size and power, lack of random assignment to conditions, threats of experimenter expectancies) and statistical conclusion (i.e., low reliability on independent and dependent variable measures), some findings can be important for the present study. Namely, the belief in a just world, or the belief that the world is fair and negative experiences are generally deserved (Lerner, 1971; Lerner, 1980; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; 1975), may be related to lower social advocacy attitudes. Further, this study

seems to suggest that exposure to information or education that may contradict a belief in a just world may actually *increase* one's just worldview as an immediate reaction.

Vansoest's (1996) findings also suggest that the influence of education and information regarding injustices and oppression may not be influential for all potential advocates. Rather, preconceived beliefs or worldviews may actually be responsible for predicting commitment to social advocacy efforts. This is an important step to understanding the belief in a just world as it applies to social justice advocacy because advocates of justice must be able to recognize injustices and feel a sense of responsibility to help those affected (Cohen, 2001; Cornelius, 1998; Garmon, 2005; House & Martin, 1998; Speight & Vera, 2004; Vansoest, 1996). It is possible that the belief in a just world and previously upheld openness to multicultural diversity or self-awareness would be better predictors of advocacy commitment. More information on the belief in a just world will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The empirical research in summation also provides some important implications for the current study. First, political interest and membership in marginalized groups may be related to higher commitment to teacher social advocacy. Secondly, worldviews that are characterized by a lack of openness to diversity or accepting societal oppression (i.e., a belief in a just world) may be related to lower commitments to teacher social advocacy. In summary, certainly the wealth of theoretical guidelines or competencies provide a necessary first step in identifying the construct of social advocacy and how it is conceptually unique for different helping professions. Secondly, although empirical literature does exist on the area of social advocacy, most literature is riddled with methodological or psychometric limitations or is difficult to generalize to teachers due to limited sample sizes or limited power to detect effect sizes. The empirical data also indicates a limitation due to unreliable, valid methods of measuring advocacy particularly with a teacher

population. The lack of teacher-specific empirical literature presents a gap in the existing literature insofar as certain aspects of the aforesaid valuable competencies and recommendations are not being empirically analyzed.

Definition of Teacher Social Justice Advocacy

When exploring empirical research that attempted to define social justice among school counselors, I found that school professionals in those studies seemed to define social advocacy rather loosely and mainly from the standpoint of valuing equal opportunity at the student level (Field & Baker, 2004; Shriberg et al., 2008) with little emphasis on what characterizes specific advocacy behaviors as opposed to merely attitudes. For example, Field and Baker (2004) conducted a qualitative analysis in which they surveyed 9 (89% female, 67% Caucasian) school counselors from a southeastern state in two focus groups in order to provide insight into how professional school psychologists define advocacy. Focus groups asked participants how they personally defined advocacy, what behaviors characterized advocacy, how they learned to become an advocate, and how their environment supported or inhibited efforts. The findings revealed five major themes for the definition of advocacy: (a) taking one's job beyond the limits of the office or regular job expectations; (b) actually engaging in supportive advocacy behaviors; (c) a focus on the individual child or student; (d) advocating for the profession of school counseling; and (e) viewing advocacy as a worldview or belief system. Formal training, modeling after positive role models, experiential learning, or possessing innate, altruistic qualities were all identified as main ways of how participants became advocates.

Although generalizability of these findings is extremely limited due to the small, homogenous sample size, the study still suggests that participants indicated a rather abstract snapshot of what constitutes advocacy among these participants, reflecting personal qualities

such as acceptance and awareness, as opposed to measurable, observable *behaviors*. Perhaps this is due to the fact that social advocacy definitions are nebulous among counselors in the field inasmuch as specific behaviors are not outlined in job descriptions or training. Secondly, although the majority of guidelines emphasize the role of advocacy not only at the student level but also the community and public arena level, no participants discussed these two other contexts when defining their role as advocates. It is possible that school counselors who are actually in the field are not exposed to those two other domains that are so strongly valued in the literature.

However, in one study I found examining exceptional teachers in one urban school, Duncan-Andrade (2005) reviewed reported beliefs and behaviors related to advocacy. Findings included exposing students to societal injustices that are regularly ignored, empowering students to become social reformers in their community, and organizing “out-of-classroom projects, such as after-school sports and game clubs, academic support systems, and parent and community partnership plans,” (p. 73). Although these findings came from one school’s exceptional teachers, these examples are important to the current study because they reflect parallels with the earlier discussed competencies and provide insight into what might define teacher advocacy. First, the participants’ responses reflected the competencies that encourage empowering students to question injustices. Second, these findings reflect competencies that suggest advocates must believe in working cooperatively with school administration, parents, and neighborhoods to employ changes in relevant communal contexts (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Constantine et al., 2007; Duncan-Andrade, 2005; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; Ratts et al., 2007).

While this is a limited number of empirical studies to draw many conclusions, the literature points to the need for a well- defined construct of teacher social advocacy in order to

ensure that the instrument will adequately capture the construct of interest. I developed a multidimensional definition of teacher social justice advocacy that reflects a synthesis of the wealth of competencies, guidelines, recommendations, as well as exploratory research. The definition also includes both attitudes and behaviors: (a) an awareness of injustices occurring in the school and other social contexts in which students exist (i.e. poverty, neighborhoods, family, sociopolitical systems) (attitudes); (b) a knowledge of unique needs and risks associated with specific vulnerable student populations (ethnic minority, immigrant/refugee, LGBT, and students with disabilities) (attitudes); (c) an effort to empower students to question social injustices and to become change agents themselves (*acting with* the student/behaviors); (d) a commitment or sense of responsibility for ensuring equal rights for all students in the school and other social contexts in which they exist (attitudes); (e) a committed effort to representing those underprivileged students where their voice might not otherwise be heard (i.e., political lobbying, school district meetings, faculty meetings, contacting local business for donations) (*acting on behalf of* the student/behaviors); and (f) taking action (behaviors) within the school context in order to create changes in school climate that will enhance vulnerable students' ability to succeed (i.e. creating after-school activities, involving parents, participating in outreach efforts, donating supplies) (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Catapano, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2004a; Constantine et al., 2007; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Garmon, 2004, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Lewis et al., 2003; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; McKenzie et al., 2008; Ratts et al., 2007). This definition highlights knowledge, awareness, a sense of responsibility and commitment, and a belief in empowering students, as well as taking action within school and in other contexts when needed. This definition was used to create items for the TSJAS which will be described later in this chapter.

Social Justice Advocacy Instruments

Despite the call for professions to include social advocacy in their professional identities and or training programs, several of the empirical studies conducted to examine social justice used a variety of different instruments or methods without a sense of a unified definition of how to measure the construct. Perhaps the shortage of reliable and valid research in the area of social advocacy is due to the need for adequate instruments to measure these constructs (Nilsson, Linnemeyer, Bahner, & Hansen, 2007). A comprehensive literature review led to the extrapolation of seven scales measuring activism or related constructs: the Activity Scale (ACT; Kerpelman, 1969), the Activism Orientation Scale (AOS, Corning & Myers, 2002), the Social Justice Advocacy Readiness Questionnaire (SJARQ, Chen-Hayes, 2001), the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Vansoest, 1996), the White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS; Pinterits, Poteat, and Spanierman; 2009), the Social Issues Questionnaire (SIQ; Miller et al., 2009) and the Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011). See Table 1 for an abbreviated review of these scales. The scales were all self-report measures and ranged from 21-188 items. The instruments varied in their focus on activism attitudes, actual behaviors, knowledge of past advocates, and willingness to confront privilege. All the scales with the exception of two (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011; SJA; Vansoest, 1996) were created for or validated with only undergraduate or graduate students and none focused specifically on advocacy in the school system. I will examine three scales in greater depth as they provide important validity implications for the TSJAS or are the most theoretically related to my construct of interest: the Activism Orientation Scale (AOS, Corning & Myers, 2002), the Social Issues Questionnaire (SIQ; Miller et al., 2009) and the Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011).

Table 1
Scales Used to Measure Constructs Related to Social Justice Advocacy

Scale	Scale Composition	Development Sample	Factor Analysis	Internal Consistency	Author/Year
ACT	24 items; ACT-A (actual Activism) and ACT-D (desired activism) Subscales	73 undergraduate students	----	Split-half reliabilities for ACT-A =.93 and ACT-D = .96 (Kerpelman, 1969); .74 and .92 (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005)	Kerpelman (1969)
AOS	35 items; Conventional Activism and High Risk Activism subscales	296 undergraduate students (43% female, 86% Caucasian, and 62% first-year students)	Exploratory FA; 2-factor structure 83.4% variance, 16.6% variance Respectively	Total Scale = .96 Content Activism = .96 High Risk Activism = .91	Corning & Myers(2002)
SJARQ	188 items; measuring 3 components: beliefs, knowledge, and skills	----	----	----	Chen-Hayes (2001)
SJAS	80 items; with five population subscales and five vignettes	222 MSW students (91% female, 89% Caucasian)	----	Pre/Post Test Cronbach values for five subscales: .72/.77, .60/.76, .69/.72, .77/.80, .65/.72	Vansoest (1996)
WPAS	28 items; with four subscales	250 undergrad/grad students(65% female, 100% Caucasian)	Exploratory FA (<i>n</i> = 250), Confirmatory FA (<i>n</i> =250)	Four Subscales: .93, .78, .84, .89, respectively	Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman (2009)
SIQ	52 items; with five domains	274 undergraduate students (71% female, 82% Caucasian)	Confirmatory FA (<i>n</i> =274)	Five Domains: .94, .81, .90, .93, .90	Miller et al. (2009)
SIAS	21 items; four subscales (PSA, PA, SIA, CD)	278 students/faculty members (78% female, 67% Caucasian) Study 2: 509 (76% female, 68% Caucasian)	Exploratory FA (<i>n</i> = 278) Exploratory FA (<i>n</i> = 509)	Theta reliability estimate for total and four subscales: .93, .93, .89, .89, .89, respectively	Nilsson et al (2011)

Note. FA = factor analysis. ACT = Activity Scale (Kerpelman, 1969), SJARQ = Social Justice Advocacy Readiness Questionnaire (Chen-Hayes, 2001), SJAS = the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (Van Soest, 1996), WPAS = White Privilege Attitudes Scale (Pinterits, Poteat, and Spanierman; 2009), SIQ = Social Issues Questionnaire (Miller et al., 2009), SIAS =Social Issues Advocacy Scale (Nilsson et al., 2011)

The Activism Orientation Scale (AOS, Corning & Myers, 2002) was developed to address the lack of instruments to quantitatively distinguish propensities towards activism. The 35-item measure consists of a 0 (extremely unlikely) -3 (extremely likely) continuum for the question *How likely is it that you will engage in this activity in the future?* Exploratory factor analyses on a sample of 296 undergraduate psychology students (43% female, 86% Caucasian, and 62% first-year students) revealed a 2-factor structure; the first factor accounted for 83.4% of the variance while the second factor accounted for 16.6%. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) value for the entire instrument was reported as .96. Based on item content, the factors were conceptualized as two subscales: Conventional Activism and High-Risk Activism, with individual internal consistency values of .96 and .91, respectively. Strengths of this scale are most apparent in the development procedures taken during the initial stages of developing the AOS insofar as great detail was taken in defining the construct of interest beforehand and calling upon a breadth of literature to do so. Furthermore, the scale has been validated across various populations (in and outside of college settings) and has shown evidence for criterion-validity by demonstrating predicted differing levels of activism scores on the AOS for undergraduate students in comparison to actively participating advocates in the community (Corning & Myers, 2002). Limitations to this scale in relation to the current study include the scale's main focus on only likelihood of activist-related behaviors, with no items measuring attitudes or actual behaviors. Secondly, for the purposes of the current study, the scale's items do not address activism-related behaviors for school settings or vulnerable students.

Miller et al. (2007; 2009) developed the Social Issues Questionnaire (SIQ) as a way to measure social justice commitment among undergraduate students. The scale was an adaptation of another instrument used to measure academic behavior (Lent et al., 2001 as cited in Miller et

al., 2009) and was theoretically-grounded in social-cognitive career theory (SCCT), which posits that interest and commitment stems from self-efficacy beliefs, expectations of outcomes, interests, goals, and social support and/or barriers (Lent et al., 2004). The 52-item questionnaire consists of five subscales: social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest, commitment, and supports/barriers. The 20 *self-efficacy* items consisted of a 0-10 scale of self-reported confidence in ability to engage in a advocacy task. Internal reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the total subscale were reported as .94. The 10 *Social justice outcome expectations* items asked participants to rate their level of agreement with a perceived positive outcome expectation for engaging in advocacy efforts (Cronbach's alpha = .81). The third subscale, *Social justice interest* consisted of nine items in which participants were asked to rate their level of interest on a 10 point scale in engaging in a series of activities (Cronbach's alpha = .90). The four items on the fourth subscale, *Social Justice commitment* asked responders to rate their level of agreement with future advocacy intentions on a 10 point scale (Cronbach's alpha = .83). Finally, the nine-itemed *Social supports and barriers to social justice engagement* subscale consisted of five support-specific items and four barrier-specific items influencing social justice behaviors (Cronbach's alpha for support and barrier items = .90, .79, respectively). In the study (2009) to confirm the theoretically grounded model, 274 undergraduate students from a northeastern university were sampled (71% female, 81.8% Caucasian). Confirmatory factor analyses suggested a significantly good fit of this factor structure.

Miller et al.'s (2009) SIQ measure revealed good evidence of internal consistency and intercorrelations between the various subscales. Further, the instrument informs the current study because it suggests that the construct of social advocacy is likely multidimensional. However, it is possible that dimensions unique to social justice advocacy (i.e. lobbying efforts or the

awareness of injustices and oppression) may have been missed in an effort to tailor items from an instrument originally designed to measure an entirely different construct (academic behavior).

Finally, the scale was examined on a sample of predominantly white, female undergraduate psychology students which limits the generalizability to ethnically diverse populations, males, or individuals outside of a college setting.

Finally, Nilsson et al. (2011) developed the Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS) as a tool to measure justice attitudes as well as behaviors across two studies. The first study examined 278 students and faculty members at two Midwestern universities (93% students, 78% female, 67% Caucasian). The 21-item measure yields a total score, but also contains four subscales assessing the following conceptual subcategories: (a) Political and Social Advocacy (PSA; 8 items); (b) Political Awareness (PA; 6 items); Social Issues Awareness (SIA; 4 items); and (d) Confronting Discrimination (CD; 3 items) that yield total subscale scores as well. The SIAS overall internal consistency, using a theta reliability estimate (Nilsson et al. 2010) revealed a .93 value. The four subscales revealed theta values of PSA = .93; PA = .89; SIA = .89; and CD = .89. This scale's factor structure was again confirmed with a larger sample of 509 undergraduates and graduate students in education, counseling psychology, or medical school (76% female, 68% Caucasian). Strengths to this scale include the strong internal consistency and reliability within the scale and its subcomponents, as well as the confirmation of the same factor structure via another principal components analysis with a larger sample ($n = 509$). Furthermore, the scale has been able to demonstrate convergent validity evidence with the ACT (Kerpelman, 1969), multicultural empathy and political interest. Due to this scale's strong psychometric properties as well as uniquely defined subcategories, the Political and Social Advocacy subscale (PSA) was chosen for this study's examination of evidence for construct validity (this will be discussed in

Chapter 3). Similar weaknesses from the other scales pertain to the SIAS as well; specifically, the scale does not directly measure teacher-specific advocacy efforts or behaviors and thus may not be suitable as a measure for advocacy for students.

Essentially these aforementioned scales provided the groundwork for measuring this construct of social justice advocacy. The scales explored have demonstrated psychometric flaws or were confounding the construct of social activism with other constructs such the desire to or likelihood of engaging in behavior. Similarly, some of the scales did not explore other aspects of the construct, such as awareness and beliefs, or the scale was not utilizable or generalizable across different populations. Specifically, these available scales could potentially fail to assess the construct of teacher social advocacy, or child/student-specific efforts that would pertain particularly to the education setting. Thus, it is necessary to identify a new scale that could be used to measure a more specific (to population injustices and profession) form of advocacy among a population of professional teachers currently in the field.

The Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS)

In a previous preliminary study, I created an initial version of the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS; Barazanji & Nilsson, 2008) to measure attitudes and behaviors among preservice teachers. The scale initially consisted of 36 items (initial TSJAS items are marked with asterisks in Appendix A) that were developed based on a brief review of the school counseling and counseling psychology research (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Catapano, 2006; Duncan-Andrade, 2005; Garmon, 2005; Lynn & Maddox, 2007). An expert panel of 3 faculty members knowledgeable in the areas of urban education and social advocacy reviewed the items to provide support for validity; necessary changes were made in response to the experts' reviews. Scores on individual items were summed to reach a TSJAS total score.

I recruited 215 participants from education classes in a Midwestern university (77% female, 78% Caucasian). Approximately 58% were obtaining a BA in Education and 32% were obtaining masters in the Education program. An exploratory, principal-components factor analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. The initial factor analysis yielded 11 factors, with eigenvalues ranging from 1.29 to 4.25. These 11 factors were then examined further. Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) and Field (2005) recommended retaining factors that have a sufficient number of items loading onto each factor, fewer cross-loadings than other factors, and that are clear and interpretable in terms of their content; further, the scree plot for this data revealed a possible 4-factor structure before the plot reached a plateau. These mentioned criteria yielded the retention of 4 interpretable factors. Each factor included 8, 4, 4, and 4 items with eigenvalues of 4.25, 3.29, 2.68, and 2.21, respectively; total variance explained by each factor was 11.8%, 9.1%, 7.4%, and 6.1% respectively. Items that loaded onto two factors with relatively equal strength were dropped due to the un-interpretable nature of those items. Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26 were subsequently dropped, leaving a remaining 20-item scale for the TSJAS that were examined for content and similarities. The range of possible scores for the total TSJAS was 20-100, with higher scores representing higher levels of teacher social advocacy attitudes and behaviors. Four conceptual labels were created for the remaining factors: a) *Student Empowerment* (8 items), (b) *Teacher Awareness* (4 items), (c) *Teacher Commitment* (4 items), (d) *Implementing Change* (4 items). Correlations were analyzed between each subscale as well as between each subscale and the total scale score; this revealed significant correlations ($r = .43-.89, p < .01$). Coefficient alphas of .86, .78, .73, and .69 were found for *Student Empowerment*, *Teacher Awareness*, *Teacher Commitment*, and *Implementing Change*, respectively.

In terms of what was gleaned from this initial study, it was clear that the construct of teacher social advocacy may be multidimensional with components related to awareness, commitment, empowering students, and actual behaviors leading to change. Also, this study provided empirical evidence that the TSJAS in its initial stage demonstrated evidence for convergent validity by its strong correlation with several subscales of a general measure of social advocacy. Unfortunately, generalizability of this scale was also limited due to the fact that the majority of participants were Caucasian females currently receiving their bachelors in education; it is possible that these participants may not have had very much experience with students to reflect upon. Also, several items were dropped that may actually be important items if they had more related items to load onto statistically. Statistically, data was positively skewed towards the “agree” and “strongly” agree spectrum of the TSJAS’ 5-point Likert scale. Furthermore, the findings from this factor analysis suggested that a new scale had to be created with a more critical focus on the literature as well as item and scale development recommendations in order to strengthen confidence of reliability and validity.

Instrument Reliability and Validity

Examining individuals’ responses on the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy scale for their relationship to these other constructs and variables can provide meaningful evidence of the scale’s psychometric properties and validity. Reliability of a scale demonstrates evidence that a scale is accurately measuring the same concept over time, across raters, or within items (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007).

Evidence of validity suggests that a scale is actually measuring the concept intended; this definition is usually referred to as construct validity which then encompasses other forms of validity such as criterion, convergent, and discriminant validity (Messick, 1989). Data reduction

strategies such as the exploratory factor analysis are considered one way to examine a test's evidence of validity and reliability. Convergent validity is usually examined by demonstrating how well a test is related to instruments that assess the same or related concepts, or demonstrating inverse relationships to a construct theorized to be negatively correlated with the construct of interest (Gall et al., 2007). Criterion validity is usually examined by demonstrating whether scores on an instrument are related to specific criteria (i.e. gender, ethnicity) or if scores are able to predict scores on other instruments. In Chapter 3, I will introduce the measures that will be used to assess for evidence of convergent and criterion validity for the TSJAS instrument.

Rationale for Present Study

The literature review has explored the need for a way to measure advocacy among teachers, as well as the history, contemporary and empirical guidelines and predictors of teacher social advocacy. Despite a wealth of literature regarding guidelines and competencies to apply to advocacy in education, little empirical literature exists specifically for the field of teachers. Moreover, most empirical literature is difficult to generalize due to the use of instruments not specific to the definition of teacher advocacy or oppressed populations in the school system. Thus, there is a need for the development of a reliable and valid teacher social advocacy instrument. The purpose of the present study was to build and create items based on this literature review and explore the initial factor structure of the TSJAS. In terms of validity analyses, examining the extent to which the scale is measuring what it is intended, evidence for convergent validity was examined by assessing the relationship between the TSJAS and a general social advocacy subscale (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011) as well as a political involvement measure (Bernstein, 2005). I also examined the relationship between the TSJAS items and the belief in a just world.

There are several reasons why the field of education and teaching would benefit from such a scale. Although teacher training programs promote such social justice advocacy behaviors for their pre-service teachers (Catapano, 2006), no research to date has been conducted to see if teachers in training are holding such values or are actually engaging in such behaviors. With the use of a scale, teacher training programs could tailor their training requirements to foster social advocacy and evaluate the success of their attempts. In addition, teachers who exhibit highly driven attitudes and behaviors towards social justice advocacy may then be recommended to seek school populations that are in need of such teachers.

Dissertation Goals and Hypotheses

The current study addressed the following goals and proposed the following hypotheses:

Goal 1. Explore the factor structure of the newly developed and modified TSJAS.

Hypothesis 1: The factor structure of the TSJAS will reflect a multidimensional definition of teacher social advocacy

Goal 2. Provide evidence for the reliability of the TSJAS

Hypothesis 2: Internal consistency coefficients for the TSJAS and any subsequent subscales will be .70 or above.

Goal 3. Provide evidence for the convergent validity of the TSJAS

Hypothesis 3. Higher levels of reported political involvement and higher scores on general social advocacy will be related to a greater orientation toward social justice advocacy for teachers.

Hypothesis 4: Higher levels of a belief in a just world will be related to less of an orientation toward social justice advocacy for teachers.

Goal 5. Provide evidence for the criterion validity of the TSJAS

Hypothesis 5: Participants belonging to marginalized populations, such as ethnic minorities and LGBT participants will report higher total scores on the TSJAS than participants from non-marginalized populations.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The target population for this study was K-12 teachers in the United States school systems with English proficiency. In terms of considering power of analysis, I followed Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) and Comrey and Lee (1992) recommendations of sampling at least 300 participants for a statistically sound and stable factor analysis. The initial sample was comprised of 755 teachers recruited from online teacher list-servs, facebook.com, school district list-servs found on google.com, and state-level teacher association websites. Of this sample, 19% ($n = 148$) of participants revealed a significant amount of missing data (more than ten items missing on one or more scales). These 148 participants' data were deleted with a final sample of 607 teachers. More information regarding these deleted cases is discussed in Chapter 4.

Participants in the final sample ranged in ages from 19 to 71 years old ($M = 43$, $SD = 12.20$). Eighty-three percent of participants were women ($n = 508$), 16% were men ($n = 98$), .4% were transgender ($n = 2$) and one participant did not respond. In terms of race/ethnicity, 88% ($n = 534$) of participants identified as Caucasian/European American, 4.6% ($n = 28$) as African American, 3.1% ($n = 19$) as Latino(a)/Hispanic/Chicano, .8% ($n = 5$) as Native American, .7% ($n = 4$) as Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, .7% ($n = 4$) as International/Non-US citizen, .5% ($n = 3$) as Middle Eastern, and .5% ($n = 3$) as Biracial/Multiracial. One percent ($n = 7$) of participants failed to report their race or ethnicity. Data on sexual orientation revealed that 96.4% ($n = 585$) of participants identified as heterosexual, 1.2% ($n = 7$) as bisexual, 1% ($n = 6$) as lesbian, .5% ($n = 3$) as gay, and .7% ($n = 4$) failed to reported their sexual orientation.

Fifty-six percent ($n = 340$) reported their highest degree earned as a Masters of Arts or Masters of Science, followed by 23% ($n = 144$) reporting a Bachelor of Arts in Education, 10.2% ($n = 62$) a Bachelor of Arts or Science in any field other than education, 5.9% ($n = 36$) Education Specialist degrees, 2.1% ($n = 13$) PhD degrees, 1.2% ($n = 7$) high school diplomas, and .2% ($n = 1$) Associate of Arts degrees. Four participants (0.7%) did not report their highest degree earned. In terms of total years of teaching experience, 42% ($n = 255$) reported 15 or more years, 18.5% ($n = 112$) reported 3-7 years, 15.7% ($n = 95$) reported 10-15 years, 11% ($n = 67$) reported 1-3 years, 9.7% ($n = 59$) reported 7-10 years, and 2.6% ($n = 16$) reported less than a year. Three participants (0.5%) did not report their total years of teaching. There was a relatively even split in terms of reported school area, with 35.7% ($n = 217$) reporting suburban, 32.5% ($n = 197$) urban, and 29.7% ($n = 180$) rural. Two percent ($n = 13$) of participants did not report school area. Eighty one percent ($n = 495$) reported working in a public school, followed by 13% ($n = 79$) in private, 2.5% ($n = 15$) in charter, and 2.3% ($n = 14$) reporting “other” school type. Of those who reported “other”, .3% ($n = 2$) reported working in a “religious school”, followed by 1 participant reporting “community based school”, developmental center, “health center”, “learning center”, and “second chance learners”, respectively. Four participants (0.7%) did not answer this item. Upon analysis of the one participant who reported her age as 19, it was evident that this participant had a high school diploma and characterized school type as "religious school". It is possible that this type of school did not require a teaching degree. In terms of political orientation, 37.4% ($n = 227$) reported being “middle of the road”, followed by 26.9% ($n = 163$) conservative, 26.7% ($n = 162$) liberal, 5.4% ($n = 33$) reporting no political orientation, 1.8% ($n = 11$) “far left”, and 1.2% ($n = 7$) “far right”. Four (.7%) participants did not respond to political orientation. Participants were also asked to indicate the emphasis on social justice

advocacy in their training backgrounds. Thirty-seven percent ($n = 229$) reported “very little” emphasis, 36% ($n = 219$) reported “some” emphasis, 18.3% ($n = 111$) reported “none at all”, while 7.6 ($n = 46$) reported “very much” emphasis. Two participants (0.3%) did not respond to this item.

Participants’ descriptions of their students. Participants were also asked to characterize their students’ overall racial/ethnic background and socioeconomic status (SES). Fifty-nine percent ($n = 358$) reported primarily Caucasian/white students, 18.3% ($n = 111$) reported evenly-split racially/ethnically, 11.2% ($n = 68$) reported primarily African American students, 8.7% ($n = 53$) primarily Latino(a)/Hispanic students, and 1.8% ($n = 11$) reported “other”. One percent ($n = 6$) of participants did not respond. Of the 1.8% that reported “other minority”, .4% ($n = 2$) classified their responses as Middle Eastern students, .4% ($n = 2$) refugee students, and .4% ($n = 2$) reported primarily Native American students. In terms of students’ SES, 29.3% ($n = 178$) reported middle class, 25.7% ($n = 156$) reported lower middle class, 21.6% ($n = 131$) reported lower class, 11.2% ($n = 68$) reported below lower class, 10.7% ($n = 65$) reported upper middle class, and 1.7% ($n = 9$) reported upper class.

The sample statistics on race, ethnicity, gender, and age were similar and representative of the demographic portrait of the three million teachers in the United States. According to the National Education Association (NEA, 2003) in 2001, 79% of such teacher population was females (this study’s sample was 83% female), average age was 43 years old (this study’s M age = 43), 90% were Caucasian (this study’s was 88% Caucasian), 5% were African American (this study was 4.6% African American), and the remaining 5% were reported as other (Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska native). The current study included 6.3% of other ethnicities. It is important to note that statistics gathered in 2000 by the National Center for Education

Statistics (NCES, 2002) yielded a much larger percentage of ethnic minority teachers, with 17% African American and 16% Hispanic. It is unclear whether the numbers truly decreased by such a large amount in one year or these numbers reflect some error.

Instruments

The instruments used to measure the constructs of teacher social justice advocacy, general social advocacy, political interest, and the belief in a just world, in addition to the demographic information questionnaire are described below (See also Appendix A).

Teacher social justice advocacy. Prior to data reduction procedures, the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS) was a 48-item measure developed based on the extensive literature review in Chapter Two and is intended to measure attitudes and behaviors related to social justice advocacy. The TSJAS used a rating scale ranging from 1-5 (1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 2 = *Disagree*; 3 = *Somewhat Agree*; 4 = *Agree*; 5 = *Strongly Agree*). The report on the development of this scale and is reported in the methods section. Scoring of this scale is discussed in the results section.

Social justice advocacy. The Political and Social Advocacy (PSA) subscale of the Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011) was used to assess for evidence of convergent validity, as one would expect a general measure of social advocacy would relate to a teacher-specific orientation towards advocacy. This subscale was chosen particularly due to its conceptual relatedness to involvement in advocacy. Specifically, the PSA measured participants' "active involvement in social and political issues (2011, p. 17). The overall SIAS is a 21-item measure designed to assess advocacy attitudes and behaviors related to social advocacy across several fields (i.e., psychology, counseling, public health, nursing, education, and social work). Exploratory and Confirmatory factor analyses with two samples yielded a four factor structure

that reflected four conceptually meaningful subscales: *Political and Social Advocacy* (PSA; 10 items; 35% variance explained); *Confronting Discrimination* (CD; 6 items; 14% variance explained); *Political Awareness* (PA; 7 items; 6% variance explained); and *Social Issue Awareness* (SIA; 4 items; 5% variance explained). In terms of evidence for reliability and validity, the SIAS has demonstrated strong internal consistency with a sample of 509 students from various degree programs (including bachelors in education, master's in counseling or psychology, medical students, and doctoral programs in counseling psychology (Cronbach's alpha = .94). The PSA subscale demonstrated good evidence for internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .95; Nilsson et al., 2011). The PSA subscale has also demonstrated evidence for convergent validity by yielding significant positive correlations with scales measuring desire to be an activist ($r = .54$) and actual engagement in activism ($r = .49$; Kerpelman, 1969), as well as significant positive relationships with multicultural empathy ($r = .32$) and political interest ($r = .51$). Finally the PSA has demonstrated evidence for discriminant validity by yielding nonsignificant relationships with a measure of self-esteem and life satisfaction (Nilsson et al., 2011). Further, the scale has been used on a similar population with students in education. Evidence for the PSA subscale's internal consistency was demonstrated in the current study, with a Cronbach's alpha value of .94

Political involvement. The political involvement questionnaire (Bernstein, 2005) was used to measure participants' self-reported political involvement with the purpose of examining evidence for convergent validity to assess for positive relationships between this measure and the TSJAS. The six-item instrument was intended to measure "cognitive and behavioral involvement in politics" (Bernstein 2005, p. 299), and the items specifically assess general political interest, interest in presidential elections and congressional elections, following political campaigns and

candidates, and participating in political conversations. The instrument uses a five-point Likert-scale (1 = *none*; 5 = *a great deal*) to measure the degree of one's attitudes or behaviors. Scores are averaged from the six items to yield a mean score for each participant, with higher scores representing high political engagement.

The scale has demonstrated strong internal consistency scores when used with a sample of 236 undergraduate students at a university (Cronbach's alpha = .92) and has demonstrated a one-factor structure from factor analysis with six items accounting for 71% of the variance in the construct (Bernstein, 2005). In her dissertation research, Linnemeyer (2009) used this measure with a national sample of 412 doctoral students in clinical, counseling and school psychology and found a good reliability as well (Cronbach's alpha = .91). In terms of validity, I was unable to find studies that directly examined evidence for convergent validity with the political involvement measure; however, Bernstein (2005) did indicate a significant gender difference with undergraduate females in nine different college campuses reporting lower political involvement than men. Evidence for the scale's internal consistency was demonstrated in the current study, with a Cronbach's alpha value of .89.

Belief in a just world. The Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991) was used to measure the belief in a just world ideology, which encompasses the belief that the world is fair and victims generally deserve their unfortunate circumstances (Furnham, 2003; Furnham & Procter, 1988; Lerner, 1971, 1980; Lipkus, 1991; Rubin & Peplau, 1973, 1975). This scale uses a 7-item, Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*), with higher scores reflecting a stronger global belief in a just world. Item responses are summed to create a total score of global just world ideology (range:7-42). Cronbach's alpha was found to

equal .80 on a Canadian undergraduate college sample (O'Connor, Morrison, & Morrison, 1996).

In its initial factor analysis with 402 undergraduate students, the GBJWS yielded a single factor solution that accounted for 69% of the variance in the construct (Lipkus, 1991). In terms of validity, the GBJWS has demonstrated a significant positive relationships with the subscales ($r = .22 - .44$) of another measure of just world beliefs (MBJWS; Furnham & Procter, 1988), and with overall trust in institutions ($r = .20$). The belief in a just world has demonstrated negative relationships in relation to attitudes towards innocent victims, helping behaviors, disapproval of the status quo, empathy towards disadvantaged populations, as well as social advocacy in general (Lerner, 1971; Lerner, 1980; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Vansoest, 1996). Furthermore, in a 1973 study, Rubin and Peplau demonstrated an inverse relationship between the belief in a just world and individuals' scores on an activism index, asking for the level to which participants were involved in activism and the degree to which "socially victimized groups" were deserving of their fate (1973, p.91). This led the researchers to conclude, "people who believe that the world is a just place were less likely to be activists," (p. 91). Similarly, conflicting religious attitudes have been associated with a lack of acknowledgment of oppression for LGBT students (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). Additionally, Pohan's study of 492 pre-service teachers indicated a significant relationship between personal beliefs or values regarding diversity and professional beliefs or sensitivity (Pohan, 1996). Specifically, participants who endorsed negative stereotypical beliefs about culturally diverse populations were less likely to endorse multicultural sensitivity on a measure of professional beliefs (Pohan, 1996). Evidence for the internal consistency of this scale was demonstrated in the current study, with a Cronbach's alpha value of .82.

Demographic data. Participants completed a demographic form that assessed the following information: age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, highest degree earned, years teaching, school setting (i.e. city, rural, or suburb), school type (i.e., public, private or charter), socioeconomic status of the student population served, general ethnic/racial breakdown of the student population served, and political affiliation (if any). The form also asked participants to indicate what (if any) experience they had with social advocacy training or education in their college or graduate school experience (*not at all, very little, some, or very much emphasis*). This question was used to assess if competency or skill level affected one's TSJAS scores, as research in this area has been inconsistent.

Design

The study followed a quantitative descriptive design with the main purpose of examining the initial factor structure of the TSJAS and providing evidence for its reliability and validity. This non-experimental design was most appropriate for the exploratory nature of my research question and my desire to sample a large population of teachers. Further, a nonexperimental design allowed me to measure the constructs of interest as they are naturally occurring, as my constructs (e.g. social advocacy behaviors and attitudes, belief in a just world) are not ones that can be feasibly or ethically manipulated in an experimental fashion. Of course, it will be important to be mindful of the internal validity threats to nonexperimental designs; specifically, my study may be vulnerable to threats of selection bias. In order to address this threat, the demographic form sought to collect as much preliminary information about participants regarding their level of experience, school system and student population, in order to check for preliminary group differences in my sample.

Procedure

Participants were anonymously recruited via the following web-based teacher associations: Teachers.Net, facebook.com, state-level educational association websites, and various school district email list-servs obtained from google.com searches. For the list-servs that did not require administrator permission to post my survey, a participant solicitation email was sent (Appendix E). This email provided a brief description of the study along with the surveymonkey link to the survey. For those list-servs that did require administrator permission (i.e., school district email list-servs and state level Education Association websites), a solicitation email (Appendix E) was first sent to the administrators or directors of these sites or districts, followed by the participation solicitation email. Total completion time for the survey was estimated at 15 minutes. Eight twenty-five dollar gift certificates to Amazon.com or Barnes and Noble were raffled as a participation incentive (Appendix G). Participants were allowed to pick the raffle of their choice, but were reminded not to provide their names anywhere. Survey responses were not connected to any of the addresses supplied.

When participants clicked on the SurveyMonkey link in the participant solicitation email, they were presented with the cover letter which described the informed consent (Appendix E), explained the minimal potential risks involved and reminded participants that their participation was completely voluntary and the confidentiality of participants was assured by reminding participants to not share their names in any part of the research survey. Participants first completed the demographic questionnaire, followed by a set of instructions for the following questionnaire items. At the completion of the survey, participants were thanked for their participation and instructed to click on a different link to enter the gift certificate raffle. At this

website, they were asked to provide their mailing address and indicated whether they wanted to be entered in the Amazon.com or Barnes and Noble drawing.

Data analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences- PC version 19.0 (SPSS-PC). The main goals of analyses were to examine the internal structure between the developed items, to analyze the reliability of the measure, and to provide initial evidence of convergent and criterion validity with specific constructs. The following section will outline the various steps of data analysis as well as important initial statistical assumptions to assess for in my raw data.

Item development.

Recommendations for initial steps of scale development include: (a) defining the construct of interest and demonstrating need for a means for measuring it; (b) conducting an extensive literature review; (c) generating a pool of clear, concise items; (d) deferring to experts to review items; (d) identifying validation constructs; (e) optimizing the length of the scale and administering to a sample of appropriate participants; (f) analyzing the items per data reduction strategies; and (g) demonstrating psychometric reliability and validity (DeVellis, 2003; Lee & Lim, 2008; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Recommendations have been made that scales be kept as short as possible in length in order to increase the probability that participants will answer all items (Kline, 2005).

Kline (2005) provided guidelines for the process of developing scale items. These guidelines included the importance of precise, brief, and concise wording. Further, Kline recommended that writers present one main thought in each item, and avoid double negative statements, *all* or *none* wording, or uncertain words like *frequently*. Other authors have

recommended that writers must make sure that each major content area of a construct is represented by an adequate number of items, avoid double-barreled items, and create items that ensure variability in response patterns (Clark & Watson, 1995). These recommendations were all taken into consideration during the item development process of this current study. In terms of data reduction procedures, exploratory factor analyses (EFA) are strongly encouraged when researchers do not have preconceived theories about how many factors are associated with the construct of interest (Lee & Lim, 2008); in such cases and for cross validating studies, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) are encouraged.

TSJAS items were developed and based on the six components to the teacher social advocacy definition presented on page 41. The original TSJAS instrument contained 55 items. Twenty-six items stems from the original TSJAS were retained; these items were reworded when needed in order to avoid double barreled items and increase clarity and construct validity. Of those twenty-six, six items did not load onto a factor in the exploratory factor analysis but were retained and slightly reworded because they contained LGBT-specific content or were action and behavior oriented (See Appendix A). Behavior oriented items were chosen based on their alignment with the teacher advocacy definition developed for this investigation. During the initial item development process, more behavioral items were added to examine whether activism behaviors would load onto the TSJAS. A total of 55 items were created based on guidelines and recommendations in the education literature (Allen, 1997; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Duncan-Andrade, 2005; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Herrera & Murry, 1999, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Russell, 2009), the ACA competencies on activism (Lewis et al., 2003; Ratts et al., 2007), and Constantine's (2007) multicultural advocacy competencies (Appendix A). To improve content validity and item wording structure, the fifty-five items were reviewed by

three experts in scale development and social advocacy. Reviewers were asked to rate each item using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all appropriate or clear*, 5 = *very appropriate or clear*) and provide any other additional feedback about each item, based on recommendations from other scale development researchers (Pinterits et al., 2009). Items that scored below 3 were re-examined for their appropriateness to the scale. On the basis of this reviewer feedback, seven items were dropped; twenty-four items were reworded for clarity, double-barreled wording, or appropriateness, leading to final instrument consisting of 48 items.

The following list delineates how many items were developed for each subcategory in the definition of teacher social advocacy that was described earlier: (a) awareness of injustices occurring in the school and other social contexts in which students exist (9 items; 4 from original TSJAS); (b) knowledge of unique needs and risks associated with specific vulnerable student populations (8 items; 3 from original TSJAS); (c) empowering their students to also question social injustices and to become change agents themselves (*acting with* the student) (6 items; 5 original TSJAS); (d) sense of responsibility for ensuring equal rights for all students in the school and other social contexts in which they exist (9 items; 6 from original TSJAS); (e) representing those underprivileged students where their voice might not otherwise be heard (i.e., political lobbying, school district meetings, faculty meetings, contacting local business for donations) (*acting on behalf of* the student) (6 items; 5 from original TSJAS); and (f) taking action within the school context in order to create changes in school climate that will enhance vulnerable students' ability to succeed (11 items, 3 from original TSJAS). The items were randomized for the survey, so as to not reflect the specific subcategories of the scale and to intermix the reverse-scored items with the regularly scored items. Ten of the 48 items in the total

scale were reverse scored due to their wording, in order to follow the structure that higher scores represented stronger teacher advocacy orientation.

Hypotheses testing.

Hypothesis one. The first hypothesis that the TSJAS would yield a multidimensional factor structure was tested using an principal axis factoring examination. PAF is a statistical method of extraction in exploratory factor analysis (EFA) data reduction that focuses on the shared variance between items (Thompson, 2008). Initially, I had intended of using an exploratory factor analysis with a maximum likelihood form of factor extraction. However, due to my data's violation of multi- and univariate normality and the failure of transformations to correct this problem, principal axes factoring (PAF) was used instead. This method has been identified as one of the best options when the goal of data reduction is to extrapolate parsimonious representation of latent constructs but the data does not meet assumptions of normality (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Principal axes factoring utilizes communality coefficients as opposed to perfect 1.0 correlations in the diagonal correlation matrix, accounting for error in score reliabilities in order to estimate more accurate communalities (Thompson, 2008). Thus, the PAF was the most statistically and theoretically sound extraction option for my research. Data reduction's goal is to synthesize variables into interrelated factor or factors. Factors then can be considered latent, operational definitions of the larger set of variables. This technique is used frequently in scale development and provides statistical evidence for the construct validity of an instrument (Field, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Factor analysis is a statistical method of assessing the structure of an instrument by categorizing a series of items on account of their correlations to one another, into a more compact factor (or factors) in which items are related. Exploratory factor

analysis (EFA) is a form of analysis geared towards establishing the initial structure of developed items without imposing any a priori expectations of the factor structure, and upon obtaining statistical results, items are removed or added in order to strengthen the structure or factor loadings (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). I utilized a direct-oblimin oblique rotation method, as I expected the item correlations in the correlation matrix to be significant and for factors to be correlated. My total sample of 607 was randomly split into two subsamples in order to examine whether the results of the initial exploratory factor analysis could be replicated across the two samples; this practice has been supported as a means for replicating factor structures (Thompson, 2008). Study 1 in the following chapter reflects the initial analysis associated with hypotheses 1-2 for the first group of participants; study 2 presents the replication analysis of hypotheses 1-2 for the second group of participants.

When analyzing the results of the two PAF's, I called upon recommendations by Costello and Osborne (2005). Specifically, I selected items that yielded a factor loading of at least .32 and did not load on any other factors at or above .32. Also, I only retained factors that included three or more items and also considered the conceptual meaningfulness of the factors I retained. Finally, I utilized the scree plot of eigenvalues to look for a natural cut off point where the curve straightens out. Although my definition of teacher social advocacy (on page 42) reflects six different domains, I did not specifically hypothesize a six factor structure as it may be possible that certain aspects of the multidimensional definition load together in larger overarching factors. Following these factor analysis criteria will provide evidence of the internal structure of the scale, as well as maximize the common variance and interpretability between the items by determining which items need to be dropped in order to yield the most parsimonious instrument accounting for variance (Bryant & Yarnold, 2000).

Hypothesis two. The internal consistency of the instrument has been defined as “the degree to which the items that make up a scale are intercorrelated” (Clark & Watson, 1995, p. 315). Internal consistency can also be understood as the homogenous nature of items within a scale (DeVellis, 2003); this homogeneity of items is believed to represent a relationship with the latent variable one was intending to measure. This is analyzed by statistically comparing scores on the individual items to one another. There are several methods for this examination; however, for this study Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) were used to provide evidence of reliability. When assessing the internal consistency of scales that measure psychological constructs such as attitudes, as opposed to tests of intelligence, recommendations have been made that cut-off values of .70 and above are evidence of adequate and suitable reliability (Kline, 1999 as cited in Field, 2005).

Hypothesis three and four. To examine evidence for preliminary convergent validity and bivariate multiple correlations were used between participants’ responses on the TSJAS and the political involvement scale (Bernstein, 2005), the Political and Social Advocacy (PSA) subscale of the SIAS (Nilsson et al., 2011), and the global belief in a just world measure (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991). Significant positive correlations between the TSJAS (and its subsequent subscales) and the political orientation scale and the PSA, at $p < .05$ would represent support for hypothesis three. Significant negative correlations between the TSJAS (and its subsequent subscales) and the GBJWS, at $p < .05$ would represent support for hypothesis four.

Hypothesis five. In order to assess for evidence of criterion validity, group differences between Caucasian participants and ethnic minorities, as well as heterosexual participants and sexual orientation minorities. Statistically, I conducted multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) to assess for significant group differences. Due to the very small percentage of

participants who reported minority status on race/ethnicity or sexual orientation, I combined the minority groups rather than examining each separately. Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used in order to include all subscales of the TSJAS as separate but related measures of the dependent variable.

Post hoc analyses. Bivariate correlations and univariate analyses of variance were conducted to explore possible differences in reporting levels of teacher social advocacy based on several demographic variables: highest degree earned (level of training), years teaching, social advocacy training emphasis, political orientation, school type, school area, and student race and student socioeconomic status. Statistical corrections were done to account for inflated alpha error when conducting multiple analyses of variance. These analyses were done last in order to use the final TSJAS after exploratory factor analysis factor structure.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Data Screening and Preliminary Analyses

Prior to data analysis, inspection of missing values, outliers, normality, multicollinearity, as well as demographic frequencies was conducted. If participants' data were missing more than six items from more than one scale, that participant's data was discarded, resulting in the list-wise deletion of 19% of participants ($n = 148$). These 148 participants were examined for potential explanations for their missing data. All participants completed the demographic form and either discontinued immediately after beginning the TSJAS, or completed the TSJAS but discontinued their participation on the PSA, Political Involvement Measure, or GBJW. It is likely these participants either fatigued or decided the items did not pertain to their line of work as a teacher. Between groups demographic comparisons between these 148 participants and the remaining 607 participants were conducted. Due to the significantly unequal sample sizes between completers and noncompleters, homogeneity of variance between groups was unlikely. Thus the Welch's F ratio, which corrects for this assumption, was used; significant p value was set at .001 to account for the multiple analyses being conducted. Results revealed no significant differences between completers and noncompleters on any demographic variables.

A missing values analysis (MVA) was conducted on the remaining 607 participant data to examine whether the patterns of missing values were missing at random. Results revealed that there were no problems with non-random missing values on any items except for a pattern found on the 36 missing cases for item 32 on the TSJAS. Separate t-tests revealed a significant ($p < .001$) variance on responses on items 18 and 39 on the TSJAS between those who did and did not answer item 32. Specifically, while the average response pattern for item 18 was 4.27, the 36

participants who skipped item 32 scored significantly different on item 18, with a mean of 4.63. While the average response pattern for item 39 was 3.78, those who skipped item 32 scored significantly different on item 32 with a mean of 4.25. Thus, there seemed to be a pattern of scoring higher on these two items if participants skipped item 32. These items were examined for their content. Item 32, *I participate in political campaigns to improve conditions for underrepresented students in schools*, was a behavior-content item. Items 18, *I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences*, and 39, *I am aware of current sociopolitical events that may influence some of my students' lives* were very similar in content. It appears that those who chose to skip a behavior-specific item related to political campaigning actually reported higher awareness in regards to socio-economic and political issues in their students' lives. Due to the significant number of participants missing this item and the non-random relationship the missing values had with other items on the scale, it was decided that this item would be dropped from the subsequent factor analyses.

Normality and presence of outliers in the TSJAS individual items and total scores for other instruments were examined. Standardized z scores for each case in the data set, as well as box-plots, were computed and analyzed to identify cases with standardized scores greater than three standard deviations above the mean (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). When univariate outliers were identified in the TSJAS items, these values were replaced with the mean plus or minus two standard deviations. This procedure has been identified as a favored method for correcting outliers as opposed to computing transformations, insofar as transformations can affect the original construct being examined (Fields, 2005; Grayson, 2004). However, while inspection of the TSJAS items' skewness and kurtosis revealed that outlier corrections slightly improved normality, thirty six items were still outside of the acceptable bounds in terms of critical kurtosis

or skewness ratio after removing the outliers ($< | 3.3 |$; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Transformations were performed by taking the $\log(10)$ of each individual TSJAS items in an attempt to correct the negative skewness in items; however, each attempt did not successfully improve the normality of distribution of TSJAS items. Thus, linear transformation of items was not used in the final factor analysis; however, the corrections for extreme outliers (adding the mean plus or minus two standard deviations) were used, as this improved skewness and kurtosis. As noted earlier, the principal axis factoring (PAF) approach was used for the analyses because this analysis does not assume normality and was thus appropriate for this particular data. Table 2 presents the descriptive and frequency statistics for the original TSJAS items.

Table 2

Original TSJAS Item Stems, Means, Standard Deviations, and Score Ranges

TSJAS Item	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Possible Range	Actual Range	Skew	Kurtosis
1. I teach my students how to overcome adversity.	607	3.90	0.86	1-5	1-5	-7.0	4.0
2. I work with local neighborhoods to improve neighborhoods safety for my students.	607	2.50	0.99	1-5	1-5	4.1	-2
3. I encourage students to question authority.	607	2.69	1.03	1-5	1-5	2.82	-2.33
4. I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.	607	3.10	1.09	1-5	1-5	-1.32	-3.55
5. I make students aware of social and political issues.	607	3.46	.99	1-5	1-5	-2.75	-2.59
6. I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments.	607	3.79	.82	1-5	1-5	-3.11	-1.34
7. I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students.	607	3.60	.97	1-5	1-5	-3.77	-2.47
8. It is my responsibility to advocate for the well-being of my underprivileged students.	607	4.0	.91	1-5	1-5	-7.43	1.23
9. I believe a student's academic achievement is a result of his/her effort.	607	2.32	.83	1-5	1-5	.23	-3.22
10. It is my job to ensure that students have equal experiences in the school environment.	607	4.24	.75	1-5	2-5	-7.43	.27
11. I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.	607	4.02	1.04	1-5	1-5	-10.53	2.95
12. I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society.	607	3.58	.98	1-5	1-5	-3.54	-2.07
13. I often participate in community activities to help children living in poverty.	607	3.09	1.05	1-5	1-5	.01	-3.09
14. I am aware of my own power and privilege in society.	607	3.99	.84	1-5	1-5	-6.11	1.04
15. I meet one-on-one with refugee parents to facilitate their child's adjustment.	607	2.19	1.11	1-5	1-5	8.29	-.20
16. I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students.	607	3.04	1.09	1-5	1-5	-.46	-3.80
17. It is the responsibility of the school counselor(s)	607	3.23	1.07	1-5	1-5	-2.58	-2.59
18. I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences.	607	4.30	.74	1-5	2-5	-7.66	-.17
19. I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families.	607	4.20	.79	1-5	1-5	-7.36	.18

table continues

Table 2 *continued.*

TSJAS Item	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Possible Range	Actual Range	Skew	Kurtosis
20. I work with the school administration (i.e., principal, superintendent, etc). to better students' learning environments.	607	4.13	.81	1-5	2-5	-6.95	-.40
21. Students are treated fairly by others regardless of race or sexual orientation.	607	3.00	1.13	1-5	1-5	-.75	-3.92
22. As an educator, it is my job to challenge systems that disenfranchise students.	607	3.86	.82	1-5	1-5	-3.67	-1.46
23. The education system often perpetuates injustices for underprivileged students.	607	3.27	1.05	1-5	1-5	-.28	-3.38
24. I am aware of the dropout rates of ethnic minority students.	607	3.93	.92	1-5	1-5	-7.56	1.17
25. I teach students to speak up for their rights.	607	3.69	.83	1-5	1-5	-1.39	-2.22
26. I am not comfortable challenging school administrators if they are promoting unequal practices for students.	607	3.52	1.01	1-5	1-5	-5.66	-.43
27. There are unique injustices experienced by children of color.	607	3.38	1.04	1-5	1-5	-.60	-3.34
28. I know whether my students are living in poverty conditions.	607	3.62	.98	1-5	1-5	-3.04	-3.43
29. Most schools are fair when identifying punishments for students' misbehavior.	607	3.00	.94	1-5	1-5	.74	-2.15
30. It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support.	607	3.74	.98	1-5	2-5	-3.71	-3.42
31. I believe in working cooperatively with parents to better students' learning.	607	4.46	.65	1-5	1-5	-8.13	-2.20
33. I organize out-of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support systems.	607	2.85	1.15	1-5	2-5	1.63	-4.02
34. I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in poorer schools.	607	4.15	.79	1-5	1-5	-6.72	-.40
35. I help lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students identify ways to protect themselves from bullies.	607	2.94	1.14	1-5	1-5	-.04	-3.81
36. I collaborate with the school counselor(s) to address oppressive issues in the school.	607	3.31	1.09	1-5	1-5	-2.76	-3.39

table continues

Table 2 continued.

TSJAS Item	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Possible Range	Actual Range	Skew	Kurtosis
37. I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.	607	3.55	1.02	1-5	1-5	-4.07	-2.02
38. There are differences in financial distributions to urban versus suburban schools.	607	3.99	.95	1-5	2-5	-8.20	1.81
39. I am aware of current sociopolitical events that may influence some of my students' lives.	607	3.82	.87	1-5	1-5	-4.05	-2.37
40. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students do not experience extra discrimination in school.	607	3.98	.91	1-5	1-5	-7.01	-.19
41. Students with disabilities are not at high risk for dropout from high school.	607	4.05	.87	1-5	1-5	-9.13	3.61
42. It is the responsibility of a social worker to improve the lives of at-risk students.	607	3.10	.99	1-5	1-5	-1.13	-1.99
43. I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms.	607	3.10	1.11	1-5	2-5	-.11	-4.01
44. Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities.	607	3.85	.84	1-5	1-5	-3.84	-2.11
45. I speak up at school meetings about the needs of underprivileged students.	607	3.29	1.03	1-5	1-5	-.66	-3.38
46. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students generally do not differ from non-LGBT students in terms	607	2.41	1.07	1-5	1-5	4.48	-2.91
47. I have too many responsibilities in the classroom to provide extra outreach.	607	3.21	1.05	1-5	1-5	-2.86	-1.97
48. I send letters to local politicians regarding my students' unmet needs.	607	2.35	1.11	1-5	1-5	7.14	-.94

Note. Values after outliers were replaced with the mean plus or minus two standard deviations. Original Skewness and Kurtosis values were retained due to no improvement after log(10) transformations were conducted.

The following sections have been organized into three studies to delineate between the first exploratory factor analysis conducted on one randomly selected sample from the total 607 participants. This analysis, along with testing of Hypothesis 2 will be considered Study 1. Study 2 will describe the replication factor analysis with the second sample as well as Hypothesis 2 again. Study 3 will outline the validity analyses (hypotheses 3-5) on the total sample.

Study 1

Data was randomly split (by selecting 50% of cases in SPSS) into two separate samples; this w. Preliminary analyses were done to examine if there were group differences between these randomly assigned groups on the demographic variables. No significant between group differences were found. The following item analysis was conducted with the first group ($n = 309$).

Item analysis. Hypothesis 1 postulated that there would be a multiple factor structure extrapolated from the TSJAS during factor analysis. Prior to analyzing the principal axis factoring analysis, intercorrelations between variables and corrected item-total scale correlations were examined to look for poor correlations (correlations less than .05), multicollinearity (correlations greater than .80) and singularity (perfect correlations) of each variable. The majority of correlations as well as corrected item-total correlations were satisfactory ranging from .10 - .61. No evidence for multicollinearity was found. However, twelve items revealed a series of nonsignificant or weak correlations with the rest of the scale, ranging from .01 - .10, ten of which were the reverse-scored items on the TSJAS scale (after being recoded to reflect the correct TSJA values). These poor correlations suggested that these items may not factor in the analysis. The remaining two items, items 31 and 38, revealed some significant correlations to other items. The reverse scored items (items 9, 17, 21, 26, 29, 40, 41, 42, 46, and 47) were

further examined for their corrected item-total correlations, score ranges and item variance, and effect on the TSJAS Cronbach's alpha if the items were to be deleted. While corrected item-total correlations for other items were satisfactory and significant (ranging from .34 - .67), the ten aforementioned items revealed weak item-total correlations (ranging from .03 - .30) suggesting that these items did not correlate to the total scale. Furthermore, the variance of the entire 47 item scale was 420.57. While other, nonproblematic items would substantially decrease that scale's variance if the item were to be deleted, the item-total statistics suggested that deleting the reverse-scored items would increase the scale's variance more than deleting other items (change in variance ranged from 406.48 – 429.00). Means and standard deviations of these reverse-scored items also suggested a relatively small range in scores. The means ranged from 2.29 – 4.00 with small standard deviations (ranging from .82 -1.10). These small ranges may suggest a pattern bias and this, paired with the correlation analysis above, provided justification for the deletion of these ten items prior to factor analysis. The final TSJAS instrument contained 37 items for preliminary factor analysis in Study 1.

Exploratory factor analysis.

During the following factor analyses procedures, both item content and item statistical data were considered when dropping or retaining items. Correlations of TSJAS items did not indicate an identity matrix insofar as Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p = .000$) and signified appropriate correlations among test variables. Additionally the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was .933. According to Field (2005) KMO values of .90 and above are superb; indicating that the pattern of correlations was relatively compact and therefore the factor analysis should produce very reliable factors. A principal axis factor analysis extraction was conducted with a direct oblimin oblique rotation with the first randomly selected

group of participants ($n = 309$). Kaiser's criterion was used with eigenvalues over 1 extracted. Factor loadings over .32 were examined per scale analysis suggestions (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The ten reverse-scored items that revealed poor correlations in the pre-analysis (items 9, 17, 21, 26, 29, 40-42, 46, 47) and item 32 (removed during the missing values analysis) were excluded from the following analyses. The principal factors analysis first conducts a principal components analysis, which suggested a 7-factor model (all with eigenvalues over 1.0) accounting for 56% of the total variance. The principal axes extraction revealed three factors with eigenvalues over 1.0 (11.1, 1.9, and 1.5 respectively), accounting for 30%, 5%, and 4% of the total variance, respectively. The factor analysis was re-run, specifying three factors to be extracted with direct oblimin rotation. The eigenvalues extracted for the three factors were similar to the prior analysis (11.1, 1.8, and 1.4) accounting for 38.6% of the total variance (30%, 4.9%, and 3.8%, respectively). Analysis of the pattern matrix provided evidence for the 3-factor structure, with several items loading uniquely onto each factor. Item 14 did not load on any factor and items 20, 23, and 39 revealed similar crossloadings on more than one factor. These four items were deleted and the analysis was re-run with a three factor specification and direct oblimin rotation. This analysis revealed eigenvalues of 9.8, 1.7, and 1.3 for the three factors, accounting for 38.6% of the total variance (29.8%, 5.2%, and 4.0% respectively).

The pattern structure matrix was evaluated again, this time for weaker factor loadings of particular items. The rationale for this was due to my initial goal of reducing the item pool to a more feasible but parsimonious length and sound instrument. Item 45 had similar cross loadings between the first two factors and item 48 did not load onto any factor after ten iterations; these two items were dropped. Items with loadings below .40 were examined for content and ultimately dropped as well: 1, 2, 10, 22, 27, and 28, 31, 35, and 38. The principal axis factoring

analysis was re-run on the remaining 22 items with a three-factor specification and direct oblimin rotation. The analysis revealed an improvement in the total variance explained (43%) by the three factors with eigenvalues of 7.0 (33% variance explained), 1.3 (5.8%), and 1.1 (5.2%). This 22 item scale had a stable component structure, with a Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO) statistic of .91, indicating superior suitability for the factor analysis (Field, 2005). The items loaded nicely onto each factor, and communalities (the proportion of variance in the item explained by the extracted factors) ranged from .27-.59. Table 3 displays the results from this principal axis factor analysis. Hypothesis 1 was supported by this principal axis factor analysis, suggesting a multidimensional factor structure of the TSJAS. The three factors were analyzed for their content and three subcategories or themes seemed to emerge.

Table 3

TSJAS Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Extraction Communality Values for Study 1 (N = 309)

Item stem	Factors ^{a,b}			<i>h</i> ²
	1	2	3	
3. I encourage students to question authority.	-.09(.25)	.05(.24)	-.58 (-.55)	.31
4. I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.	.09 (.46)	.05(.27)	-.74 (-.77)	.59
5. I make students aware of social and political issues.	.01 (.45)	.06 (.38)	-.81 (-.83)	.70
12. I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society.	.14 (.51)	.00 (.33)	-.69 (-.77)	.43
25. I teach students to speak up for their rights.	.22 (.04)	.12 (.05)	-.53 (-.18)	.48
6. I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments.	.52 (.55)	.07(.30)	.01(-.29)	.30
7. I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students.	.58 (.67)	.11 (.41)	-.05(-.42)	.46
8. It is my responsibility to advocate for the well-being of my underprivileged students.	.52 (.64)	.20 (.46)	-.06 (-.41)	.45
11. I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.	.48 (.54)	.15 (.36)	.01(-.20)	.31
13. I often participate in community activities to help children living in poverty.	.73 (.70)	-.14(.21)	-.05 (-.40)	.50
15. I meet one-on-one with refugee parents to facilitate their child's adjustment.	.54 (.51)	-.05(.19)	.00(-.26)	.27
16. I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students.	.45 (.61)	.10 (.39)	-.22 (-.50)	.42
30. It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support.	.56 (.10)	.16 (.05)	.14 (-.18)	.33
33. I organize out of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support systems.	.72 (.17)	-.21 (.08)	-.06 (-.01)	.47
36. I collaborate with the school counselor(s) to address oppressive issues in the school.	.54 (.12)	.04 (.02)	-.10 (-.01)	.39
37. I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.	.46 (.09)	.07(.02)	-.20(-.03)	.39
43. I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms.	.54 (.56)	.04(.29)	.01(.29)	.36
18. I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences.	.10 (.01)	.76 (.34)	-.02(.01)	.59
19. I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families.	.06 (.02)	.71 (.27)	.04 (.02)	.51
24. I am aware of the dropout rates of ethnic minority students.	.06 (.02)	.47 (.12)	-.09 (-.01)	.30
44. Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities	.01(.23)	.53 (.52)	-.01(-.21)	.29
34. I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in poorer schools.	.05(.01)	.57 (.20)	-.12 (-.03)	.44

Note. 1= Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO). 2=Social Justice Awareness (SJA). 3=Student Empowerment (SE). Bolded coefficients are of those items retained for that factor. Only pattern coefficients over .32 were retained in analysis. a. Factor correlations were as follows: $r_{12} = .46$, $r_{13} = -.54$, $r_{23} = -.39$. b. Pattern coefficients are followed by structure coefficients in parentheses.

The multidimensional definition of teacher social justice advocacy that guided the item development stage of this dissertation (see Chapter Two) represented themes such as awareness and knowledge of injustices and issues for specific vulnerable student groups, a sense of responsibility and commitment, empowering students in the area of advocacy, as well as taking action within the school and in other contexts when needed. Although no hypothesis was made about a six-factor structure, I did hypothesize that a multidimensional factor structure would emerge. The results indicated three underlying dimensions.

The first factor seemed to overlap several components of the social justice advocacy definition, representing both behaviors and attitudes related to school- and community-based advocacy. Given this factor's wide representation of advocacy related issues, it was titled Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO; 12 items; accounting for 33% of the variance). The items measured teachers' collaboration with other school personnel for social justice related issues, development of programs in and outside of school for vulnerable populations, increasing public awareness of social justice, donating supplies for underprivileged schools, and openly challenging school decisions that disenfranchise students. In addition to these behavior-latent measurements, the TAO also included items measuring teachers' sense of responsibility to work with and advocate for underprivileged youth.

The second factor was titled Social Justice Awareness (SJA; five items; accounting for 5.2% of the variance) and appeared to measure a combination of the two initial categories of the teacher advocacy definition: (a) an awareness of injustices occurring in the school and other social contexts in which students exist, as well as a (b) knowledge of unique needs and risks associated with specific vulnerable student populations. Although items had been created to address several vulnerable student populations, only items related to refugee, non-English

speaking, ethnic minority, and poverty-related vulnerabilities loaded onto the factor. Items related to students with disabilities or lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students did not load onto this factor. Potential reasons for this are discussed on page 102 of the discussion section.

The third factor’s five items yielded negative factor loadings onto the factor. Negative loadings typically suggest that the items are grouping together because they are reflecting a factor that may be inherently different from the other two factors. When explored for their content, all items appeared to be measuring teachers’ behaviors related towards empowering students to become advocates themselves and question injustices in society. It is possible that these items (or this factor) are uniquely different from teacher social advocacy as they are geared towards training others to become advocates, rather than a measure of one’s own advocacy attitude or behavior. Additionally, the mean scores for this third factor equaled 16.6 ($SD = 4.0$). This average was lower than the TAO ($M = 40.1, SD = 8.1$) and SJA ($M = 20.4, SD = 2.9$) subscales. Factor correlations also suggest that these factors, while related, may be negatively associated with the third factor.

Table 4

Factor Correlations for Study 1

Factor	1	2	3
1. TAO	1	0.46	-0.54
2. SJA		1	-0.39
3. SE			1

$p < .05$

It is possible, then, that this factor reflects a higher-level or more advanced form of advocacy orientation insofar as these behaviors were endorsed less than general advocacy orientation or social issues awareness. This conclusion is discussed further in the next chapter.

Thus, this factor was titled Student Empowerment (SE; five items; accounting for 5.1% of the variance) and reflected teachers' tendency to encourage students to advocate for themselves and question authority or status quo. These three factors, TAO, SJA, and SE were adopted as subscales to the TSJAS. Composite scores were created by summing the item scores to individual items in each subscale, with higher scores representing higher social justice advocacy orientation. Due to the significant but negative factor correlations (as seen in Table 4), a TSJAS total score was not computed, as the exploratory factor analyses could not show evidence of a unidimensional structure. Possible TAO scores ranged from 12-60; possible SJA and SE scores ranged from 5-25. Table 5 displays the inter-item correlations between the final items retained in the TSJAS in Study 1.

Table 5

Correlations for Final TSJAS Items in Study 1

TSJAS Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1. TSJAS1		.41	.42	.20	.21	.20	.09	.42	.12	.12	.31	.16	.14	.20	.44	.12	.20	.24	.15	.19	.18	.17
2. TSJAS2			.68	.25	.32	.33	.25	.57	.39	.29	.37	.24	.22	.23	.51	.17	.34	.24	.31	.40	.26	.18
3. TSJAS3				.27	.37	.36	.28	.68	.32	.22	.41	.31	.24	.28	.54	.20	.31	.36	.35	.39	.24	.23
4. TSJAS4					.39	.41	.32	.24	.39	.28	.32	.22	.15	.26	.31	.30	.35	.25	.25	.28	.33	.20
5. TSJAS5						.51	.33	.37	.41	.32	.47	.31	.33	.28	.47	.39	.43	.29	.39	.40	.41	.16
6. TSJAS6							.39	.40	.36	.26	.51	.33	.27	.33	.45	.45	.37	.36	.35	.35	.30	.24
7. TSJAS7								.35	.50	.22	.30	.29	.26	.24	.30	.34	.27	.25	.37	.34	.25	.22
8. TSJAS8									.39	.25	.43	.29	.24	.21	.56	.27	.30	.31	.39	.42	.28	.16
9. TSJAS9										.37	.43	.21	.17	.15	.39	.34	.51	.23	.45	.40	.32	.10
10. TSJAS10											.42	.13	.23	.20	.20	.28	.40	.11	.31	.29	.27	.12
11. TSJAS11												.31	.29	.25	.46	.30	.34	.33	.37	.37	.31	.19
12. TSJAS12													.60	.39	.33	.26	.11	.51	.24	.27	.23	.36
13. TSJAS13														.36	.29	.26	.16	.43	.26	.31	.23	.42
14. TSJAS14															.36	.24	.11	.37	.20	.21	.16	.26
15. TSJAS15																.27	.37	.36	.43	.45	.30	.19
16. TSJAS16																	.34	.22	.28	.29	.36	.22
17. TSJAS17																		.19	.38	.40	.39	.10
18. TSJAS18																			.33	.33	.25	.37
19. TSJAS19																				.51	.44	.18
20. TSJAS20																					.37	.16
21. TSJAS21																						.17
22. TSJAS22																						

Note. For final order of TSJAS Item Stems, see Appendix C

Reliability analysis.

The TSJAS was deemed to have three subscales. Analysis of Cronbach's alpha values for the three subscales and the total TSJAS was conducted to examine Hypothesis 2. For the first subscale, Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO; 12 items), Cronbach's alpha value was .87. Examination of the Cronbach's alpha values if any of the twelve items were deleted revealed that the subscale's internal consistency would have decreased with the deletion of any item. The second subscale, Social Justice Awareness (SJA; 5 items) revealed Cronbach's alpha value of .77. Again, each item's contribution to the scale appeared significant, as Cronbach's alpha would have decreased substantially if any item were deleted. The third subscale, Student Empowerment (SE; 5 items) yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of .84, with each item contributing to this internal consistency as well. These overall Cronbach's alpha values, ranging from .77 to .87, indicated the TSJAS subscale scores were internally consistent (Field, 2005) and supported the hypothesis that each internal consistency value would be over .70. Table 9 presents the Cronbach alpha values for the TSJAS subscales as well as other study variables. With hypotheses 1 and 2 supported in Study 1, Study 2 sought to replicate these findings.

Study 2

Exploratory factor analysis.

For the second study, the second randomly split group of participants from the sample ($n = 298$) were used for a replication of the initial exploratory principal axis factoring. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was .89, indicating adequacy of the sample's fit for a factor analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was also significant, indicating that the correlations were not an identity matrix. The 22 items from the final TSJAS instrument

revealed adequate inter-item correlations (see Table 7), and were entered into a principal axis factoring data reduction analysis. Identical methods were used for extraction, rotation, and criteria for factor loadings being over .32. Three factors were identified for extraction in order to evaluate whether the same items loaded onto the same factors as in Study 1. In this study, 40.5% of the total variance was explained by the three-factor model. The first factor had an eigenvalue of 6.6 and accounted for 29.8% of the variance, while the second factor had an eigenvalue of 1.2 (5.5% variance explained) and the third factor had an eigenvalue of 1.1 (5.1% variance explained). These values and the proportion of variance accounted for by each factor was very similar to Study 1.

The pattern matrix was examined again in this study to evaluate which items loaded onto these three factors. The rotations converged after 9 iterations and the items loaded nicely onto each factor, with most items loading onto the same factors with relatively equal strength as in the initial study. The one exception to this was item 25, which loaded on the second factor in Study 2 and on the third factor in Study 1. However, analysis of other item-factor coefficients suggested the item still belonged in factor 3. For instance, structure coefficients, analogous to B coefficients in regression, of item 25 in study 2 reveal that this item cross-loads onto both factors. Thus, there was not enough evidence to either remove the item from the scale nor from factor 3. Additionally, the content of item 25, *I teach students to speak up for their rights*, aligned more conceptually to the third factor, *Student Empowerment*. Validity and reliability analysis was resumed with item 25 retained in factor three. Again, the third factor yielded negative factor loadings and structure coefficients, suggesting that these items and this factor are representing something different or against the first two factors. This is discussed more in the following chapter. Table 8 presents the item stems, factor and structure coefficients, and

communalities for the TSJAS in Study 2. Study 2 supported hypothesis one as well as the final factor structure of the TSJAS with the following subscales: Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO; 12 items; 6.6% variance explained), Social Justice Awareness (SJA; 5 items; 5.5% variance explained), and Student Empowerment (SE; 5 items, 5.2% variance explained). The third factor yielded negative factor loadings as it did in Study 1. Average scores were analyzed to examine whether SE scores were lower than the other two subscales. Again, SE's average score was lower ($M = 16.4, SD = 3.6$) than the TAO ($M = 40.4, SD = 7.4$) and SJA ($M = 20.4, SD = 2.9$) subscales. These average scores, paired with the negative factor loadings and negative correlations (see Table 6), provide support for the argument that this third factor is related to student empowerment represents a more advanced form of social advocacy. This data also suggests that the TSJAS should not be summed to a total score at this point.

Table 6

Factor Correlations for Study 2

Factor	1	2	3
1. TAO	1	0.48	-0.29
2. SJA		1	-0.27
3. SE			1

$p < .05$

Table 7

Correlations for Final TSJAS Items in Study 2

TSJAS Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
1. TSJAS1		.53	.43	.41	.45	.18	.29	.24	.10	.18	.22	.36	.21	.18	.16	.10	.27	.24	.12	.23	.15	.21	
2. TSJAS2			.52	.52	.47	.25	.44	.39	.18	.31	.27	.39	.25	.25	.20	.29	.41	.27	.26	.38	.46	.21	
3. TSJAS3				.55	.41	.31	.28	.26	.15	.21	.19	.30	.31	.20	.29	.10	.24	.24	.20	.26	.19	.32	
4. TSJAS4					.44	.28	.38	.36	.28	.39	.25	.31	.26	.28	.29	.15	.32	.37	.33	.35	.31	.22	
5. TSJAS5						.23	.47	.45	.24	.30	.27	.49	.35	.39	.42	.28	.33	.42	.32	.37	.29	.26	
6. TSJAS6							.41	.31	.17	.31	.28	.27	.14	.27	.15	.18	.35	.16	.29	.28	.27	.19	
7. TSJAS7								.64	.29	.41	.34	.46	.32	.29	.35	.33	.39	.32	.30	.36	.34	.26	
8. TSJAS8									.42	.38	.22	.39	.30	.26	.35	.35	.32	.34	.37	.30	.36	.20	
9. TSJAS9										.33	.24	.25	.28	.28	.30	.35	.21	.34	.24	.26	.18	.14	
10. TSJAS10											.41	.32	.21	.19	.25	.39	.39	.30	.38	.36	.34	.12	
11. TSJAS11												.40	.13	.21	.23	.26	.35	.25	.18	.31	.22	.13	
12. TSJAS12													.26	.27	.22	.25	.29	.34	.23	.28	.24	.25	
13. TSJAS13														.51	.42	.20	.21	.54	.18	.15	.16	.32	
14. TSJAS14															.35	.18	.19	.41	.22	.32	.12	.32	
15. TSJAS15																.31	.30	.48	.14	.22	.19	.27	
16. TSJAS16																	.27	.29	.34	.25	.27	.15	
17. TSJAS17																		.33	.36	.33	.34	.18	
18. TSJAS18																				.24	.28	.19	.35
19. TSJAS19																					.46	.32	.16
20. TSJAS20																						.38	.21
21. TSJAS21																							.29
22. TSJAS22																							

Note. For final order of TSJAS Item Stems, see Appendix C

Table 8

TJSAS Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Extraction Communality Values for Study 2 (N = 298)

Item stem	Factors ^{a,b}			h^2
	1	2	3	
3. I encourage students to question authority.	.05(.28)	.08(.28)	-.68 (-.71)	.52
4. I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.	.42(.57)	.00 (.33)	-.54 (-.66)	.59
5. I make students aware of social and political issues.	.09 (.35)	.19(.39)	-.57 (-.65)	.47
12. I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society.	.35(.51)	.10 (.38)	-.42 (-.57)	.46
25. I teach students to speak up for their rights.	.29 (.54)	.34(.55)	-.31 (-.49)	.50
6. I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments.	.43 (.47)	.01(.25)	-.13(-.25)	.25
7. I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students.	.53 (.67)	.19 (.48)	-.11(-.31)	.48
8. It is my responsibility to advocate for the well-being of my underprivileged students.	.53 (.64)	.21 (.47)	.01(-.22)	.45
11. I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.	.38 (.47)	.30 (.44)	.22(.03)	.32
13. I often participate in community activities to help children living in poverty.	.68 (.66)	.00(.30)	.06(-.13)	.44
15. I meet one-on-one with refugee parents to facilitate their child's adjustment.	.45 (.49)	.05(.27)	-.05(-.19)	.25
16. I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students.	.35 (.51)	.21 (.42)	-.21(-.36)	.34
30. It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support.	.56 (.54)	.12 (.32)	.27(.07)	.37
33. I organize out of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support systems.	.54 (.58)	.01(.30)	-.10(-.26)	.35
36. I collaborate with the school counselor(s) to address oppressive issues in the school.	.63 (.58)	.07(.21)	.03(-.12)	.35
37. I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.	.54 (.58)	.01(.29)	-.10(-.26)	.35
43. I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms.	.59 (.56)	.14(.17)	.11(.24)	.33
18. I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences.	-.12(.26)	.80 (.75)	-.02(-.20)	.57
19. I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families.	.07 (.35)	.56 (.60)	-.02(-.19)	.37
24. I am aware of the dropout rates of ethnic minority students.	.14 (.39)	.56 (.62)	.04(-.15)	.39
44. Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities.	.10(.17)	.46 (.43)	.20(.29)	.26
34. I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in poorer schools.	.12 (.42)	.67 (.71)	.05(-.16)	.52

Note. 1= Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO). 2=Social Justice Awareness (SJA). 3=Student Empowerment (SE). Bolded coefficients are of those items retained for that factor. Only pattern coefficients over .32 were retained in analysis. a. Factor correlations were as follows: $r_{12} = .48$, $r_{13} = -.29$, $r_{23} = -.27$. b. Pattern coefficients are followed by structure coefficients in parentheses.

Reliability analysis.

The TSJAS' three subscale structure was supported in Study 2. Analysis of Cronbach's alpha values for the three subscales was conducted to replicate the results from Study 1 in this study. For the first subscale, Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO; 12 items), Cronbach's alpha value was .85. Examination of the Cronbach's alpha values if any of the twelve items were deleted revealed that the subscale's internal consistency would have decreased with the deletion of any item. The second subscale, Social Justice Awareness (SJA; 5 items) revealed Cronbach's alpha value of .76. Again, each item's contribution to the scale appeared significant, as Cronbach's alpha would have decreased substantially if any item were deleted. The third subscale, Student Empowerment (SE; 5 items) yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of .76, with each item contributing to this internal consistency as well. These overall Cronbach's alpha values, ranging from .76 to .85, indicated the TSJAS subscales scores were internally consistent (Field, 2005) and supported the hypothesis that each internal consistency value would be over .70 (see Table 9). Additionally, these values were very similar to the values found in Study 1's reliability analysis. The next study, Study 3, sought to examine the preliminary evidence for validity for the TSJAS.

Study 3

Validity Analysis

The next step of this analysis was to examine preliminary evidence for convergent and criterion validity for the TSJAS. The entire sample of 607 participants was used for the validity portion of the analysis. First, composite total scores for the GBJWS (Lipkus, 1991), the PSA subscale of the SIAS (Nilsson et al., 2011), and Political Involvement measure (Bernstein, 2005) were examined for outliers and normality. These total scores yielded adequate skewness and kurtosis

values, providing evidence for normal distribution and no outliers in these scales. Bivariate correlations, means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis statistics and alpha coefficients for validity variables (as well as the final TSJAS subscales) are reported in Table 9.

Hypothesis three. To examine evidence for preliminary convergent validity bivariate multiple correlations were examined between participants' responses on the TSJAS subscales and the political involvement scale (Bernstein, 2005), the Political and Social Advocacy (PSA) subscale of the SIAS (Nilsson et al, 2011), and the global belief in a just world measure (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991). Significant positive correlations between the TSJAS subscales (TAO, SJA, and SE) and the political involvement scale (Bernstein, 2005) were found, ranging from .17 - .28, $p < .01$, yielding small effect sizes. Additionally, significant positive correlations were found between the TSJAS subscales and the Political and Social Advocacy (PSA) subscale of the SIAS (Nilsson et al., 2011), with scores ranging from .23 - .46, $p < .01$, yielding small to medium effect sizes. Hypothesis three was supported and these significant positive correlations provided evidence for convergent validity insofar as the TAO, SJA and SE subscales were positively correlated with constructs one would expect to be related to teacher social advocacy: general political and social advocacy orientation and political interest or involvement.

Hypothesis four. Analysis of bivariate correlations between the TAO, SJA, and SE and the Global Belief in a Just world Scale (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991) revealed a significant negative relationship between these instruments, ranging from -.16 - -.28, $p < .01$, yielding small effect sizes. These significant negative correlations provided evidence for convergent validity insofar as the TSJAS subscales were all negatively correlated with the construct of just world ideology, or the belief that the world is fair and no injustices occur. Thus, hypothesis four was supported and evidence of convergent validity was found.

Table 9

Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's alpha values for final TSJAS Subscales and the Validity and Post-hoc measures in Study 3

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. TSJAS-TAO		.49**	.59**	.17**	.44**	-.16	.22**	.10*	.08*
2. TSJAS-SJA			.45**	.24**	.23**	-.28	.09*	.16**	.20**
3. TSJAS- SE				.28**	.40**	-.23	.19**	.15**	.10*
4. POL					.53**	-.11	.10*	.01	.12**
5. PSA						-.18	.16**	.09*	.11**
6. GBJW							.067	-.22	-.16
7. Social Advocacy Training								-.13	-.27
8. Political Orientation									.09*
9. Level of Training									
<i>M</i>	40.29	20.43	16.52	3.4	25.87	20.35	2.33	3.18	4.5
<i>SD</i>	7.78	2.94	3.83	0.87	9.65	5.87	0.86	1.06	1.06
Minimum	16	10	5	1	10	7	1	1	1
Maximum	60	25	25	5	50	40	4	6	7
Cronbach's alpha	.85/.87	.76/.77	.76/.84	0.89	0.94	0.82			
Skewness	-1.33	-3.06	-.37	-2.06	1.34	1.08			
Kurtosis	.11	-2.79	-2.12	-1.29	-3.13	0.37			

Note. N = 607 teachers. Cronbach's alpha values for TAO, SJA, and SE organized as: "Study One/Study Two"

Hypothesis five.

In order to assess for evidence of criterion validity, group differences between Caucasian participants and ethnic minorities, as well as heterosexual participants and sexual orientation minorities. Statistically, I conducted multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) to assess for significant group differences. Due to the very small number of participants who reported minority status on race/ethnicity ($n = 69$) or sexual orientation ($n = 18$), minority groups were combined rather than examined separately. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used in order to include all subscales of the TSJAS as separate but related measures of the dependent variable.

Data was combined to represent two racial/ethnic minority groups: Caucasian and ethnic minorities. Preliminary assumptions of multivariate analyses of variance, multivariate normality, the assumption of equality of covariance matrices, were checked. Although the original individual 48 items of the TSJAS failed the assumption of normality, the final TSJAS subscale scores were analyzed and there was no evidence of problematic skewness or kurtosis in the dependent variables. Levene's test of homogeneity of variance was first conducted on the TAO, SJA, and SE subscales across sexual orientation and race groups. All Levene's values were nonsignificant, providing evidence for homogeneity of variance. As seen previously in Studies 1 and 2, the subscales of the TSJAS were significantly correlated (with no multicollinearity) and thus suitable as dependent variables in a MANOVA. In order to account for the multiple analyses of variance conducted here a Bonferonni correction was made to the .05 p value by dividing it by the number of MANOVAs conducted (4) for a p value of .01 (Field, 2005).

A MANOVA was conducted with race (Caucasian versus ethnic minority) as the between-subjects factor and the TSJAS subscales, TAO, SJA, and SE as the dependent variables.

Hotelling's T was used as this statistic is best when comparing two groups in the independent variable. Hotelling's $T = 2.01$, and was not significant ($p = .11$). This suggested that there were no significant mean differences in responses on the TSJAS depending on race or ethnicity. Given the large discrepancies in sample size, with 69 in the ethnic minority group and 535 in the Caucasian group, another MANOVA was run with an SPSS command to randomly select a group of 69 Caucasian participants and the 69 ethnic minority participants. Again, Hotelling's T statistic was used and equaled 1.04, and was not significant (See Appendix D for tables).

Data was also combined to represent two sexual orientation groups: heterosexual and sexual orientation minorities. A MANOVA was conducted with sexual orientation (heterosexual versus sexual orientation minority) as the between-subjects independent variable and the TSJAS subscales (TAO, SJA, and SE) as the dependent variables. Hotelling's T was the statistic used, as the analysis was comparing two groups in the independent variable. Analyses revealed a Hotelling's $T = 1.69$, and was not significant ($p = .17$). Again, given the large discrepancies in sample size, with 18 in the sexual orientation minority group and 585 in the heterosexual group, another MANOVA was conducted on a randomly selected group of 18 heterosexual participants and the 18 LGBT participants. Hotellings $T = 1.76$ and was not significant. These analyses suggested that there were no group differences on responses on the TAO, SJA, or SE depending on sexual orientation. Thus, Hypothesis 5 (a test of criterion validity for the TSJAS) stating that participants in marginalized populations, specifically ethnic and LGBT participants would report higher scores on the TSJAS than non-minority participants was not supported (See Appendix D for tables).

Post hoc analyses.

Post hoc analyses were conducted on a series of the demographic variables and the final three subscales of the TSJAS. The purpose of these analyses was to examine if there were any differences in reporting of teacher social advocacy attitudes and behaviors based on the data collected about teachers': (a) age; (b) social justice advocacy training; (c) political orientation; (d) level of training; (e) years teaching; (f) school area and type; and (g) and students' race and socioeconomic status.

Bivariate correlation analyses were conducted on the continuous variables in the demographic form and the TAO, SJA, and SE subscales. Table 9 presents the bivariate correlations between the TSJA subscales and the continuous variables. A positive correlation was found between participants' age and their score on the SE (Student Empowerment) subscale, $r = .12, p < .01$ (a small effect size). No significant correlations were found between age and the TAO or SJA subscales. These findings suggest that as participants' age increased, so did their attitudes and behaviors regarding empowering their students to become advocates. The social advocacy training item asked participants to rank their training programs' level of training in social advocacy ($1 = none\ at\ all, 2 = very\ little\ emphasis, 3 = some\ emphasis, and 4 = very\ much\ emphasis$). Significant positive correlations were found between the TAO, SJA, and SE subscales and the demographic item assessing level of social justice advocacy training in their education (ranging from $r = .10 - .22, p < .05$). These correlations yielded small effect sizes. This finding suggested that as level of social advocacy training or competence increased, so did scores on the TSJAS subscales. The political orientation item on the demographic form asked participants to rank their orientation ($1 = far\ right, 2 = conservative, 3 = middle\ of\ the\ road, 4 = liberal, 5 = far\ left$). Significant positive correlations, with small effect sizes, were found

between the TSJAS subscales and this item (r ranging from = .10 - .16, $p < .05$). These correlations suggest that as political orientation shifted from far right or conservative to a more liberal or far left orientation, participants reported higher teacher advocacy orientation, social advocacy awareness, and student empowerment behaviors.

The demographic item regarding level of training asked participants to rank their highest degree obtained ($1 = \text{high school diploma}$, $2 = \text{Associate of Arts degree}$, $3 = \text{Bachelor of arts and science}$, $4 = \text{Bachelor of arts and science in education}$, $5 = \text{master of arts or science}$, $6 = \text{education specialist}$, and $7 = \text{PhD}$). Bivariate correlation analyses revealed significant positive correlations, with small effect sizes, between highest level of training and the TSJAS TAO, SJA, and SE subscales (r values ranging from .10 - .16, $p < .05$). These findings suggested that as teachers' level of training increased, so did their level of social advocacy orientation related to teacher advocacy orientation, social advocacy awareness, and student empowerment behaviors. The demographic form asked participants to report their total years of teaching experience ($1 = \text{less than a year}$, $2 = 1-3 \text{ years}$, $3 = 4-7 \text{ years}$, $4 = 7-10 \text{ years}$, $5 = 10-15 \text{ years}$, $6 = 15 \text{ or more years}$). Bivariate correlations were not significant between years of teaching and scores on the TAO, SJA and SE subscales. These findings suggest that there is not a relationship between a teacher's total years in the workforce and their attitudes and behaviors related to social advocacy.

Univariate analyses of variance were conducted to examine group differences on the TSJAS subscales and the categorical variables assessed in the demographic form: (a) participant gender (*male or female*); (b) school area (*urban, rural, or suburban*); (c) school type (*public, private, or charter*); (d) student race (*primarily Caucasian; primarily African American; primarily Latino/a/Hispanic; primarily other ethnic minority; or evenly split*); and (e) student SES (*below lower class, lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, or upper class*). To account

for the multiple ANOVA's conducted in these post-hoc analyses, a Bonferroni correction was made to the p value to protect from a Type I error. Specifically the .05 alpha value was divided by 15 (the number of individual ANOVAs conducted) for a p value of .003. ANOVAs were conducted as opposed to MANOVA's in this section because no a priori hypotheses were made for these analyses and the interest was to examine whether there were specific differences in the unique subscales. Five separate ANOVAs were conducted on the TAO subscale as the dependent variable. Specifically, a separate ANOVA was conducted with each of the following entered in as independent variables: gender, school area, school type, student race and student SES. These five ANOVA's were repeated for the SJA and SE subscales as well. No significant main effects were found for the ANOVAS at the p threshold of .003, suggesting that no between group differences exist in these variables and scores on the Teacher Advocacy Orientation subscale, Social Justice Awareness subscale, or Student Empowerment subscale (See Appendix D). However, it is important to note that the main effects for Gender on TAO and SJA had p values below .05 and observed power ranging from .54-.72. Similarly the main effect for Student race on the SJA subscale yielded a p of .03, with an observed power of .73. It is possible that these relationships would have been significant had their power to detect an effect were higher than .80 and the p value was less stringent.

In summary, these post-hoc analyses added to the understanding of the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale insofar as participants' reported scores on the TAO, SJA, and SE subscales were related to their training programs' level of emphasis on social advocacy training, their political ideology, and their level or amount of total education. Additionally, participants' age was positively correlated to their reports of Student Empowerment behaviors but not their general teacher justice advocacy (TJA) or awareness of social justice issues (SJA). Finally, the

post hoc analyses suggested that one's level of teacher social advocacy orientation did not differ depending on their gender, the type or area of their school, nor their student population's race/ethnicity or socio-economic status. The next chapter reviews the results found in this study and provides an overall discussion of them.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The present study sought to examine the initial factor structure of an instrument developed to measure the construct of teacher social justice advocacy (the TSJAS) among teachers in K-12 schools in the United States (final $n = 607$). In addition, initial evidence of reliability and validity of the TSJAS was examined by exploring internal consistency of the scale as well as relationships with other related constructs of interests. A need for teachers committed to social justice advocacy has been strongly communicated in the last decade of scholarly literature (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Cochran-Smith, 1995, 2004a, 2004b; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Moule, 2005; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008). Although there are some advocacy-related scales in the fields of psychology or social work (Chen-Hayes, 2001; Corning & Myers, 2002; Kerpelman, 1969; Miller et al., 2009; Nilsson et al., 2011; and Vansoest, 1996); however, no teacher specific advocacy measures were located in the literature, nor was much empirical literature present on the actual practice of social advocacy among teachers (Ivey & Collins, 2003; Speight & Vera, 2004). This gap in the literature, paired with the limited empirical examination of the competencies being used in education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009) was sought to be addressed by the development of the TSJAS. Items for the TSJAS were developed based on a multidimensional definition of teacher social advocacy that was a result of synthesized literature in various fields (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Catapano, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 1995, 2004a, 2004b; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Constantine et al., 2007; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Garmon, 2004, 2005; Holmes & Herrera, 2009; Lewis et al., 2003; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; McKenzie et al., 2008; Ratts et al., 2007). This dissertation investigation used a quantitative nonexperimental

descriptive design to address the psychometric properties of the TSJAS including: (a) initial factor structure; (b) scale reliability; (c) convergent validity; and (d) criterion validity. In general, findings supported the use of this instrument for training and research purposes. A summary and discussion of the findings is presented in this chapter. Limitations of the current research study and implications for future research and training are also provided. As the results from studies 1 and 2 were similar, the discussions of these findings were combined below.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that the newly developed Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS) would yield a multidimensional factor structure, representing a multidimensional definition of the construct. Support for this hypothesis was found in both the initial study and the replication study (study 2). Results from the exploratory principal axis factoring analysis (PAF) suggested a three-factor structure in both studies. Study one resulted in the removal of 15 items, including the 11 items removed in initial item analysis. Removing these items was justified empirically given their poor intercorrelations with other items and the entire scale.

The final factor structure of the TSJAS suggests that there is a conceptually meaningful construct of teacher social justice advocacy that is comprised of three distinct subcomponents: (a) general teacher advocacy behaviors and orientation (within the school and community); (b) knowledge and awareness of injustices in the school or with specific vulnerable student groups; and (c) behaviors geared towards empowering students to become social advocates. Of note, this third component should be conceptualized as a separate definition of a more advanced form of social advocacy for teachers. A total TSJAS total score was not evaluated or calculated due to the negative factor loadings on the third factor. Moreover, the third factor yielded negative

correlations with the other two factors, suggesting that a total summed score of the three factors would not be conceptually meaningful.

One strength to these findings is the study's use of a second sample to replicate the initial exploratory factor analysis. This practice has been supported in data reduction research (Thompson, 2008) and increases the confidence that the three-factor structure is stable across two randomly split samples of teachers. Additionally, the TSJAS successfully captured attitudes *and* behaviors related to teacher social advocacy, further improving the construct validity of the instrument.

The first subscale, titled Teacher Advocacy Orientation to encompass its wide incorporation of advocacy-related behaviors, accounted for the greatest amount of variance in the scale (33%). This subscale was also the only one to include both attitudes and behavior indicators. When reviewing the literature originally used to develop TSJAS items, it appears that the TAO subscale reflects values and recommendations laid forth by the American Counseling Association (ACA) task force (Lewis et al., 2003) and the field of school counseling's adaptation of that framework (Ratts et al., 2007). Specifically, these competencies sought to expand the construct of advocacy from just individual-level interventions (such as individual counseling) to include a school/community and public arena advocacy component in addition to individual level work. Advocacy behaviors were characterized as either *acting with* or *acting on behalf* of the person or group in need of social advocacy. When *acting on behalf*, professionals are encouraged to: (a) provide access to resources; (b) create systemic plans for change; and (c) actively lobby for social and political reform (Lewis et al., 2003).

Items on the TAO seem to reflect these acting on behalf behaviors, but also beliefs and attitudes centered on acting *with* the student or students in need. In fact, two items developed

based on specific recommendations or examples by Ratts et al. (2007) loaded onto the TAO: *I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms; I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.* These examples had been given by Ratts and colleagues as acting or advocating *with* and *on behalf* of students in need. Other items on the TAO included: *I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments; I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students; and I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.* Appendix C includes all items on the TAO subscale. The twelve items reflect collaborating with other school professionals to ensure advocacy, participating in and initiating social advocacy efforts inside and outside of the school, and challenging issues in the school that serve to oppress vulnerable students. Openly challenging injustices while also balancing cooperative collaboration with other school personnel were both key components to scholars' recommendations in the literature base (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Constantine et al., 2007; Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007; Ratts et al., 2007).

The second subscale, titled Social Justice Awareness (SJA), included five items centered on an awareness of injustices occurring in the school or other social contexts in which children exist, as well as knowledge of unique needs or risks associated with specific vulnerable student populations. Appendix C presents the five items on the SJA subscale. Although items had been created to address several vulnerable student populations, only items related to refugee, non-English speaking, ethnic minority, and poverty-related vulnerabilities loaded onto the factor. Potential reasons for this include the notion that poverty-related effects on youth and educational development have been long studied and understood (Bo, 1994; Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Brown, Anfara, & Roney, 2004; Evans, 2004; Fibkins, 2005). Similarly, ethnic minorities (which

could include refugee and/or non-English speaking students and families) make up a large proportion of the population that experiences inequities and disparities in the school system (Bowen & Bowen, 1999; Milner, 2006; Rogers & O'Bryon, 2008; Slavin, 1997). It is possible then that these specific vulnerable populations are more likely to be discussed in teaching training programs and issues faced by these populations may be more widely understood by teachers as opposed to issues faced by students with disabilities or LGBT students.

The Student Empowerment subscale includes items that assess a teacher's involvement in encouraging or educating students to become social justice advocates themselves (i.e., *I encourage students to question authority*). Appendix C presents the five items on the SE subscale. This unique subscale relates to literature in the field of education that calls to teachers to include empowerment as a form of teaching. While education values the process of influencing others to become critical thinkers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009) this extra step requires teachers to “*teach* social consciousness or to raise political awareness among students by enhancing their knowledge and sense of power to make a change in society (Allen, 1997, p. 1). This unique factor yielded negative loadings as well as negative correlations with the other two subscales of the TSJAS. This, paired with the fact that the subscale demonstrated similar relationships to validity measures as the other two subscales despite its negative correlation suggests that the student empowerment behaviors assessed in the subscale may represent an advanced form of social advocacy. Specifically, it may be that some teachers orient strongly to their general advocacy behaviors as well as awareness of social injustices; however, they may not necessarily take it one step further to teach others to take on such a standpoint as well. A review of the literature, including a qualitative study of urban-school teachers that were identified as exceptional further substantiates this argument. Duncan-Andrade (2005) noted that

the main commonality between these exceptional teachers was “a focus on student-empowering social justice pedagogy,” (p. 70). Allen’s (1997) recommendations in this area of student empowerment also included a consideration of students’ age and cognitive development, early proactive intervention. It is important to note that one item, *I teach students to speak up for their rights*, cross loaded with more heavy factor loading on the second factor rather than the third in Study 2. It was considered to delete the item; however, ultimately it was decided to retain the item on the third factor due to the strong cross loading on both factors, the item content, as well as recommendations that scales should include at least five items (Clark & Watson, 1995; Cronbach, 1951; Field, 2005). Of note, Study 2 yielded substantially lower correlations between the SE subscale and the TAO subscale than Study 1 (-.29 versus -.54) and the internal consistency for the SE subscale also decreased from .84 in Study 1 to .76 in Study 2. These changes in stability from Study 1 to Study 2 are further discussed in the limitations section of this chapter. Further research on this scale may lend support for retaining the item on this third factor or ultimately deleting the item if it leads to problematic loadings in confirmatory factor analyses.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that adequate evidence for the reliability of the TSJAS would be supported via internal consistency Cronbach values of .70 or above. Both Studies 1 and 2 provided support for this hypothesis, with internal consistency values ranging from .76-.87 for the three TSJAS subscales. A strong Cronbach value provides useful information about a scale’s internal structure by demonstrating that items within a scale are sufficiently correlated with one another (Clark & Watson, 1995; Cronbach, 1951; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Reliability evidence is particularly important in scale development research insofar as it increases

confidence that the items on a scale are yielding consistent scores. The ability to replicate adequate internal consistency across two studies strengthens support for the argument that the TSJAS subscales are consistently measuring social advocacy attitudes and behaviors across two samples of K-12 teachers in the United States.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the TSJAS demonstrate evidence for convergent validity by demonstrating positive relationships with a general social justice advocacy measure and political orientation. As predicted, the results of the correlation analyses revealed that general social advocacy and political interest and involvement were significantly related to social justice advocacy among teachers. In terms of general social advocacy, the Political and Social Advocacy (PSA) subscale of the Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS; Nilsson et al., 2011) measured personal and professional involvement with advocacy. This subscale was shown to be the largest component of the SIAS in the development of the measure, and the authors noted it can be used to measure one's actual involvement in social advocacy. The positive relationship between the TSJAS and the measure of general social advocacy provides evidence of convergent validity, revealing that the construct of teacher advocacy is likely measuring a construct very similar to that of general social advocacy. As noted earlier, several of the activism concepts investigated in the TSJAS stemmed from the general literature related to social activism in field of counseling and education; therefore, it is empirically and theoretically meaningful that scores on the TSJAS would positively relate to scores on a measure of social activism, separate from the field of teaching or the population of students.

The positive correlation between political involvement/orientation and teacher advocacy also paralleled other empirical literature in the area of social advocacy (Linnemeyer, 2009;

Linnemeyer, Hansen, Bahner, & J. E. Nilsson, 2005; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Up until now, little has been done to directly examine the relationship between political involvement and teacher social advocacy. However, several scholars and researchers identify a knowledge and interest in political issues and policies to be parallel to social action in several professions (Athanases & Larrabee, 2003; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Lynn & Maddox, 2007; Van Soest, 1996). Furthermore, political participation has shown positive relationships with feelings of social responsibility, altruistic attitudes, and activism behaviors (Cole & Stewart, 1996; Fendrich & Lovoy, 1988; Lee, 1997; Smith, 2006). The findings also parallel previous results that a political interest explains variance in social advocacy attitudes and behaviors among graduate students (Beer, 2008; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). These findings further support the notion that political involvement is related to teacher-specific social advocacy as well. However, it is important to note that given the nonexperimental nature of this study, it is not clear whether teacher social advocacy orientation leads to an interest and involvement in politics or whether political involvement leads to an advocacy commitment. Of note, the effect sizes for these significant correlations were small, indicating that the strength of these relationships may not be very large.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 proposed that the TSJAS would demonstrate evidence for convergent validity by yielding a negative relationship with a measure of the belief in a just world ideology. This hypothesis was supported by significant negative correlations between the three TSJAS subscales and the GBJWS (Lipkus, 1991). This finding provides evidence for the idea that the stronger teachers' beliefs are that the world is just and fair, the lower their attitudes and behaviors related to teacher social advocacy are going to be. Of note, however, the effect sizes

for these significant correlations were small, indicating that the strength of these relationships may not be very large. This finding builds on the supported literature that the belief in a just world has demonstrated negative relationships in relation to attitudes towards innocent victims, helping behaviors, disapproval of the status quo, empathy towards disadvantaged populations, as well as social advocacy in general (Lerner, 1971; Lerner, 1980; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Vansoest, 1996). Furthermore, in a 1973 study, Rubin and Peplau demonstrated an inverse relationship between the belief in a just world and individuals' scores on an activism index, asking for the level to which participants were involved in activism and the degree to which "socially victimized groups" were deserving of their fate (1973, p.91). This led the researchers to conclude, "people who believe that the world is a just place were less likely to be activists," (p. 91). Similarly, conflicting religious attitudes have been associated with a lack of acknowledgment of oppression for LGBT students (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). Additionally, Pohan's study of 492 pre-service teachers indicated a significant relationship between personal beliefs or values regarding diversity and professional beliefs or sensitivity (Pohan, 1996). Specifically, participants who endorsed negative stereotypical beliefs about culturally diverse populations were less likely to endorse multicultural sensitivity on a measure of professional beliefs (Pohan, 1996).

The belief in a just world is a phenomenon that can be viewed as a negative or incorrect way of viewing the world; however, some might argue it is also an adaptive mechanism. Theoretically, Lerner and Miller argued that the just world belief allows one to exist in his or her environment comfortably, by believing that it were "stable and orderly," (1978, p.1030). By operating from this worldview, it was believed that individuals would find comfort in being able to determine their own fate, by believing the fates of others was due to their goodness or

badness. In fact, Lerner and Miller argued that operating from this worldview even allowed individuals to pursue long-term goals in life. Therefore, this worldview was initially described as an adaptive process in place human beings to function within their environment. Lerner also hypothesized that such a world view allowed humans to create and maintain harmony in our attributions of the world, implying that humans will inherently feel conflict if we realize the world is arbitrary and unpredictable. This conflict, it was argued, could lead individuals to feel motivated to restore their worldview so that the predictability of their own fate would be protected. It was also theorized that the closer in proximity that one would witness possible injustice, the more of a potential threat would be posed to one's belief in a just world. Eventually, Lerner modified his theory to suggest that although there are adaptive qualities to the just world belief, it is also a myth or fundamental error from which some operate.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that the TSJAS would provide evidence for criterion validity by demonstrating that participants belonging to marginalized groups (specifically ethnic and sexual orientation minority groups) would report higher TSJAS scores than participants from majority groups (specifically Caucasian and heterosexual groups). No support for hypothesis five was found insofar as no significant group differences were found between ethnic or sexual orientation minority participants and Caucasian, heterosexual participants on their scores on the TSJAS subscales. This hypothesis was formulated based on literature that suggested minorities in general tend to uphold a stronger commitment towards ensuring equality among others (Linnemeyer, 2009; Moule, 2005; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Thomas, 2001). Further, it was hypothesized that there would be group differences due to the fact that minorities would have greater awareness of and experience with injustice and oppression than others who may not

notice strong prevalence of racism in society (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 2000). It is possible that the lack of support in this study suggests that among teachers, sexual orientation and ethnic minority teachers engage in as much teacher-related advocacy behaviors their heterosexual and Caucasian counterparts. However, it is important to note that the nonsignificant relationship between sexual orientation and social advocacy is inconsistent with Linnemeyer's (2009) dissertation findings in which LGB students yielded significant group differences on social advocacy attitudes and behaviors than their heterosexual counterparts. This finding was found despite the small sample size of LGB students ($n = 30$). It is possible then that there may be a significant effect in this current study, however the findings were limited due to low power. In terms of racial and ethnic minority, it is also possible that minorities may uphold different ideas as to what defines social advocacy and may place greater importance on exposing racism related injustice (Moule, 2005) than White teachers. If this is the case, it is possible that some racial/ethnic minorities may be more keenly aware of covert issues of racism and oppression but may feel unable to make effective change in societal injustices as they are equally affected by the issues themselves.

It is important to note that the lack of significant findings may also be due to the data's weaknesses related to low power and unequal groups made it difficult to detect an effect. Specifically, the number of participants who belonged to minority groups was very small. It is possible that had the sample included more minority participants, the increased power would have detected a potential effect of group differences. If this is the case, the small proportion of minorities in this study further highlights the importance of increasing the number of minority teachers in the workforce (Moule, 2005).

Post-hoc conclusions

The post-hoc analyses yielded several interesting findings. Notably, all significant correlations in the post-hoc analyses yielded small effect sizes, so it is possible that these relationships are not very strong in the population. First, all subscales of the TSJAS were positively associated with level of emphasis on social advocacy in participants' training programs. This finding adds to the body of research insofar as there was a gap in the research regarding whether or not training program emphasis actually influenced or was related to advocacy in practice. This finding suggests that, in fact, an emphasis on developing social advocacy competence may be related to increased advocacy behavior among those teachers when they enter the workforce. Similarly, as teachers' level of training increased, so did their level of social advocacy orientation related to teacher advocacy orientation, social advocacy awareness, and student empowerment behaviors. This finding is interesting given the inconsistency in previous literature that has found similar differences based on level of training (e.g., Linnemeyer et al., 2005) as well as no significant differences among training level and advocacy in counseling among students (Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). It is possible that higher education is synonymous with a more sophisticated emphasis on developing teacher competence in several areas including advocacy. Implications for this finding are discussed in the Implications section below.

A positive correlation was found between all the TSJAS subscales and a measure of political ideology. As political orientation shifted from far right or conservative to a more liberal or far left orientation, participants reported higher teacher advocacy orientation, social advocacy awareness, and student empowerment behaviors. This finding provides interesting additional information to the validity analysis that demonstrated a positive correlation between non-

ideological specific political involvement and the TSJAS. This finding is notably inconsistent with a research study that found no differences between liberal and conservative ideologies and social advocacy behaviors and attitudes among counseling students (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Future research on teacher advocacy may seek to examine political ideology as it relates to activism in order to clarify inconsistencies in the literature.

Participants' age was only positively related to the third subscale of the TSJAS, Student Empowerment (SE) and not the other subscales. Interestingly, this was the only differential relationship among teacher characteristics and the three subscales. Given the argument that this subscale potentially measures a more advanced skill in advocacy, older age may provide some support for this argument in so far as participants' age increased, so did their attitudes and behaviors regarding empowering their students to become advocates. However, findings suggested that there was not a relationship between a teacher's total years in the workforce and their attitudes and behaviors related to social advocacy on any subscale. Research and theory from the 1980s and 1990s related to activism and aging included suggestions that those who grew up in the generation of confrontational activism during the 1960s and 1970s would influence the rates of social activism among the aging population in the United States today (Williamson, 1998). Importantly, scholars argue that while activism may increase due to this baby boomer population, the *form* of activism will likely transition from a more confrontational or active approach to a less confrontational or physically demanding form of justice work (Binstock & Day, 1996; Jennings & Markus, 1988). It may be that the tendency to encourage and teach youth to become advocates and questioners of status quo is a form of this activism.

Finally, the post hoc analyses suggested that one's level of teacher social advocacy orientation did not differ depending on their gender, the type or area of their school, nor their

student population's race/ethnicity or socio-economic status. While no a priori hypotheses were made regarding these teacher and student factors and the TSJAS, the lack of significant findings is interesting nonetheless. On the one hand, it is possible that these findings suggest that social advocacy attitudes and behaviors truly do not differ based on a teacher's gender, school setting, or student population they serve. Support for this includes the fact that the sample was relatively representative of all school settings (suburban, urban, or rural) and student socioeconomic breakdown. However, it is important to note the unequal sample sizes in regards to participants' gender (83% female), school type (81% reported working in a public school), and student race. Over half of the participants reported serving primarily Caucasian students, while other ethnic/racial student percentages only ranged from 1%- 11%. These unequal sample sizes may have limited the power of the analyses to detect an effect that exists between these groups (potential Type II error). Similarly, stringent p values were assigned to these tests in order to protect from Type I error ($p = .003$); Gender's main effect on the TAO and SJA subscales were significant at less stringent p values; thus, it is possible that an effect does exist in reality.

Limitations

Several limitations to this study should be noted. The limitations to this investigation fell into three categories: (a) sampling methodology and generalizability; (b) threats to construct validity; or (c) threats to statistical conclusion validity.

Sampling methodology.

Although a large sample was recruited for this study, it is quite possible that participants who chose to take part in a study with this description may have greater commitment or adherence to social advocacy attitudes than those who chose not to participate. Other selection bias information in the literature suggests that those who participate in social science research

tend to be more educated, altruistic, extroverted, intelligent, and of higher social class than those who do not participate (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). These limits to the sampling procedures limits the overall generalizability of the findings of this scale to a more highly educated and possibly more advocacy-oriented population of teachers, as opposed to all teachers (thus limiting external validity). While the sample was representative of the national sample (NCES, 2002; NEA, 2003) of teachers currently in the United States in terms of age, gender, and ethnicity, the majority of the sample had high level of experience teaching and were highly educated. It is possible that these findings are not generalizable to beginner teachers or teachers with less education or training. Similarly, given the relatively homogenous sample regarding race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender, generalizability to ethnic/racial, sexual orientation minorities and males may be limited. Finally, the target population for this study was all K-12 teachers in the United States. This target population likely increased heterogeneity and allowed me to examine social advocacy among all types of teachers. However, no data was collected regarding participants' specific teaching subject. It is possible that given the items of the TSJAS, very different endorsements could have existed for social studies teachers versus music teachers, for example.

Selection bias may have also been an issue insofar as all participants were recruited via convenience sampling through an online internet survey, with no paper-pencil formats used in this study. It is possible that teachers without computers, internet access, or interest in belonging to online social networking groups were missed in this study's recruitment procedures. Additionally, several participants (N = 148) did not complete the full study. This large number of attrition potentially threatens the internal validity of the study as there is limited knowledge as to what differed between those who chose not to complete the study and those who did.

Threats to construct validity.

This study's data revealed relatively high levels of teacher advocacy, general advocacy, and political involvement (See Table 1). No hypotheses were made about the rates or level of endorsement regarding advocacy given the limited and inconsistent research done to examine actual rates of advocacy among teachers (Goodlad, 1990). While these findings could be indicating authentic high levels of these constructs, it is also possible that the high endorsements on items could be a result of participants feeling internally pressured to report higher levels of teacher advocacy, general advocacy, as well as political involvement than are necessarily characteristic of their attitudes. This phenomenon is otherwise referred to as social desirability response bias (Nederhof, 1985). This bias refers to a participant's inclination to misrepresent his or her responses in a socially favorable manner by denying "socially undesirable traits and to claim socially desirable ones," (Nederhof, p. 269). Such desirability demands could have influenced participants' responses, as participants may have felt compelled to over-identify with social advocacy-related questions regarding their teacher skills and behaviors. Additionally, this study utilized only retrospective, self-report measures to assess constructs. This limitation of monomethod bias of measurement may limit the ability to accurately measure the constructs of advocacy, political involvement, and a belief in a just world as they exist in reality.

Threats to statistical conclusion validity.

In terms of data, the largest limitation was the data's non-normal distribution. The data's original problematic skewness and kurtosis values indicated that there was not a normal distribution of the data in the TSJAS items. The violation of this basic assumption creates problems related to increased risk of Type I and Type II error (Field, 2005). Specifically, it is possible that the non-normal distribution of values either over- or under- estimated the inter-item

correlations for which factor analysis so greatly relies on. The non normal distribution of data was one primary reason for utilizing a principal axis factoring analysis, as this test does not rely on normally distributed data. However, it is important to note that skewness and kurtosis values were no longer problematic after the retention of the final items that comprised the TSJAS. This may somewhat decrease the impact of this limitation. Another way of assessing whether skewness is affecting the factor results is to examine if items are sorting out onto factors due to their mean values. Table 2 lists item means and given my review of these means, there does not appear to be a pattern of various mean values between the three factors of the TSJAS. Nonetheless, this limitation of the non-normally distributed data suggests caution when considering the final factor structure of the TSJAS. Future research may ameliorate this limitation by demonstrating normal distribution of data or by utilizing other methods for correcting for outliers among categorical variables (Kline, 2005), such as using polychoric inter-item correlations as opposed to Pearson correlations (Panter, Swygart, Dahlstrom, & Tanaka 1997). Before conducting their principal components analysis, Nilsson et al. (2001) utilized such a method to account for skewed data.

Specifically, the main limitation of the final TSJAS instrument is the inconsistent findings between Study 1 and Study 2 regarding the placement of item 25. While its content and relatively weak factor loading in Study 2 provided justification for retaining item 25 on the third subscale, it is possible that this item is problematic and would not load properly in future studies. Of note, Study 2 yielded substantially lower correlations between the SE subscale and the TAO subscale than Study 1 (-.29 versus -.54) and the internal consistency for the SE subscale also decreased from .84 in Study 1 to .76 in Study 2. It is a possibility that item 25's problematic factor loadings are accounting for the decreased stability of the TSJAS in Study 2. Future

research may ameliorate this limitation by testing different models for the two factor structures and may provide justification for dropping the item in future studies. Finally, for the purposes of this investigation, it was concluded that the scale was sound with three factors; however, given the much larger percentage of variance explained in factor 1, future research may wish to test the hypothesis that the TSJAS is in fact a unidimensional structure.

One final error in this dissertation pertains to the initial demographic questionnaire. Transgender was erroneously categorized under *Sexual Orientation* rather than *Gender* on the demographic form. When this was caught during the analysis phase, both participants who reported transgender as sexual orientation reported “other” as a response to the gender question. It was decided to retain these two participants; however it is important to note this error in classification during data collection.

Research Recommendations

Future TSJAS scale development research can potentially take several different directions to further strengthen the scale in terms of reliability and validity. Specifically, replication of the scale’s 3-factor structure is necessary with a similar sample of teachers or other populations such as beginning teachers. A confirmatory factor analysis is necessary in order to also examine whether the TSJAS’ three subfactors are reflective of one global factor or not. Similarly, a CFA can further test the hypothesis that the third factor of Student Empowerment reflects a more advanced or higher-order skill. This future analysis of the TSJAS may lend normative data for the scale which would increase the ability to make accurate conclusions regarding the instrument and its generalizable ability across populations. Factor analyses studies will also want to examine the fifth item in the Student Empowerment subscale in order to assess whether it yields

problematic cross loadings again. This may lend support for removing the item from the final scale.

Similarly, future research may focus on addressing the limitations related to construct validity and sampling bias by recruiting a more heterogeneous sample of teachers in order to get a more accurate perspective of attitudes and behaviors among racial/ethnic minority, LGBTQ teachers, and male teachers. This emphasis in sampling a heterogeneous sample would increase the external validity of the TSJAS instrument. If the scale is used in future research among teachers, more detail will need to be given in the demographic form in order to distinguish between types of teachers (i.e., social studies teachers versus music teachers) in order to assess the construct validity or applicability of the scale across teacher specialties. Similarly, more detailed data should be collected in the demographic form regarding the general geographic locations of the teachers drawn for future samples. Future research may also consider utilizing a more rigorous evaluation of the generalizability of the sample to the population of teachers in the United States. For example, demographic variables can be tested against national data percentages using chi-square statistics. These measures would increase the understanding of the generalizability of the sample. Additionally, a more randomized sampling procedure, such as randomly selecting schools across the nation to sample a more random composite of teachers in the United States would decrease the threats of selection bias inherent to convenience sampling. Also, paper-pencil assessments and multiple methods of measurements could also be used to examine if there are differences between them and online or self-report questionnaire survey procedures.

Finally, in terms of reliability and validity, future research may want to include additional assessments of reliability in addition to internal consistency assessment. For example, future

studies could also include test-retest reliability among teachers. Similarly, validity analysis may seek to examine other constructs believed to be positively or negatively associated with teacher advocacy. As social desirability could have been an issue, future analyses confirming the TSJAS should include some type of social desirability instrument to examine whether the constructs measured in the TSJAS are at all correlated with impression management. An examination of predictive validity could be used to assess whether TSJAS scores predict actual behavior in the schools. Continued efforts to assess for criterion validity analyses comparing group differences based on school area, school type, teacher gender, student race and student SES is recommended, as some of these relationships approached significance but were unable to meet the stringent *p* criteria. These added measures and analyses would further improve the evidence of the reliability and validity of this new instrument of teacher social advocacy.

Implications and Conclusions

Although this investigation was exploratory in nature, there are several important possible implications from the findings in this study. The TSJAS instrument suggested a three-factor structure of the construct of teacher social advocacy. These factors included emphasis on awareness and knowledge of injustice or vulnerability, as well as behaviors related to collaboration, challenging injustice, implementing social advocacy related programs, providing support for parents, and working within the school as well as community context. While this study focused on teachers already in the field, the findings related to the TSJAS instrument provide implications for training programs in education. Specifically, results revealed a positive correlation between teachers' level of social advocacy orientation and their self-reported impressions of their training programs' emphasis on social advocacy education. Training programs must incorporate an emphasis on social advocacy and societal injustices as it relates to

the field of education and specific vulnerable populations of students. This research study suggests that a greater emphasis on such issues in one's pre-service training may in fact influence or be related to a teacher's future advocacy behaviors and commitment. Proponents of social advocacy have argued for a stronger emphasis on social justice training as a necessary component to the values already placed on other teaching outcomes (i.e., students' achievement test scores, pre-service teachers' performance on entry-level standardized exams, etc) in education training (Cochran-Smith, 2004a, 2004b).

The specific dimensions of the TSJAS scale also have several implications for training of teachers entering the workforce. Training may seek to increase emphasis on social justice awareness and knowledge of injustices in society as well as include behavioral markers such as field experiments and social advocacy exercises in the community. Additionally, the third factor, Student Empowerment, was conceptualized a more developed or advanced skill of teacher advocacy. Schools may seek to identify their teachers who are engaging in student empowerment behaviors and consult with these teachers for brainstorming ways to increase this behavior among other novice advocates or beginning teachers.

The results related to convergent validity suggested that political interest and involvement was related to social advocacy among teachers. School systems as well as education training programs may consider supporting or encouraging political involvement among teachers. For example, training programs may include a political involvement project in which pre-service teachers are encouraged to become involved or knowledgeable in political issues related to education or in general. While these findings were correlational, it is possible that as political involvement increases, so will one's engagement or orientation towards social advocacy. Similarly, given the significant findings that a belief in a just world is negatively

related to social advocacy, training programs may want to spend time educating preservice teachers on the idea of the belief in a just world. It is possible that raising awareness into this phenomenon may inspire teachers to self-reflect on their own attitudes on the world and injustice.

In conclusion, this scale development research study introduced the Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS) and sought to address the gap in the teacher field and research regarding social justice advocacy orientation. Scale development procedures continue to increase within the field of psychology (Clark & Watson, 1995) and psychological principals were considered when developing the TSJAS as well as considering validity relationships. It is the hope that the growing emphasis on the construct of social justice advocacy continues to be a focus in research, training programs for fields such as counseling, social work, and education, as well as practice.

APPENDIX A

Table of original TSJAS items with item-specific citations

Appendix A

Original Developed Items based on TSJAS definition

TSJAS Items	Response Options	Citations/Guidelines
Awareness of Injustices		
I believe that school curriculum often maintains oppression for some student groups	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
The education system is guilty of maintaining injustices for some student groups	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I am aware of the statistics of dropout rates among ethnic minority students	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007);Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I know who of my students are living in poverty conditions	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Most schools conduct themselves fairly when identifying punishments for students' behavior infractions	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I believe a student's academic achievement is a result of his/her effort	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I am aware of my power and privilege in society	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007)
I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in urban schools*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Constantine (2007)
I am familiar with neighborhood-related issues that my students deal with**	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)

There are differences in financial distributions to urban versus suburban schools *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Knowledge of unique needs/risks for specific populations		
I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Constantine (2007)
Students are treated fairly regardless of race or sexual orientation	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I am aware of current sociopolitical events that may influence some of my students' lives (i.e. immigration laws, same-sex marriage rights)	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Constantine (2007)
There are unique injustices experienced by children of color**	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
LGBT students do not experience extra discrimination in school*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
LGBT-students are not at greater risk for lower education aspirations than non LGBT students	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Students with disabilities are not at greater risk for dropout from high school than other students	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)

I believe some groups of students (i.e. LGBT, students living in poverty) receive inadequate amounts of adult support in their lives.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Empowering students to be Change agents/acting with student (behaviors)		
I encourage students to question authority *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society. *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I teach students to speak up for their rights. *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I empower my students to overcome adversity *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I make students aware of social and political issues	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
When class readings under represent groups, I encourage students to discuss the implications of this	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
Commitment/Sense of responsibility to ensure equal rights in school/society (attitudes)		
It is my job to ensure that my students have equitable experiences*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
It is my responsibility to		Allen (1997); Constantine

advocate for the wellbeing of my underprivileged students *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	(2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
As an educator, it is my job to challenge systems I feel disenfranchise students *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I believe in working cooperatively with parents to better students' ability to learn*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Bemak & Chung (2005);Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Allen (1997); Bemak & Chung (2005); Constantine (2007); Duncan-Andrade (2005); Russell (2009)
It is the school counselor(s)' responsibility to improve inequities in the school.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
It is a social worker's responsibility to improve the lives of vulnerable students	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I have too many responsibilities in the classroom to provide extra outreach	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I am responsible for my students' success outside of the classroom	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
Representing underprivileged students/acting on behalf of student (behaviors)		
I work with local neighborhoods to improve neighborhood safety for my students.*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)

When needed, I send letters to local politicians regarding my students' unmet needs**	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students**	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I attempt to form partnerships with business, political, religious, or police department leaders to tackle student injustices	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I organize out of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support system. *	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I campaign for social change for my underrepresented students*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009)
I organize food drives to help students living in poverty.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
Taking Advocacy Action within school (behaviors)		
I speak up at faculty meetings about the needs of certain underprivileged students **	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005)
I donate supplies (pencils, backpacks, lunchboxes) for our students from low SES backgrounds	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I work with school administration to better students' learning environment.*	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005)
	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree,	

I meet one-on-one with refugee/immigrant parents to facilitate their children's adjustment	3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Constantine (2007); Gallagher & Clifford (2000); Herrera & Murry (1999; 2005); Holmes & Herrera (2009); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005)
I am not comfortable challenging school administrators if I feel they are promoting unequal practices for students.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005)
When needed, I help LGBT students identify ways to protect themselves from bullies	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I have implemented after-school activities for at-risk students at my school.**	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I collaborate with the school counselor(s) to address oppressive issues in the school	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)
I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curriculum.	1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat agree, 4=Agree, 5= Strongly agree	Bemak & Chung (2005); Lewis et al. (2003); Ratts et al. (2007)

*Indicates an item retained from the original TSJAS

**Indicates an item retained from the original TSJAS that did not load onto original factor structure

APPENDIX B

Measures Used in Dissertation

Original Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale (TSJAS; in order presented to participants)

Please indicate your level of agreement to each item, based on the scale provided

Strongly Disagree					Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	

1. I teach my students how to overcome adversity.
2. I work with local neighborhoods to improve neighborhoods safety for my students.
3. I encourage students to question authority.
4. I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.
5. I make students aware of social and political issues.
6. I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments.
7. I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students.
8. It is my responsibility to advocate for the well-being of my underprivileged students.
9. I believe a student's academic achievement is a result of his/her effort.
10. It is my job to ensure that students have equal experiences in the school environment.
11. I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.
12. I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society.
13. I often participate in community activities to help children living in poverty.
14. I am aware of my own power and privilege in society.
15. I meet one-on-one with refugee parents to facilitate their child's adjustment.
16. I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students.
17. It is the responsibility of the school counselor(s) to address inequities in the school.
18. I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences.
19. I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families.

Please indicate your level of agreement to each item, based on the scale provided

**Strongly
Disagree**

1

2

3

4

**Strongly
agree**

5

20. I work with the school administration (i.e., principal, superintendent, etc). to better students' learning environments.

21. Students are treated fairly by others regardless of race or sexual orientation.

22. As an educator, it is my job to challenge systems that disenfranchise students.

23. The education system often perpetuates injustices for underprivileged students.

24. I am aware of the dropout rates of ethnic minority students.

25. I teach students to speak up for their rights.

26. I am not comfortable challenging school administrators if they are promoting unequal practices for students.

27. There are unique injustices experienced by children of color.

28. I know whether my students are living in poverty conditions.

29. Most schools are fair when identifying punishments for students' misbehavior.

30. It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support.

31. I believe in working cooperatively with parents to better students' learning.

32. I participate in political campaigns to improve conditions for underrepresented students in schools.

33. I organize out-of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support systems.

34. I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in poorer schools.

Please indicate your level of agreement to each item, based on the scale provided

**Strongly
Disagree**

1

2

3

4

**Strongly
agree**

5

35. I help lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students identify ways to protect themselves from bullies.

36. I collaborate with the school counselors to address oppressive issues in the school.

37. I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.

38. There are differences in financial distributions to urban versus suburban schools.

39. I am aware of current sociopolitical events that may influence some of my students' lives.

40. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students do not experience extra discrimination in school.

41. Students with disabilities are not at high risk for dropout from high school.

42. It is the responsibility of a social worker to improve the lives of at-risk students.

43. I help develop anti-harassment and bullying education programs for classrooms.

44. Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities.

45. I speak up at school meetings about the needs of underprivileged students.

46. Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender students generally do not differ from non-LGBT students in terms of educational aspirations.

47. I have too many responsibilities in the classroom to provide extra outreach.

48. I send letters to local politicians regarding my students' unmet needs.

Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS)

Political and Social Awareness Subscale (PSA)

This questionnaire is intended to evaluate attitudes towards advocacy. Advocacy is defined as actively supporting something such as a cause, idea, or policy. Please note that the questions below sometimes refer to your personal advocacy and other times to your professional advocacy.

Please rate the following items according to the scale below. Circle the responding code that most clearly reflects your opinions and experiences.

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree

1. I meet with policymakers (e.g. City council, State and Federal legislators, local elected officials) to advocate for social issues.
2. I make telephone calls to policymakers to voice my opinion on certain social issues that are personally important to me.
3. I participate in demonstrations or rallies about social issues that are important to me.
4. I make financial contributions to political causes or candidates who support the values of my profession.
5. I volunteer for political causes and candidates I believe in.
6. I participate in demonstrations or rallies about social issues that are important to my profession.
7. I make telephone calls to policymakers to voice my opinion on issues that impact my profession.
8. I make financial contributions to political causes or candidates who support the values of my profession.
9. I use letter or email to influence others through the media regarding issues that affect my profession.
10. I volunteer for political causes and candidates that support the values of my profession.

Political Involvement Scale

Response options: **1** = none **2** = very little **3** = some **4** = quite a bit **5** = a great deal

1. In general, how much interest do you have in politics?
2. In general, how much do you discuss politics with your family and friends?
3. How much interest do you have in the upcoming presidential election?
4. How much interest do you have in the upcoming congressional election?
5. I follow political campaigns.
6. I research political candidates.

The Global Belief in a Just World Scale

Indicate your level of agreement with respect to how well the statements apply to your beliefs about others and yourself.

1 = strong disagreement 2 = disagreement 3 = slight disagreement 4 = slight agreement 5 = agreement 6 = strong agreement

1. I feel that people get what they are entitled to have.
2. I feel that a person's efforts are noticed and rewarded
3. I feel that people earn the rewards and punishments they get.
4. I feel that people who meet with misfortune have brought it on themselves.
5. I feel that people get what they deserve.
6. I feel that rewards and punishments are fairly given.
7. I basically feel that the world is a fair place.

Demographic Form

Please fill in or circle your responses to all of the following statements:

1. Race/Ethnicity:

- (a) Caucasian/European American
- (b) Black/African American
- (c) American Indian/Alaskan Native
- (d) Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
- (e) Latino(a)/Hispanic/Chicano
- (f) Middle Eastern
- (g) International/Non-US Citizen
- (h) Biracial/Multiracial
- (j) Other: _____

2. Sex: (a) Female (b) Male (c) Other: _____

3. Age: _____

4. Sexual Orientation Identification:

- (a) Heterosexual
- (b) Gay
- (c) Lesbian
- (d) Bisexual
- (e) Transgender
- (f) Other: _____

5. Highest Degree Obtained

- (a) High school Diploma
- (b) Associate of Arts Degree
- (c) Bachelor of Arts and Science in Education
- (d) Bachelor of Arts and Science
- (e) Master of Arts or Science
- (f) Education Specialist
- (g) PhD
- (h) Other: _____

6. Total Years of Teaching Experience

- (a) less than a year
- (b) 1-3 years
- (c) 4-7 years
- (d) 7-10 years
- (e) 10-15 years
- (f) 15+ years

7. Please describe the area your school currently serves

- (a) Urban area
- (b) Suburban area
- (c) Rural area

8. Please describe the school system you are currently serving

- (a) Public school
- (b) Private School
- (c) charter school

8. To the best of your knowledge, please describe the overall racial/ethnic breakdown of the students in your school

- (a) primarily Caucasian/white
- (b) primarily African American
- (c) primarily Latino/a/Hispanic
- (d) primarily other ethnic minority
- (e) Evenly split ethnically
- (f) Other: _____

8. To the best of your knowledge, please describe the overall socioeconomic status of the students served in your school:

- (a) below lower class
- (b) lower class
- (c) lower middle class
- (d) middle class
- (e) upper middle class
- (f) upper class

9. Please mark one to describe your political orientation

- (a) Far Right
- (b) Conservative
- (c) Middle of the road
- (d) Liberal
- (e) Far left
- (f) none

10. Please rate your training program's level of emphasis on social advocacy competency

- (a) None at all
- (b) Very little emphasis
- (c) some emphasis
- (d) very much emphasis

APPENDIX C

Final TSJAS Items and Subscales after Factor Analyses

The Teacher Social Justice Advocacy Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement to each item, based on the scale below.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	Strongly disagree	disagree	somewhat Agree	agree	strongly agree	
1. I encourage students to question authority.						<i>(Student Empowerment Subscale; SE)</i>
2. I do in-class activities where students learn about social justice.						<i>(Student Empowerment Subscale; SE)</i>
3. I make students aware of social and political issues.						<i>(Student Empowerment Subscale; SE)</i>
4. I believe in working cooperatively with neighborhoods to better students' environments.						<i>(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)</i>
5. I try to increase public awareness of the educational needs of vulnerable students.						<i>(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)</i>
6. It is my responsibility to advocate for the well-being of my underprivileged students.						<i>(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)</i>
7. I donate school supplies to the school for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.						<i>(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)</i>
8. I teach my students to become aware of injustices occurring in society.						<i>(Student Empowerment Subscale; SE)</i>

9. I often participate in community activities to help children living in poverty. *(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)*
10. I meet one-on-one with refugee parents to facilitate their child's adjustment.
11. I openly challenge school interventions that are unfair for some groups of students. *(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)*
12. I am aware of how socio-economic status affects students' experiences. *(Social Justice Awareness; SJA)*
13. I am aware of the struggles faced by limited English speaking students and their families. *(Social Justice Awareness; SJA)*
14. I am aware of the dropout rates of ethnic minority students. *(Social Justice Awareness; SJA)*
15. I teach students to speak up for their rights. *(Student Empowerment Subscale; SE)*
16. It is my responsibility to work in school settings where students may be in need of extra support. *(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)*
17. I organize out of-classroom activities or programs to strengthen students' support systems. *(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)*

18. I am aware of possible disadvantages to students in poorer schools.

(Social Justice Awareness; SJA)

19. I collaborate with the school counselor(s) to address oppressive issues in the school.

(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)

20. I collaborate with other teachers to include culturally diverse literature in our curricula.

22. Refugee parents may miss opportunities to become involved in school-related activities.

(Teacher Advocacy Orientation; TAO)

(Social Justice Awareness; SJA)

APPENDIX D

MANOVA AND ANOVA Results

Table 10

MANOVA of Effects of Participants' Race/Ethnicity on TAO, SJA, and SE Subscale Scores

Source	<i>df</i>	F	<i>p</i>	η^2
Intercept	1	4294.86	.00	0.96
Race/Ethnicity	1	2.01	.11	0.01

Note. Ethnic Minority ($N = 69$), Caucasian ($N = 535$). Hotelling's Trace F value was used in analyses.

Table 11

MANOVA with Equal Sample Sizes of Effects of Participants' Race/Ethnicity on TAO, SJA, and SE subscale Scores

Source	<i>df</i>	F	<i>p</i>	η^2
Intercept	1	1960.71	.00	.98
Race/Ethnicity	1	1.04	.38	.02

Note. Ethnic Minority ($N = 69$), Caucasian ($N = 69$). Hotelling's Trace F value was used in analyses.

Table 12

MANOVA of Effects of Participants' Sexual Orientation on TAO, SJA, and SE Subscale Scores

Source	<i>df</i>	F	<i>p</i>	η^2
Intercept	1	1189.45	.00	.86
Sexual Orientation	1	1.69	.17	.01

Note. Sexual Orientation Minority ($N = 18$), Heterosexual ($N = 585$). Hotelling's Trace F value was used in analyses.

Table 13

MANOVA with Equal Sample Sizes of Effects of Participants' Sexual Orientation on TAO, SJA, and SE Subscale Scores

Source	<i>df</i>	F	<i>p</i>	η^2
Intercept	1	532.54	.00	.98
Sexual Orientation	1	1.76	.18	.14

Note. Sexual Orientation Minority ($N = 18$), Heterosexual ($N = 18$). Hotelling's Trace F value was used in analyses.

Table 14

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Gender on Teacher Advocacy Orientation subscale (TAO)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	<i>p</i>	Observed Power
Gender	394.70	1	394.70	6.57	.01	.01	.72
Error	36296.71	604	60.09				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 15

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Gender on Social Justice Advocacy subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	<i>p</i>	Observed Power
Gender	36.85	1	36.85	4.28	.00	0.04	0.54
Error	5200.6	604	8.61				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 16

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Gender on Student Empowerment subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	<i>p</i>	Observed Power
Gender	16.19	1	16.119	1.10	.00	.29	.18
Error	8838.70	604	14.63				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 17

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Area on Teacher Advocacy Orientation subscale (TAO)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Area	469.76	2	234.88	3.47	.01	.05	.78
Error	39966.68	591	67.63				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 18

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Area on Social Justice Awareness subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Area	39.74	2	19.86	2.32	.00	.10	.47
Error	5055.66	591	8.55				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 19

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Area on Student Empowerment subscale (SE)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Area	24.22	2	12.11	.83	.00	.44	.19
Error	8579.59	531	14.52				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 20

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Type on Teacher Advocacy Orientation (TAO)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Type	157.78	3	52.59	.86	.00	.46	.24
Error	36472.68	599	60.89				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 21

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Type on Social Justice Awareness Subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Type	79.36	3	26.45	3.09	.01	.03	.24
Error	5120.67	599	8.55				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 22

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of School Type on Student Empowerment Subscale (SE)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
School Type	11.77	3	3.92	.266	.00	.85	.10
Error	8845.47	599	14.77				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 23

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Race on Teacher Advocacy Orientation Subscale (TAO)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student Race	738.30	4	184.58	2.23	.01	.06	.59
Error	49158.96	596	82.48				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 24

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Race on Social Justice Awareness Subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student Race	94.35	4	23.59	2.76	.02	.03	.76
Error	5099.77	596	8.56				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 25

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Race on Student Empowerment Subscale (SE)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student Race	52.17	4	13.04	.89	.01	.47	.28
Error	8777.33	596	14.73				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 26

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Socioeconomic Status on Teacher Advocacy Orientation Subscale (TAO)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student SES	1257.66	5	251.53	2.31	.01	.06	.54
Error	65466.41	601	108.93				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 27

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Socioeconomic Status on Social Justice Awareness Subscale (SJA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student SES	183.07	5	36.61	.62	.005	.65	.22
Error	35466.41	601	59.01				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

Table 28

ANOVA of Between-Subjects Differences of Student Socioeconomic Status on Student Empowerment Subscale (SE)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	η^2	p	Observed Power
Student SES	50.47	5	10.09	.69	.006	.63	.25
Error	8846.44	601	14.72				

Note. Computed using alpha = .003

APPENDIX E

Solicitation and Informed Consent Email

Consent for Participation in a Research Study

*TEACHER SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY FOR CHILDREN:
A SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND PRELIMINARY VALIDITY STUDY
Principal Investigator: Danah Barazanji, M.A.*

You are invited to participate in a study that seeks to understand teachers' orientation and opinions towards social justice advocacy and factors that might be related to such an orientation. This research is for my dissertation, under advisement of Dr. Johanna Nilsson, PhD and has been approved by the University of Missouri-Kansas City Institutional Review Board (*Protocol Number here*). If you are currently a teacher in any type of school setting and have proficiency in English, you are eligible to participate in this study. The content of the survey questionnaires should cause no discomfort and has no foreseen risks to you as a participant. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us better understand the attitudes and behaviors of teachers in our education system.

As part of the current study, you will be asked to complete the following on-line survey packet, which includes a demographic questionnaire, and four short measures, which should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose to not participate or to withdraw your participation at any time. Deciding not to participate or choosing to leave the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. If you decide to leave the study the information you have already provided may be used in data analysis. The alternative to participating in this study is to choose to not to participate.

If you choose to complete this questionnaire, you can be entered into a raffle for one of eight \$25 gift certificates to either Barnes and Noble or Amazon.com. A link will be provided, after the survey, for you to enter your preferred mailing address and name for the chance to win one of these gift certificates. You may choose which raffle you'd like to be entered into (Amazon or Barnes and Noble). This information you provide will in no way be connected to the survey item responses and all the collected data will be kept confidential in a secure computer web-based survey program. It is important to remind you that if you wish to voluntarily withdraw from the study, you will forfeit your chance of being selected in the raffle for the eight gift certificates.

While every effort will be made to maintain confidentiality of all the information you complete and share, it cannot be absolutely guaranteed. Individuals from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies), Research Protections Program, and Federal regulatory agencies may look at records related to this study in the event that they need to ensure quality improvement and regulatory functions.

The University of Missouri-Kansas City appreciates the participation of people who help it carry out its function of developing knowledge through research. If you have any questions regarding this study, you are encouraged to email Danah Barazanji at dmb4zc@mail.umkc.edu. Although it is not the University's policy to compensate or provide medical treatment for persons who

participate in studies, if you feel that you have been injured as a result of participating in this study, please call the IRB Administrator of UMKC's Social Sciences Institutional Review Board at (816) 235-1764.

By clicking on the "submit form" icon below, your consent for participation in the current online survey is inferred. If you do NOT wish to participate in this study, please decline participation by closing the window. Thank you for your time, support, and assistance.

Principal Investigator:

Danah Barazani, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110
Dmb4zc@mail.umkc.edu

Dissertation Chair:

Johanna E. Nilsson, Ph.D
Training Director, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110
nilssonj@umkc.edu
816-235-2484

The "submit form" icon placed here

APPENDIX F

Solicitation Email for Permission to Submit Survey on Website

Solicitation Email for Website or List-serv Permission

To Whom It May Concern:

I know that your time is extremely valuable and I appreciate your consideration. I am currently conducting a study for my dissertation (under the advisement of Dr. Johanna Nilsson, PhD at the University of Missouri-Kansas City) that examines teachers' orientation towards social justice advocacy and the factors that might be related to this orientation. All teachers who have had some experiences working with children in any type of school setting are eligible to participate in this study.

This study has been approved by my university's institutional review board (*approval protocol # here*). **I respectfully request your permission to recruit participants via your state-level association of teachers in whatever way that is most convenient or appropriate for your association.** Participation involves completion of an online survey that should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete and participation is entirely voluntary and confidential; participants will have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Each participant who completes the study will have the opportunity to win one of eight \$25.00 gift certificates to the place of his or her choice (Barnes and Noble or Amazon.com).

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me by phone or email and we can discuss your concerns. Or, you may contact my dissertation chair.

Respectfully,

Principal Investigator:

Danah Barazanji, M.A.

Doctoral Candidate, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Kansas City, MO 64110

Dmb4zc@mail.umkc.edu

515-480-4121

Dissertation Chair:

Johanna E. Nilsson, Ph.D

Training Director, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Kansas City, MO 64110

nilssonj@umkc.edu

816-235-2484

APPENDIX G

On-line Incentive Form

Compensation: Raffle Directions Form

After participants complete the survey, they are routed to this on-line incentive form:

Thank you so much for completing the survey!

You are now eligible to be entered into a drawing for one of eight \$25 gift certificates. Please click on the link below (or cut and paste it into a new browser) to enter your mailing address for the chance to win a gift certificate to the place of your choice (Barnes and Noble or Amazon.com). To ensure confidentiality, I ask that you do not include any other identifying information. Please note that this information cannot be linked to your survey responses in any way and your address information will be destroyed at the conclusion of this raffle.

When data collection is completed the drawings will be conducted. If your address is chosen, you will receive a gift certificate in the mail in an envelope addressed to “Research Study Participant”. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this reimbursement process.

Sincerely,

Danah Barazanji, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate, Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110
Dmb4zc@mail.umkc.edu

Here is the link: *This is where link will be provided*

Teacher Advocacy Study Raffle Information

In the space below please provide your preferred mailing address to participate in the raffle. This information will not be linked to your survey responses in order to protect your confidentiality.

- 1) Please type your mailing address
- 2) Please re-type or mailing address
- 3) Please click on your preference of gift certificate: Barnes and Noble Amazon.com

Thank you again for your participation!

APPENDIX H

Permission to Use Instruments

Permission to use Political Involvement Measure

From: Bernstein, Arla [Arla.Bernstein@gpc.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2011 8:43 AM
To: Barazanji, Danah M. (UMKC-Student)
Subject: RE: Permission to use your scale

Yes, as long as you cite my article.

Arla G. Bernstein, Ph.D.
Department of Humanities
Dunwoody Campus
770 274 5524

Dr. Bernstein,

Hello there, I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri- Kansas City currently working on my dissertation proposal which is focused on developing a measure of social justice advocacy orientation among teachers. I am interested in examining preliminary evidence of validity of my scale by exploring its correlations with variables that have been associated with advocacy efforts; one of which is political engagement. After reviewing the literature on political involvement, I would love to include your designed questionnaire that you used in your article, "Gendered characteristics of political engagement in college students". I also know a fellow student-colleague of mine used your scale and found interesting results! So, I am asking to request permission to include the political engagement questionnaire in my study.

I appreciate your consideration of this request. If you are interested, I would be more than happy to send along my findings based on the items of your

scale after I have completed analyzing my data.
Thanks again!

Danah Barazanji Brown, MA
Counseling Psychology Doctoral Candidate
Empowerment Program Coordinator
University of Missouri-Kansas City
School of Education

Permission to use the SIAS-PSA subscale

from Nilsson, Johanna E. <NilssonJ@umkc.edu>
to danah barazanji <danah.barazanji@gmail.com>
date Thu, Feb 24, 2011 at 10:06 AM
subject RE: IRB
mailed-by umkc.edu

With this email, I confirm that you can use SIAS for your dissertation.

Johanna

Permission to use the Global Belief in a Just World Scale

From: Isaac Lipkus [<mailto:lipku001@mc.duke.edu>]
Sent: Tue 11/16/10 11:39 AM
To: Barazanji, Danah M. (UMKC-Student)
Subject: Re: Global Belief in a Just World Scale

My scale is publicly available, so use it as you see fit.

Good luck,
Isaac

References

- Achinstein, B., & Athanases, S. Z. (2005). Focusing new teachers on diversity and equity: Toward a knowledge base for mentors. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An international journal of research and studies*, 21(7), 843-862.
- Allen, A. (1997). Creating space for discussion about justice and equity in an elementary classroom. *Language Arts*, 74(7), 518-524.
- Arrendondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Jones, L., Locke, D., & Sanchez, J. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 24, 42-78.
- Athanases, S. Z., & Larrabee, T. G. (2003). Toward a consistence stance in teaching for equity: learning to advocate for lesbian-and gay-identified youth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 237-261.
- Attar, B. K., & Guerra, N. G., & Tolan, P. H. (1994). Neighborhood disadvantage, stressful life events and adjustments in urban elementary-school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 23(4), 391-400.
- Attwood, T. (2006). *The complete guide to Asperger's Syndrome*. Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Barazanji, D., & Nilsson, J. E. (2008). Teacher Social Justice Advocacy: The initial development of items and exploration of internal consistency and validity. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Missouri-Kansas City.
- Barazanji, D., Nilsson, J. E., Heintzelman, A., Siddiqi, M., & Shilla, Y. (2008). *Mental health in the United States: Perspectives of Somali women*. Paper presented at the the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.

- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 196-202.
- Bernstein, A. G. (2005). Gendered characteristics of political engagement in college students. *Sex Roles, 52*(5), 299-310.
- Bhui, K., Abdi, A., Abdi, M., Pereira, S., Dualeh, M., & D.Robertson. (2003). Traumatic events, migration characteristics and psychiatric symptoms among Somali refugees: Preliminary communication. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 38*, 44-48.
- Bhui, K., Craig, T., Mohamud, S., Warfa, N., Stansfeld, S. A., & Thornicroft, G. (2006). Mental disorders among Somali refugees: Developing culturally appropriate measures and assessing socio-cultural risk factors. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology 41*, 400-408.
- Binstock, K. H., & Day, C. L. (1996). Aging in politics. In R. H. Binstock & L. K. George (Eds.), *Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bo, I. (1994). The sociocultural environment as a source of support. In I. F. Nestmann & K. Hurrelmann (Eds.), *Social networks and social support in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 363–384). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bowen, N. K., & Bowen, G. L. (1999). Effects of crime and violence in neighborhoods and schools on school behavior and performance of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*, 319-342.
- Brabeck, M., Walsh, M. E., Kenny, M., & Comilang, K. (1997). Interprofessional collaboration for children and families: Opportunities for counseling psychology in the 21st century. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 615-636.

- Bryant, F. B., & Yarnold, P. R. (2000). Principal-Components Analysis and Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In L. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate analysis* (pp. 90-136). Washington D.C.: APA Press.
- Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(3), 209-224.
- Catapano, S. (2006). Teaching in urban schools: Mentoring pre-service teachers to apply advocacy strategies. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 14*, 81-96.
- Chung, R. C., Bemak, F., & Wong, S. (2000). Vietnamese refugees' levels of distress, social support and acculturation: Implication for mental health counseling. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 22*, 150-161.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309-319.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color Blindness and Basket Making Are Not the Answers: Confronting the Dilemmas of Race, Culture, and Language Diversity in Teacher Education. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 493-522.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004a). Defining the outcomes of teacher education: what's social justice got to do with it? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 193-212.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004b). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education, 115*(3).

- Cole, E. R., & Stewart, A. J. (1996). Meanings of political participation among black and white women: Political identity and social responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 130-140.
- Constantine, M. G., Hage, S. M., Kindaichi, M. M., & Bryant, R. M. (2007). Social justice and multicultural issues: Implications for the practice and training of counselors and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 85*(1), 24-29.
- Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology, 23*, 703-726.
- Costello, A., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*(7), 1-9.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297-334.
- DeVellis, R. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R. (2005). Developing social justice educators. *Educational Leadership, 62*(6), 70-73.
- Evans, G. W. (2004). The environment of childhood poverty. *The American Psychologist, 59*(2), 77-92.
- Fendrich, J. M., & Lovoy, K. L. (1988). Back to the future: Adult political behavior of former student activists. *American Sociological Review, 53*, 780-784.
- Fibkins, W. L. (2005). *Students in trouble*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Education.

- Field, A. F. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Field, J. E., & Baker, S. (2004). Defining and Examining School Counselor Advocacy. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(1), 56-63.
- Fouad, N. A., Gerstein, L. H., & Toporek, R. (2006). Social justice and counseling psychology in context. In R. Toporek, L. Gerstein, N. Fouad, G. Roysircar & T. Israel (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fouad, N. A., H.McPherson, R., Gerstein, L., Blustein, D. L., Elman, N., Helledy, K. I., et al. (2004). Houston, 2001: Context and legacy. *Counseling Psychologist, 31*(1), 15-77.
- Frieden, L. (2004). Improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Retrieved May 20, 2010 from <http://www.ncd.gov/newsroom/publications/2004/educationoutcomes.htm>
- Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(5), 795-817.
- Furnham, A., & Procter, E. (1988). *The multi-dimensional just world belief scale*. London University: Mimeograph.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Gallagher, J., & Clifford, R. (2000). The missing infrastructure in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research and Practice, 2*(1), 1-29.
- Garmon, M. A. (1996). How prospective teachers' racial attitudes mediate what they learn from a course on diversity. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(9), 3896A

- Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(3), 201-213.
- Garmon, M. A. (2005). Six key factors for changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity. *Education Studies*, 38(3), 275-286.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Grayson, D. (2004). Some myths and legends in quantitative psychology. *Understanding Statistics*, 3(1), 101-134.
- Greenlee, B. J., & DeDeugd, I. S. (2002). From hope to despair: The need for beginning teacher advocacy. *Teacher Development*, 6(1), 63-73.
- Guerin, B., Guerin, P., Dilriye, R. O., & Yates, S. (2004). Somali conceptions and expectations concerning mental health: Some guidelines for mental health professionals. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33, 59-67.
- Heptinstall, E., Sethna, V., & Taylor, E. (2004). PTSD and depression in refugee children: Associations with pre-migration trauma and post-migration stress. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 13, 373-380.
- Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (1999). In the aftermath of Unz. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23(2-3), 113-132.
- Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: Differentiated instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Holmes, M. A., & Herrera, S. G. (2009). Enhancing advocacy skills of teacher candidates. *Teaching Education*, 20(2), 203-213.

- House, R. M., & Martin, P. J. (1998). Advocating for better futures for all students: A new vision for school counselors. *Education, 119*(2), 1-8.
- Ingersoll, R., & Merrill, L. (2010). Who's teaching our children? *Educational Leadership, 67*(8), 14-20.
- Ivey, A. E., & Collins, N. M. (2003). Social justice: A long-term challenge for counseling psychology. *The counseling psychologist, 31*(3), 290-298.
- Jennings, M. K., & Markus, G. B. (1988). Political involvement in the later years: A longitudinal survey. *American Journal of Political Science, 32*(2), 302-316.
- Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 40*(3), 208-230.
- Kiselica, M. S., & Robinson, M. (2001). Bringing advocacy counseling to life: The history, issues, and human dramas of social justice work in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 387-397.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Knitzer, J., Steinberg, Z., & Fleisch, B. (1991). Schools, children's mental health, and the advocacy challenge. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 20*(1), 102-111.
- Kosciw, J. G., Diaz, E. M., & Greytak, E. A. (2008). *The 2007 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth in our nation's school*. New York: Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lane, S., Lacefield-Parachini, N., & Isken, J. (2003). Developing novice teachers as change agents: Student teacher placements “against the grain”. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(2), 55-68.
- Lee, C. (1997). *Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lee, D., & Lim, H. (2008). Scale construction. In P. P. Heppner, B. E. Wampold & D. M. Kivlighan (Eds.), *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Lerner, M. J. (1971). Observer’s evaluation of a victim: Justice, guilt, and veridical perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 20, 127-135.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lewis, Arnold, M. S., House, R., & Toporek, R. (2003). Advocacy competencies. Retrieved February 26, 2010, from <http://www.counseling.org/Publications>
- Lewis, J., & Bradley, L. (2000). *Advocacy in Counseling: Counselors, Clients, & Community*: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services.
- Lewis, J. A., Lewis, M. D., Daniels, J., & D’Andrea, M. J. (1998). *Community counseling: Empowerment strategies in a diverse society*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Linnemeyer, R. (2009). Social justice advocacy among graduate students: An empirical investigation. . Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Missouri-Kansas City.

- Linnemeyer, R., Hansen, L., Bahner, A., & J. E. Nilsson, J. E. (2005). *Integrating social justice and multicultural competence: the Social Advocacy Scale*. Paper presented at the the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 1171-1178.
- Lynn, M., & Smith-Maddox, R. (2007). Preservice teacher inquiry: Creating a space to dialogue about becoming a social justice educator. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 94-105.
- Marshall, C. (2004). social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly 40*(3), 3-13.
- Marshall, G., Schell, T. L., Elliott, M. N., Berthold, S., & Chun, C. (2005). Mental health of Cambodian refugees two decades after resettlement in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 294*, 571-579.
- McCabe, P. C., & Rubinson, F. (2008). Committing to social justice: The behavioral intention of school psychology and education trainees to advocate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered youth. *School Psychology Review, 37*(4), 469-486.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 111-138.
- Miller, M. J., Sendrowitz, K., Connacher, C., Blanco, S., Pena, C. M. d. l., Bernardi, S., et al. (2009). College students' social justice interest and commitment: A social-cognitive perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(4), 495-507.

- Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447-454.
- Milner, R. H. (2006). Preservice teachers' learning about cultural and racial diversity: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education, 41*(4), p.343-375.
- Moule, J. (2005). Implementing a social justice perspective in teacher education: Invisible burden for faculty of color. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(4), 23-42.
- National Association of School Psychologists (2000). Standards for training and field placement programs in school psychology. Retrieved on October 5, 2010 from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=tMFr0gOCa5c%3D&tabid=676>.
- National Center for Education Statistics, (2009a). Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2008. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on May 20, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009022>.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009b). Student effort and educational progress: Elementary/Secondary persistence and progress. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on May 20, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/#/>.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2003). Digest of education statistics, 2002. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on September 3, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003060b.pdf>
- National Education Association (2003). Status of the American public school teacher 2000-2001: Highlights. Retrieved on September 4, 2010 from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/statushighlights.pdf>

- NCATF. (2006). Who will teach? Experience matters. Retrieved on May 109, 2010 from <http://www.nctaf.org/WhoWillTeachExperienceMatters.htm>.
- Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 15, 263-280.
- Nilsson, J. E., Linnemeyer, R., Bahner, A., & Hansen, L. (2007). *Scale development and validation of a social issue advocacy scale*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Nilsson, J. E., Marszalek, J. M., Linnemeyer, R., Bahner, A., & Hansen, L. (2011). Development and assessment of the social issues advocacy scale (SIAS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 71(1), 258-275.
- Nilsson, J. E., & Schmidt, C. (2005). Social justice advocacy among graduate students in counseling: An initial exploration. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 267-279.
- Panter, A. T., Swygart, K. A., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Tanaka, J. S. (1997). Factor analytic approaches to personality item-level data. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68(3), 561-589.
- Phillips, P. (1990). A self-advocacy plan for high school students with learning disabilities: A comparative case study analysis of students', teachers', and parents' perceptions of program effects. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 23(8), 466-471.
- Pinterits, J. E., Poteat, P. V., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The white privilege attitudes scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(3), 417-429.
- Pohan, C. A. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity: Uncovering factors leading to multicultural responsiveness. *Equity and excellence in education*, 29(3), 62-69.

- Porter, M., & Haslam, N. (2005). Predisplacement and postdisplacement factors associated with mental health of refugees and internally displaced persons: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 294*, 602-612.
- Ratts, M. J., DeKruyf, L., & Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2007). The ACA advocacy competencies: A social justice advocacy framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(2), 90-97.
- Reisch, M. (2002). Defining social justice in a socially unjust world. *Families in Society: The journal of contemporary Human Services, 83*(4), 343-354.
- Robertson, C., Halcon, L., Savik, K., Johnson, D., Spring, M., & Butcher, J. (2006). Somali and Oromo refugee women: Trauma and associated factors. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 56*, 577-587.
- Rogers, M. R., & O'Bryon, E. C. (2008). Advocating for Social Justice: The Context for Change in School Psychology. *School Psychology Review, 37*(4), 493-498.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1975). *The volunteer subject*. New York: Wiley.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. *Journal of Social Issues, 29*(4), 73-93.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world. *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 65-90.
- Rusch, E. A. (2004). Gender and race in leadership preparation: A constrained discourse. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 14-46.
- Russell, S. (2009). Ten strategies for effective advocacy. *Young Children, 64*(1), 6.
- Sack, W. H. (1998). Multiple forms of stress in refugee and immigrant children. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 7*, 153-167.

- Sack, W. H., Clarke, G. N., & Seeley, J. (1996). Multiple forms of stress in Cambodian adolescent refugees. *Child Development, 67*, 107-116.
- Schwallie-Giddis, P., Maat, M., & Pak, M. (2003). Initiating leadership by introducing and implementing the ASCA National Model. *ASCA Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 170-174.
- Shen, J. (2003). *New teachers' certification status and attrition pattern. A survival analysis using the Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study 1993-97*. Paper presented at the AERA annual meeting.
- Shriberg, D., Bonner, M., Sarr, B. J., Walker, A. M., Hyland, M., & Chester, C. (2008). Social justice through a school psychology lens: Definition and applications. *School Psychology Review, 37*(4), 453-468.
- Smith, T. W. (2006). *Altruism and empathy in America: Trends and correlates*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Speight, S. L., & Vera, E. M. (2004). A social justice agenda: Ready, or not? *Counseling Psychologist, 32*, 109-118.
- Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *Counseling Psychologist, 29*(6), 790-821.
- Sue, D. W., Arrendondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 20*, 64-88.
- Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. E., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E. K., et al. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(45-52).

- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Thomas, G. D. (2001). The dual role of scholar and social change agent: Reflections from tenured African American and Latina faculty. In R. O. Mabokela & A. L. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent Black women scholars in higher education* (pp. 80-91). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Thompson, B. (2008). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Toporek, R. L., Lewis, J., & Crethar, H. C. (2009). Promoting systemic change through the ACA competencies. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 87*(3), 260-268.
- Trusty, J., & Brown, D. (2005). Advocacy competencies for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 259-265.
- U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports (2004). The foreign-born population in the United States: 2003. Retrieved on May 20, 2010 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p20-551.pdf>
- Vansoest, D. (1996). Impact of social work education on student attitudes and behavior concerning oppression. *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*, 191-202.
- Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The counseling psychologist, 31*, 253-272.
- Walter, H. J., Gouze, K., & Lim, K. G. (2006). Teachers' beliefs about mental health needs in inner city elementary schools. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 45*(1), 61-68.
- Weiner, L. (2003). Why is classroom management so vexing for urban teachers? *Theory into*

Practice, 42(4), 305-312.

Williamson, J. B. (1998). Political activism and the aging of the baby boom. *Generations*, 22(1), 55-61.

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6), 806-838.

VITA

Danah Barazanji was born May 3rd, 1984 in Des Moines, IA. She was raised in Nebraska and Iowa and graduated high school in 2002. She went on for her undergraduate training at the University of Iowa in Iowa City and graduated Cum Laude in 2006, with a Bachelors of Arts in psychology. During her undergraduate education, Mrs. Barazanji assisted in cognitive and psychological research examining infant cognitive development as well as adult psychopathology symptoms and comorbidity. In 2006, she continued her education by pursuing a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, working with Dr. Johanna Nilsson, who shared her interest in social justice advocacy as well as immigrant and refugee empowerment. As part of her doctoral research, Mrs. Barazanji conducted two studies examining social advocacy features among pre-service and in-service teachers. She also participated in research regarding predictors of mental health among Vietnamese and Somali refugee women as well as Somali refugees' attitudes and beliefs regarding their children's adjustment and mental health.

During her graduate training, she has had featured writing in a psychology handbook of supervision as well as three published journal articles. She has also been supported by various fellowships, scholarships, and assistantships throughout her education and has presented group and individual research at annual American Psychological Association conferences.

In 2009 Mrs. Barazanji received her Master's in Counseling and Guidance, in route to her Ph.D. She has completed five years of practicum training in various settings including, a community mental health center, university counseling center, inpatient child and adolescent hospital, and veteran's affairs medical center, conducting individual and group therapy with adults and children. Her work has also incorporated cognitive and psychological assessment of

adults and children, and supervision of master's level practicum students. Mrs. Barazanji has also been active in volunteer outreach programming throughout her education and assistantships. Mrs. Barazanji provided ongoing mentorship and support for undergraduate and graduate School of Education students at UMKC for two years as the SOE Life Coach. She also provided outreach programming of self care and mental health psychoeducation for refugee and immigrant women and children over the course of her graduate training.

In 2011 she began her predoctoral internship providing cognitive and psychological assessment as well as individual, group and couples therapy with Veteran populations at the Dwight D. Eisenhower VA Medical Center in Leavenworth, KS. She completed her predoctoral internship as well as her doctoral requirements in July of 2012.