



International Journal of Educational Methodology

Volume 6, Issue 4, 775 - 788.

ISSN: 2469-9632

<https://www.ijem.com/>

The Relationship between Social Justice Leadership, Trust in Principals and Student Motivation

Yener Akman*

Suleyman Demirel University, TURKEY

Received: May 30, 2020 • Revised: August 25, 2020 • Accepted: November 9, 2020

Abstract: Motivation for school is an important concept which influences students' academic, social and cultural development. Leadership behaviours to be displayed by school principals can be thought to affect the network of social relations in school and to support the climate of trust in school for students to develop positive attitudes towards the school. In this context, this paper aims to analyse the correlations between school principals' social justice leadership behaviours, students' trust in school principals and motivation for school. The study group was composed of 762 secondary school students from Altindag district of Ankara. The data were collected with social justice leadership scale, trust in the school principal scale and motivation for the school scale. The data were put to descriptive analysis, correlation analysis and multiple linear regression analysis. The findings demonstrated that students had moderate level of perceptions of school principals' social justice leadership behaviours and trust in school principals and high level of motivation for school. Besides, significant correlations were also found between the variables. Additionally, it was found that social justice leadership predicted significantly trust in school principals and motivation for school. The findings showed that the social justice leadership behaviors of the school principal play a key role on students' motivation and their trust in the principals.

Keywords: *Social justice leadership, trust in principals, student motivation, secondary school.*

To cite this article: Akman, Y. (2020). The Relationship between Social Justice Leadership, Trust in Principals and Student Motivation. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 6(4), 775-788. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.6.4.775>

Introduction

It is apparent that the concept of social justice has been examined in studies in recent years intensely (Berkovich, 2014; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Oplatka, 2010; Özdemir, 2017; Rivera-McCutchen, 2014; Slater et al. 2014; Theoharis, 2007; Zhang et al., 2018). Access to education- a fundamental human right- by every individual and activating the practices which enable individuals' self-development are an unignorable liability. The situation was also guaranteed by international law. Banks (1997) states that the disadvantaged groups (the disabled, women, the poor, etc.) encounter problems in access to education despite this. It is important to put into action the approaches which can observe social justice in educational institutions at micro level According to Bates (2006), educational principals' acting as leaders in social justice is discussed. The social problems that the disadvantaged encounter burden moral responsibility on educational leaders (Selsky, 1991). Sisman (2011) points out that research into leadership today highlights leaders' moral roles and argues that moral responsibility should be given in education -which is an open system. Adams and Coopeland (2005) state that society has complex interaction with the process of education and that school principals are expected to develop policies for the resolution of the complexity. School-centred enterprises are on the increase in the literature (Kundakci et al., 2016).

Examination of approaches to leadership in school makes it clear that student characteristics such as gender, ethnicity and social class have been ignored. The situation can seem that school principals break off from social phenomenon and perform managerial functions in a narrow framework. *Cultural re-production theory* suggested by Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) emphasises that schools contribute to the production of social inequalities, and it points to social justice leadership rather than mainstream leadership approaches (McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). Zembylas (2010) states that the social, economic and political conditions of society are re-produced in schools and thus stresses the importance of social justice.

* **Correspondence:**

Yener Akman, Suleyman Demirel University, Educational Sciences Department, Turkey. ✉ yenerakman@sdu.edu.tr



Social justice leadership appeared in the literature as a remarkable concept in recent years (Oplatka, 2010). Analyses of social justice and leadership was mostly considered in the context of critical approaches (Furman & Gruenewald, 2004). Tillman, Brown, Jones and Gonzalez (2006) point out that there is consensus that social justice leadership in the literature establishes fairer and more equalitarian infrastructure in schools. This situation can indicate that the educational structure in schools do not fully meet the expectations of students with differing characteristics. Dantley and Tillman (2010) define social justice leaders as individuals who identify the problems creating social injustice and who recommend solutions to the problems. Theoharis (2009), on the other hand, states that school principals struggle with injustice by creating an environment of belonging, by promoting students' achievement and by encouraging students to participate and to have new opportunities. The above-mentioned activities can be thought to influence students in positive ways and to increase their commitment to school.

According to Ozdemir and Kutkut (2015), social justice leaders place supporting students, inclusiveness and raising critical awareness into the centre of their behaviours so that students can have access to quality education. It can be said that school principals who are concerned with students' problems, who make students feel their presence, who develop diversity and sharing, who never permit discrimination and who raise awareness of social injustice will become a person who inspires trust in the eyes of the students. That is to say, school principals who behave facilitating access to quality education will inculcate trust in people around them. Ozdemir and Pektas (2017) also claim that social justice leadership affects trust in school environment. In a similar way, Furman (2012) also emphasises that social justice leaders try to create a trust-based environment in schools. It can be said that students' commitment to school, their motivation and performance will increase in a school where trust is dominant. In this context, Daly and Chrispeels (2008) also state that environment of trust is positively correlated to students' performance. The effects of motivation on performance were also emphasised in several studies (Akman, 2018; Jackson & McNamara, 2011; Woessmann, 2011). It appears that there might be significant correlations between trust and motivation.

The studies available in the literature were found to focus mostly on the correlations between various patterns of organisational behaviour (Ozdemir, 2017), the conceptual foundations of social justice leadership (Berkovich, 2014; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; Oplatka, 2010), the feasibility, effectiveness, probable obstacles of social justice leadership programmes (Furman, 2012; Zembylas, 2010), the elimination of the obstacles and on the process of scale development (Zhang et al., 2018). Besides, the studies were generally conducted with the participation of principals and teachers (Berkovich, 2014; Blackmore, 2002; Carlisle et al., 2006; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; Furman, 2012; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Oplatka, 2010; Zembylas, 2010; Zhang et al., 2018). Only a small number of them were found to analyse social justice leadership on the basis of students' views (Özdemir & Kütüküt, 2015; Özdemir, 2017). Thus, it is important to analyse leadership behaviours to be displayed by school principals in creating a school where social justice has been internalised from the perspective of students. It is because students are influenced directly by unequal and unfair approaches in access to education. Moreover, it can also be thought that the school principals who give versatile support to students and who strengthen students' engagement by considering their views important gain trust. It can be predicted that students' academic, social and cultural development will be influenced positively by environments in which there is trust and that their motivation will increase. No studies considering social justice leadership, trust in school principals and student motivation in combination were found in the literature. Therefore, it is believed that analysing the correlations between the three variables will enable school to have a more effective structure.

Social Justice Leadership

It can hardly be said that there is a general definition of the concept of social justice despite the fact that it attracts many researchers attention (Blackmore, 2002; Shields, 2004). According to Rasinsky (1987), social justice is the belief about inequalities caused by social conditions on the disadvantaged groups. Rucinski and Bauch (2006) contend that social justice aims to eliminate social and cultural inequalities available in society. In this regard, Goddard (2007) emphasises that social justice leaders call attention to injustice related to racism, poverty and discrimination; Dantley et al. (2009) state that such leaders consider interpersonal relations and have holistic and moral perspectives. In the context of school, Freire (1990) and Marshall et al. (2010), on the other hand, argue that it is the moral duty of educators to offer all students democratic and equalitarian education. Considering the situation in a moral framework, it can be said that social justice leaders will develop strong commitment to the masses for which they are responsible. Dantley (2008) highlights that school principals who put social justice in the centre have high commitment to their school even though schools have various structural and cultural problems.

According to Chiu (2010), perceptions of inequality affect social solidarity between students. It reduces students' motivation and also increases undesirable student behaviours. As a result, the effectiveness of school is harmed. Apple (2010) claims that inequalities can be hindered in education by implementing the principles of social justice. The researcher also states that schools discuss the problems of social justice in the context of academic achievement, participation, and school atmosphere. Thus, it can be said that solving the above-mentioned problems will serve to establishing social justice in schools. In this context, Carlisle, Jackson and George (2006) also lay emphasis on students' academic and socio-cultural development. In a similar vein, social justice leaders should focus primarily on students'

academic and emotional achievement (Theoharis, 2007). This development responsibility can be considered to be fulfilled by the school principal (Shields, 2004). The inclusive nature of the school will play a role in encouraging the equal participation of disadvantaged students in society (Theoharis, 2007). Besides, Giroux (1992) argues that a school climate in which differences are adopted and respects strengthens social justice. Otherwise, school attendance and academic achievement can be influenced in negative ways. Those hitches can be overcome through multi-cultural education and tolerance for cultural differences (Gaudelli, 2001; Theoharis, 2007).

While the concept of Ozdemir and Kutkut (2015)- in a study conducted with a sample of students- classify the concept into three as support, critical consciousness and inclusion. In the aspect of support, school leaders support the school staff and students multidimensionally. In this context, Theoharis (2007) says that school principals should make active efforts for the development of students' academic and emotional achievement. It was also emphasised that disadvantaged students should be supported with current curricula so that they could have access to quality education (McKenzie et al., 2008). Another aspect is critical consciousness. Here, social justice leaders approach the isolation of the disadvantaged groups in society since they have inclusive perspective. They are aware of social inequalities and they make efforts so that students can also become aware (Brooks & Miles, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008). In the aspect of inclusion, it is stated that all the students in schools should be accepted with their differences, that the differences should be considered as richness and that all the students should be integrated. It is claimed that it will be easier for students to socialise in heterogeneous classes in this way (DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014). A school climate with no discrimination will be developed in this approach (Tomul, 2009).

Trust in School Principals

The concept of trust has been considered as a fundamental element in human interaction throughout history. Considering the fact that humans are the building blocks of organisations, the importance of trust will manifest itself in describing the social structure of organisations. Bottery (2003) stresses that trust is a critical existential need in social and interpersonal relations. It cannot be said that there is a universal definition of the concept due to its multi-faceted and complicated structure even though it has been investigated for a long time. Atkinson and Butcher (2003) attributed the situation to that fact that the concept of trust is shaped with the influence of the internal dynamics of societies. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, p. 189), define trust as "the state of an individual's or a group's eagerness to be defenceless by putting the other side's beliefs about being reliable, honest and open on the basis".

Trust, which plays significant roles in the functioning of schools- as in the functioning of all other organisations, is an element with which care should be taken for organisational effectiveness. The presence of trust-based climate in schools where human interaction is intensive can be thought to facilitate attaining the organisational goals. While all the stakeholders in school contribute to the climate of trust, school principals in particular influence the general school climate and trust (Hoy et al., 2002). In addition to that, researchers also claim that trust in school principals plays key roles in encouraging students' study and achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2017). Some of the experimental studies also point to the fact that trust in school principals is associated with students' achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). Bryk and Schneider (2002) state that interpersonal trust affects students' performance in positive ways. In a similar way, Marshall (2000) also contends that a strong tie is formed in leader-followers relations in which trust is available and the tie facilitates attaining the organisational goals.

Review of literature shows that several studies concerning trust are available (Akar, 2018; Bottery, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tarter et al., 1989; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2017). The majority of the studies were found to be concerned with organisational trust and trust in leaders according to teachers' views. Therefore, analysing the behaviours displayed by school principals- who can be said to play critical roles in developing the climate of trust in schools- from the perspective of students is important.

Student Motivation

Motivation is known as a concept which has significant effects on human behaviours. Several definitions of the concept- which was analysed heavily in the area of organisational behaviour- were offered. While Woolfolk (2007) defines it as an internal state which initiates, directs and maintains behaviours; Kaplan (2007) describes it as the driving energy which makes individuals act. Motivation can be regarded as internal and external power which facilitates individuals' attaining their objectives. It was found that the elements motivating individuals were considered as intrinsic and extrinsic in the literature. The factors which evoke individuals with strong intrinsic motivation were found to stem from individuals' inner world. Such individuals are satisfied with and enjoy the jobs they do. Moral gains such as individual achievement, curiosity and self-respect can be highlighted as the factors of intrinsic motivation in school environment. Instrumental factors such as tangible rewards or incentives are referred to as extrinsic motivation. Such factors as educational methods, technology and the quality of teachers can be thought to motivate students extrinsically. Students were motivated with such concrete variables and thus making them achieve their goals was focused on (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Besides, it was also found in the literature that intrinsic factors leading individuals were stronger and more effective than extrinsic factors (Yazici, 2009).

This study considers students' motivation for school in three elements (commitment to school, performance, and target). The first element, commitment to school (Martin, 2004), is described as students' integration into school and thus their loving school and developing positive feelings for school. Performance (McInerney et al., 2001) is considered as the jobs that students are expected to fulfil successfully in the process of education and instruction. The jobs include academic activities (such as homework and tasks) and having various values (such as responsibility, benevolence, etc.). The element of target (Sage & Kinnderman, 2001), on the other hand, can be regarded as raising academic proficiency, students' establishing social relations with their environment and so on.

The Correlations between Social Justice Leadership, Trust in School Principals and Student Motivation

Social justice leaders would like students to have critical perspectives. The development of a critical perspective can be dependent on the quality of relations between school principals and students. The importance of trust in leaders is referred to in the process of successful transformation in this respect (Hanford, 2011). In a similar way, Tarter et al. (1989) state that school principals will build trust with their supporting behaviours. Besides, school principals are the moral leaders who are responsible for shaping the ethical contexts and environments in society (Johnson, 2004). According to Northouse (2013), trust is an important leadership characteristic which directs individuals towards a joint goal. MacNeil et al. (1998), however, found that trust in leaders raised motivation. Wentzel (1991) stresses that students regard relations of trust as an element of motivation in solving problems.

Leithwood et al. (2010) think that school leaders make modifications to instructional conditions- mainly to the curricula- so as to provide students with appropriate opportunities for learning. The situation can be interpreted as that school leaders have indirect effects on students' learning (Lezotte & McKee, 2006). It is claimed in this context that social justice leaders compensate for disadvantaged students' lacks through rich curricula (McKenzie et al., 2008). Thus, students will enter into a process of effective learning. Educations research has also indicated that student motivation is an important element in effective learning and in students' achievement (Robinson, 2017; Slavin, 2003; Wang & Eccles, 2013). Apart from that, Rutter and Maughen (2002) also argue that feeling of justice affects the psychological and social atmosphere in educational environments in positive ways. In support of this, Latham and Pinder (2005) also claim that there are positive correlations between justice and the concept of motivation- which is directly influenced by individuals' psychology. That is to say, social justice leaders' arguing for diversity with their decisions and their displaying equalitarian mentality can raise students psychology and then their motivation.

Purpose

This study aims to analyse the correlations between social justice leadership, student trust in school principals and student motivation on the basis of students' views. Hence, it seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of social justice leadership behaviours of principals according to the students' perceptions?
2. What is the level of trust in principals according to the students' perception?
3. What is the level of motivation according to the students' perception?
4. What is the relationship between social justice leadership, student trust in principals and student motivation?
5. How is the social justice leadership predictive of student trust in principals and student motivation?

Methodology

This study analyses the correlations between social justice leadership, trust in school principals and motivation for school. It was designed in relational survey model, and it employs quantitative techniques for data analysis. According to Karasar (1994, p.81), "relational survey models aiming to determine the existence of covariance and/or its degree between two or more variables".

The Study Group

The study was conducted with the participation of students who attended the public secondary schools located in Altindag district of Ankara in Turkey. Altindag district has negative values compared to the Ankara average in terms of the socio-economic status of the families and the level of education and high poverty and crime rates (Bektaş & Yücel, 2013; Turkish Statistical Institute, 2019). Therefore, the study group of this research focusing on social justice leadership was chosen from this region. According to the statistics reported by Ankara Provincial Directorate of National Education, 24,169 students attend state secondary schools. The study group was composed of a sample due to the fact that it was impossible to reach all the population. The number of students to be included in the sample was determined according to the table of sample size. Accordingly, it was indicated that a group of 378 students would have the capability to represent the population with error margin of 5% (Cohen et al., 2007). The sample was chosen in random sampling method. Plans were made to send at least 1000 scale to the students by taking the probability of losses in data collection process into consideration, and 762 of them were included in evaluation. It was found on

examining the demographic information on the participants that 395 (51.8%) of the students were female while 367 (48.2%) of them were male. Besides, 136 (17.8%) of them were the fifth graders, 254 (33.3%) were the sixth graders, 194 (25.5%) were the seventh graders and 178 (23.4%) were the eighth graders.

Data Collection Tools

Students' views on school principals' social justice leadership behaviours were measured with "Social Justice Leadership Scale" developed by Ozdemir and Kutkut (2015) in this study. Students' perceptions of trust in school principals, on the other hand, were determined with "Trust in School Principals Scale" developed by Barnes et al. (2003) and adapted into Turkish by Ozer and Atik (2014). In addition to that, students' motivation for school was determined with "Motivation for School Scale" developed by Kaynak et al. (2017). The psychometric properties of the scales used and the results for validity-reliability analysis made for the current data set are presented below.

Social Justice Leadership Scale (SJLS): The students' perceptions of school principals' social justice leadership behaviours were determined with the 24-item, 3-factor (support, critical consciousness, and inclusion), five-pointed Likert type SJLS. The validity of the scale was tested with a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Following the analysis, the goodness of fit values demonstrated that the scale was valid [$\chi^2 = 527.46$; $df = 249$; $\chi^2/df = 2.11$; AGFI = .96; RMSEA = .05; CFI = .96; NFI = .92]. Cronbach's alpha coefficient values showed that the scale was a reliable data collection tool in the study (support: .91; critical consciousness: .92; inclusion: .72, overall scale: .94). The reliability and validity analyses were repeated for the existing data set. Item #1 was removed from the data set since the t-value was found insignificant as a result of the first CFA. The analysis was repeated and correlations were set up between items 4 and 5 by taking recommendations for modification into account. As a result of the CFA done after that, the goodness of fit values were found as $\chi^2 = 987.47$; $df = 229$; $\chi^2/df = 4.31$; AGFI = .86; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .97; NFI = .96. Cronbach's Alpha reliability was found as .88 for support, .87 for critical consciousness, .69 for inclusion and as .93 for the overall scale. Accordingly, the SJLS can be said to be a data collection tool that can be used in the study.

Trust in School Principals Scale (CISDS): The students' perceptions of trust in school principals were determined with the one-factor, 16-item CISDS. Following the CFA, the values of $\chi^2 = 243.67$; $df = 102$; $\chi^2/df = 2.38$; AGFI = .86; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .95 were found. Cronbach's alpha was examined so as to find the reliability of the scale. That the value was found as .95 indicated that the scale reliability was perfect. The above-mentioned analyses were also repeated here. At the end of the first CFA, item #20 was removed (because the t-value was insignificant) and then the analysis was repeated and item #21 was also removed (again due to the fact that the t-value was insignificant), and the analysis was repeated again. As a result, the goodness of fit values were found as: $\chi^2 = 366.42$; $df = 76$; $\chi^2/df = 4.82$; AGFI = .89; RMSEA = .08; CFI = .95; NFI = .94. Cronbach's alpha was calculated as .80. On evaluating the analyses as a whole, the scale was found to be valid and reliable as a tool of data collection.

Motivation for School Scale (MFSS): The scale, which was prepared in 5-point Likert type, was composed of 3 factors (commitment to school, performance, and target) and 14 items. The goodness of fit values found following a CFA indicated that the scale was valid [$\chi^2 = 213.33$; $df = 72$; $\chi^2/df = 2.96$; AGFI = .88; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .95]. Cronbach's alpha was found as .88 for commitment to school, .78 for performance and .90 for target. The values pointed that the MFSS was a reliable scale. The validity and reliability analyses were repeated with the existing data set. Items #4, #5 and #11 were removed from the data set after CFA since the values of standard error were big. After that, correlation was set up between items #2 and #13 with recommendation for modifications. The goodness of fit values found as $\chi^2 = 194.91$; $df = 43$; $\chi^2/df = 4.53$; AGFI = .91; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .97; NFI = .96 indicated the validity of the scale. Cronbach's alpha was found as .88 for commitment to school, .86 for performance and .83 for target. Considering the figures as a whole, it can be said that the MFSS is a valid and reliable scale.

The data in the present study were collected from the same participants through three scales in the same time period. This may cause common method bias (CMB). Podsakoff et al. (2012) pointed out that CMB is one of the main sources of measurement error. In this direction, exploratory factor analysis was used in the study and CMB was examined with Harman's single-factor test. CMB was questioned according to the exploratory factor analysis finding on three scales. According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), a single factor variance of less than 50% is interpreted as no CMB. As a result of the analysis, single factor value (24.74%) indicated that there was no CMB.

Procedures and Data Analysis

The data were collected from 762 students who attended the state secondary schools located in Altindag district of Ankara in 2019-2020 academic year. Eight state secondary schools were chosen at random. The research was carried out in public schools. Because it is thought that the students studying in these schools are more disadvantaged in terms of factors such as socio-economic status, access to education, and poverty. Then, the students were sent the relevant scales digitally or through mobile phones by means of some of the teachers employed in the schools. The 762 scale which were completed and returned were evaluated. Mean and standard deviations were calculated in determining the participants' perceptions of the variables, correlation analysis was done in analysing the correlations between the variables and multiple linear regression analysis was done in determining predictiveness. Primarily, such assumptions

as having normal distribution for the data, having no multicollinearity and no autocorrelation were examined in doing the multi-variable analyses. Skewness and kurtosis values and normality assumption were tested. The skewness and kurtosis values found as -1.47 and 1.01 interval for social justice leadership, -1.09 and .13 interval for trust school principals and -1.39 and .65 interval for motivation for school demonstrated that there was normal distribution. In this context, Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) regard values in the range between -1.5 and 1.5 as indicative of normal distribution. The VIF and tolerance values were calculated for multicollinearity. The VIF and tolerance values were found as 2.67 and .37 for support, 2.56 and .39 for critical consciousness and 1.42 and .70 for inclusion, respectively. According to Field (2005), $VIF < 10$ and tolerance $> .2$ indicate that there is no multicollinearity. The existence of autocorrelation was analysed with Durbin-Watson value. Having the value in the range between 1.5 and 2.5 indicates that there is no autocorrelation (Kalayci, 2014). Durbin-Watson value in this study was 1.90 for trust, 1.74 for target, 1.83 for performance and 1.87 for organisational commitment. Examining the values found, it can be said that all the assumptions were confirmed for the multivariate analyses. The 1.00-1.80 range was regarded as very low, the 1.81-2.60 range was regarded as low, the 2.61-3.40 range was regarded as moderate, the 3.41-4.20 range was regarded as high and the 4.21-5.00 range was regarded as very high in interpreting the arithmetic averages in this study. Additionally, the 0.00-.30 range was regarded as low, the .31-.70 range was regarded as moderate and the .71-1.0 range was regarded as high correlation in correlation analysis (Buyukozturk et al., 2012).

Findings

The results of descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among study variables are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Findings of the Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis for the Factors

Scales	Factors	\bar{X}	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SJLS $\bar{X} = 3.29$	1.Support	3.34	.90	-						
	2.Critical consciousness	3.46	.91	.77**	-					
	3.Inclusion	2.61	1.16	.52**	.49**	-				
CISDS MFSS $\bar{X} = 3.88$	4.Trust in school principals	3.38	.68	.53**	.50**	.39**	-			
	5.Organisational commitment	4.30	1.04	.18**	.21**	-.04	.25**	-		
	6.Performance	3.87	1.09	.26**	.26**	.03	.36**	.62**	-	
	7.Target	3.56	1.09	.24**	.23**	.05	.45**	.41**	.62**	-

** $p < .01$; $N = 762$

As is clear from Table 1, the school principals displayed behaviours of support and inclusion at “moderate” levels according to the students’ views. Besides, the students’ trust in school principals was found to be moderate and all the factors of the motivation for school scale were found to be high. Analysis of correlation coefficients showed that the factor of support had positive and moderate correlations with trust in school principals ($r = .53$; $p < .01$) and low correlations with organisational commitment ($r = .18$; $p < .01$), performance ($r = .26$; $p < .01$) and target ($r = .24$; $p < .01$) and the factor of inclusion had positive and moderate correlations with trust in school principals ($r = .39$; $p < .01$). In addition to that, no significant correlations were found between the factor of inclusion and all the factors of motivation for school [($i_{inclusion-organisational\ commitment} = -.04$; $p > .01$); ($i_{inclusion-performance} = .03$; $p > .01$); ($i_{inclusion-target} = .05$; $p > .01$)]. The results of multiple linear regression analysis done to find predictiveness between variables are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Finding of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

	Trust in school principals			Organisational commitment			Performance			Target		
	B	t	R ²	β	t	R ²	B	t	R ²	β	T	R ²
			.32			.083			.098			.074
Support	.310	6.327*		.112	1.972*		.215	3.816*		.210	3.677*	
Critical consciousness	.204	4.252*		.243	4.364*		.180	3.255*		.124	2.212*	
Inclusion	.127	3.561*		-.223	-5.375*		-.171	-4.167*		-.113	-2.704*	

$N = 762$. * $p < .05$.

Accordingly, the three factors of social justice leadership together explain 32% of the total variance in terms of students’ perceptions of trust in school principals ($F = 118.389$, $p < .05$). Support ($\beta = .310$, $p < .05$), critical consciousness ($\beta = .204$, $p < .05$) and inclusion ($\beta = .127$, $p < .05$) were found to be significant predictors of trust in school principals. In terms of perceptions of organisational commitment, all the factors of social justice leadership together explained 8% of the total variance ($F = 27.588$, $p < .05$). It was also found that support ($\beta = .215$, $p < .05$), critical consciousness ($\beta = .180$, $p < .05$) and inclusion ($\beta = -.171$, $p < .05$) predicted performance significantly. And finally, in terms of students’ perceptions of target, all the factors of social justice leadership together explained 7% of the total variance ($F = 20.092$, $p < .05$).

Support ($\beta=.210, p<.05$), critical consciousness ($\beta=.124, p<.05$) and inclusion ($\beta=-.113, p<.05$) were the significant predictors of target.

Discussion

This paper analysed the correlations between school principals' social justice leadership behaviours, students' trust in school principals and students' motivation on the basis of 762 students' views. The findings indicated that the school principals displayed moderate levels of social justice behaviours. Studies supportive of the finding are available in the literature (Feng & Chen, 2018; Goren, 2019; Ozdemir, 2017). Some of the studies, however, report that school principals display high levels of social justice behaviours. Yet, those studies were generally conducted with samples of school principals and teachers (Albritton et al., 2017; Arslan, 2019; Forde & Torrance, 2017; Ozdemir & Pektas, 2017). It can be said that the leadership behaviours displayed by school principals in the studies which focus on social justice leadership mostly aim to eliminate the problems hindering students' participation in good quality educational-instructional activities. Based on the findings, it can be stated that school principals cannot adequately perform the activities to eliminate the disadvantaged situations encountered in school environment. According to the literature, social justice leaders are the individuals who support their students especially in terms of academic and social development, who consider their views important and who try to raise their awareness of inequalities (Brooks & Miles, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008; Theoharis, 2007). The findings indicated that school principals' social justice leadership competence is questionable. Tomul (2009) argues that social insensitivity, lack of knowledge and deficiencies in legal regulations are influential in school principals' practices of establishing social justice. Additionally, the fact that the educational system has centralistic structure can also support the delusion that state schools have a similar structure. In other words, the view that there is no need to develop different approaches and practices for disadvantaged schools can gain strength. Nevertheless, it is emphasised that efforts are made to develop policies to raise the quality of schools with negative conditions in several countries (Kondakci et al., 2016).

This paper also found that students had moderate level of perceptions of trust in school principals. In other words, it can be stated that trust in school principals is low. There are studies in the literature conflicting with this finding (Ozer & Atik, 2014; Donmez & Atik, 2016). Accordingly, the studies found that secondary school and high school students had high perceptions of trust in school principals. Regarding this finding, the region (rural or central) where the schools are located can be considered. The reason for the finding might have been that the students in the study group had attended the schools located in the city centre. The schools in city centred can generally thought to be better quality and more equipped. The situation can enable healthier student-teacher-school manager relations and thus can reduce undesirable student behaviours. The fact that the students included in the study group attended schools with lower socio-economic status than the other schools in Altindag district might have influenced trust in school principals in negative ways. According to Yanpar (1994), rise in socio-economic status increases students' academic achievement. The opposite case can be thought to reduce achievement. Undesirable behaviours displayed by students with low academic achievement and their conflicts with teachers and school administrators as a result can also diminish trust.

Another finding obtained in this study was that students' motivation for school was high. The finding was consistent with the ones obtained in various studies concerning student motivation (Altun & Yazici, 2010; Guay & Bureau, 2018). Thus, secondary school students' motivation for school can be said to be positive. Some of the studies in the literature, on the other hand, found that students had moderate level of motivation for school (Cakir, 2006). One of the reasons for students' high motivation may be that schools focus on supportive practices by being aware of the socio-economic status of students. As a matter of fact, in the study of Bektaş and Yucel (2013), it was stated that teachers and principals work very devotedly in the region. As another reason, the low socio-economic level of the region may affect the low expectations of families from their children. It is known that the family's economic level and educational perspective affect the academic success of the child (Hanushek & Luque, 2003). For this reason, it can be thought that students who do not believe that they can come somewhere through education may have low expectations. In other words, low expectation may result in less anxiety and higher motivation.

This study analysed the correlations between school principals' behaviours of social justice leadership, trust in school principals and students' motivation for school. The findings demonstrated that there were positive and significant correlations between all factors of social justice leadership and trust in school principals and students' perceptions of motivation for school (organisational commitment and performance), and that all factors of leadership were the significant predictors of trust in school principals and of students' motivation for school. It was found that leadership behaviours were the highest predictors of trust in school principals in particular. Schools can be considered as the organisations where informal relations are brought into prominence. It is claimed that establishing, developing, and sustaining healthy interpersonal relations are dependent on the existence of mutual trust (Bottery, 2003). Cooperation between the stakeholders of school is expected in creating effective schools. Yet, cooperation is built upon trust between stakeholders (Ozer & Caglayan, 2016). The statements made above indicate that the behaviours to be displayed by school principals are important for schools to attain their goals. School principals' approaches will affect teachers, students and other stakeholders in a school- which is a social organisation. School principals' showing interest in students' problems, making efforts to solve them rather than ignoring them, considering students' views important, making students feel that they are individuals each and taking measures for their academic and social development can

affect students' perceptions of school in positive ways. Thus, it can be said that such practices will create a warm school climate and will promote trust in school principals. It is also reported in the literature that the behaviours displayed by social justice leaders promotes students' trust (Furman, 2012; Ozdemir & Pektas, 2017) and their academic achievement (Jones & Shindler, 2016; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). Goddard et al. (2001) stress that the environment of trust determines the quality of the learning environment of especially disadvantaged students. As Theoharis (2007) also states, social justice leaders should focus primarily on students' academic and social achievement- which is consistent with the statements made above.

That social justice leaders were a significant predictor of students' commitment to school was another finding obtained in this study. Various studies also indicated that leadership behaviours increased commitment to school (Cobanoğlu, 2020; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Murray, 2009; Ozdemir, 2017). Social justice leaders have behaviours which encourage students to explain their views. In this way, measures can be taken and modifications can be made in the process of education according to their views. Students' needs can be identified and a more efficient process of education can be managed. That is to say, students can be helped to develop more positive attitudes towards school by making them a part of the decision-making process. For example, it may be considered to make applications by taking their opinions more into consideration in the boards involved in the internal functioning of the school. In this context, Ozdemir (2017) found that social justice leadership behaviours predicted significantly students' attitudes towards school. In a similar way, Ihtiyaroglu and Demir (2015) also pointed to the importance of providing opportunities to participate in school activities in increasing students' commitment to school. It was also found that the quality of school life had positive correlations with commitment to school (Kalaycı & Ozdemir, 2013). Considering the effects of school principals' behaviours on school climate, the significant correlations between student commitment and social justice behaviours were the results that had been expected.

Another finding obtained in this study was that social justice leaders were the significant predictors of students' performance. Koh et al. (1995) argue that effective leadership behaviours promote students' performance. Students' interest in school and their engagement, their preparing assignments given to them and their happiness with studying can be considered as indicators of their performance. Appropriate learning opportunities given to students can underly their enjoyment with the process of education and instruction in school. School principals as teaching leaders have significant responsibilities in taking the measures to facilitate students' process of learning. According to Flath (1989), teaching leaders implement the approaches which encourage students' academic development. They should pave the way for implementing curricula with appropriate and rich content and thus for conduction good quality education for this purpose (Leithwood et al., 2010; Lezotte & McKee, 2006). Social justice leaders in addition to teaching leaders are expected to adopt flexible approaches for disadvantaged students (McKenzie et al., 1993). It was also stated that supportive school environments increased students' satisfaction with school and their motivation for learning (Keys & Fernandes, 1993). Thus, students with increased motivation for learning can be said to have higher performance.

It was also found in this study that social justice leadership significantly predicted the factor of target in motivation for school. The factor of target was conceptualised as the development of students' academic proficiency and social relations (Sage & Kinnderman, 2001). Social justice leaders' steps taken primarily to raise the quality of education and for teacher-student development are on the basis of teaching leadership approach. In other words, both social justice leaders and teaching leaders make efforts to promote the quality of teachers. Considering the roles school principals play in raising teachers' classroom management skills and their academic and social competence, it can be said that their leadership behaviours will be influential in teachers' and students' life (Sisman, 2011). Several studies suggest that school principals are indirectly rather than directly influential in students' versatile achievement (academic, social, sport achievement and so on) (Demirtas, 2010; Sari & Cenkseven, 2008). The studies cited above emphasise that leaders develop school climate and thus they promote students' achievement indirectly. Social justice leadership can guide students in setting up harmonious relations with their friends and in having sense of living together by considering social solidarity and by respecting differences. It is because the perceptions of equality plays important roles in individuals' socialisation. Chiu (2010) and Tomul (2009) claim that feeling of inequality between students in school environment hurts social relations. Apple (2010), on the other hand, stresses that inequality can be eliminated with the principles of social justice. On considering the findings obtained in the literature and in this study as a whole, it can be said that social justice leadership behaviours have positive effects on students' target orientation in various aspects (academic, social, etc.).

Conclusion

Schools are the educational institutions where students are developed academically, socially, culturally and psychologically. They play roles in social life especially because their input and output are individuals. The quality of social relations inside school should be taken into account for healthy development of the educational process. Social relations occur mostly between administrators, teachers and students. The leadership behaviours displayed by school principals in particular can be thought to influence teachers directly and students indirectly through teacher-student relations and thus to shape social relations. According to the findings, the following conclusions were reached in this study;

(i) School principals' social justice leadership and trust in school principals were insufficient.

(ii) Students' perceptions of motivation for school were found to be more positive.

(iii) School principals' leadership behaviours promoted students' trust in school principals and their motivation for school. In other words, it can be said that school principals' effective leadership is important for schools to attain their goals.

Recommendations

According to the study findings, the following recommendations were presented

(i) It can be thought that the level of trust of students in schools is related to the qualities of the relationships between internal stakeholders and external stakeholders. School management should be considered as a separate expertise and school principals should be offered strong theoretical and applied training in the pre-service and in-service periods. Coopering with the educational management departments of universities in this process of training will raise the quality of education.

(ii) The process should be made objective through legal arrangements and school principals' powers and responsibilities should be increased. This can open the way for school principals to take initiatives at a wider level. In addition, it can be thought that the presence of qualified school administrators, both administratively and pedagogically, will positively affect the confidence and performance of the students by making the school a healthier climate.

(iii) It should also be mentioned here that there is interest in social justice leadership in the literature. The interest is considered mostly in quantitative methods and on the basis of teachers' and principals' views. Researchers could be recommended that students' perspective should be identified by using different research methods and the correlations between social justice leadership various organisational behaviours should be analysed.

Limitations

While the study examining the relationships among social justice leadership, trust in principal and student motivation contributes to the literature, it also has some limitations. Firstly, the study group used in the current study includes only secondary school students. Although secondary school students' perceptions of the relevant variables are important, they do not allow them to be generalized to students in different school types. Second, analysing the study with quantitative methods prevented reaching more in-depth findings. Therefore, different results can be expected from a study in which qualitative research methods are used on variables.

References

- Adams J. E., Jr., & Copeland, M. (2005). *When learning counts: Rethinking licenses for school leaders*. Center for Reinventing Public Education.
- Akar, H. (2018). Meta-Analysis of organizational trust studies conducted in educational organizations between the years 2008-2018. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 4(4), 287-302.
- Akman, Y. (2018). Orgutsel adalet, is motivasyonu ve ogretmen performansi arasindaki iliskilerin incelenmesi [The investigation of the relationships between organisational justice, work motivation and teacher performance]. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal/ Cukurova Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 47(1), 164-187.
- Albritton, S., Huffman, S., & McClellan, R. (2017). A study of rural high school principals' perceptions as social justice leaders. *Administrative Issues Journal*, 7(1), 18-38.
- Altun, F., & Yazici, H. (2010, November 11-13). *Ogrencilerin okul motivasyonunu yordayan bazi degiskenler*. [Some variables that predict students' school motivation] [Paper presentation]. International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, Antalya, Turkey.
- Ankara Provincial Directorate of National Education. (2020). *Education statistics*. <http://ankara.meb.gov.tr/www/egitim-istatistikleri/icerik/24>.
- Apple, M. W. (2010). *Global crises, social justice, and education*. Routledge.
- Arslan, A. (2019). *Sosyal adalet liderligi ve etik iklim arasindaki iliskiye yonelik ogretmen gorusleri* [Teachers' opinions on the relationship between social justice leadership and organizational ethical climate] [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Hacettepe University.
- Atkinson, S., & Butcher, D. (2003). Trust in managerial relationships. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(4), 282-304.
- Banks, J. A. (1997). *Education citizens in a multicultural society*. Teachers College Press.

- Barnes, L., Forsyth, P. B., & Adams, C. M. (2004, April 12-16). *Student trust of principal: Scale development* [Poster presentation]. American Educational Research Association 2004 Annual Meeting, San Diego, USA.
- Bates, R. (2006). Educational administration and social justice. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 1(2), 141-156.
- Bektas, Y., & Yücel, C. (2013). Ankara-Altındağ tepesi gecekondü bölgesinde mekansal ayrışmanın gözlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma [Research regarding observation of spatial segregation in Ankara-Altındağ hill squatter region]. *Megaron*, 8(2), 115-129.
- Berkovich, I. (2014). A socio-ecological framework of social justice leadership in education. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(3), 282-309.
- Blackmore, J. (2002). Leadership for socially just schooling: more substance and less style in high risk, low trust times? *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(2), 198-222.
- Bottery, M. (2003). The management and mismanagement of trust. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 31(3), 245-261.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education society and culture* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Brooks, J. S., & Miles, M. (2006). From scientific management to social justice [...] and back again? Pedagogical shifts in the study and practice of educational leadership. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 10, 1-11.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Buyukozturk, S., Cokluk, O., & Koklu, N. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik* [Statistics for social sciences] (2nd ed.). Pegem A Publishing.
- Carlisle, L. R., Jackson, B. W., & George, A. (2006). Principles of social justice education: the social justice education in schools project. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 39(1), 55-64.
- Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects of inequality, family and school on mathematics achievement: country and student differences. *Social Forces*, 88(4), 1645-1676.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2005). Navigating justice in practice: An exercise in grounding ethical theory. *Theory and Research in Education*, 3(3), 327-342.
- Cakir, E. (2006). *Anadolu öğretmen liselerinde okuyan öğrencilerin depresyon ve motivasyon düzeyleri* [Depression and motivation levels of students who are educating in Anatolian teacher training high schools] [Unpublished master's thesis]. Sakarya University.
- Cobanoğlu, N. (2020). Investigation of shared leadership and organizational commitment in primary and secondary schools: Malatya case. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 6(3), 613-629.
- Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, J. (2008). A question of trust: Predictive conditions for adaptive and technical leadership in educational contexts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(1), 30-63.
- Dantley, M. E. (2008). The 2007 Willower family lecture reconstructing leadership: Embracing a spiritual dimension. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(4), 451-460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760802247411>
- Dantley, M., Beachum, F., & McCray, C. (2009). Exploring the intersectionality of multiple centers within notions of social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18(2), 124-133.
- Dantley, M. E., & Tillman, L. C. (2010). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 19-34). Allyn & Bacon.
- DeMatthews, D., & Mawhinney, H. (2014). Social justice leadership and inclusion: Exploring challenges in an urban district struggling to address inequalities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(5), 844-881.
- Feng, F., & Chen, W. (2018). The effect of principals' social justice leadership on teachers' academic optimism in Taiwan. *Education and Urban Society*, 51(9), 1245-1264.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage Publication.
- Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader. *ATA Magazines*, 69(3), 19-22, 47-49.
- Forde, C., & Torrance, D. (2017). Social justice leaders: Critical moments in head teachers'/principals' development. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 2(1), 29-52.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Seabury Press.

- Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of social justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 47-76.
- Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.
- Gaudelli, W. (2001). Identity discourse: problems, presuppositions, and educational practice. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21(3), 60-81.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education*. Routledge.
- Goddard, T. (2007). School leadership and equity: Results from an international comparative study. *School Leadership and Management*, 27(1), 1-5.
- Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102(1), 3-17.
- Goren, S. Ç. (2019). *Sosyal adalet liderligi, okul yasam kalitesi ve okula aidiyet duygusu iliskisi* [Relationship between social justice leadership, quality of school life and sense of school belonging] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University.
- Guay, F., & Bureau, J. S. (2018). Motivation at school: Differentiation between and within school subjects matters in the prediction of academic achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 54, 42-54.
- Handford, V. (2011). *Why teachers trust school leaders* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Toronto.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 184-208.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of an organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49.
- Ihtiyaroglu, N., & Demir, E. (2015). Farkli denetim odagina sahip ogrencilerin okul baglilik duzeylerinin incelenmesi [Analysis of the level of students' attachment to school, having different locus of control]. *Karadeniz Social Sciences Journal/ Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(3), 281-295.
- Jackson, G. T., & McNamara, D. S. (2013). Motivation and performance in a game-based intelligent tutoring system. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(4), 1036-1049.
- Johnson, C. E. (2004). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow*. Sage.
- Jones, A., & Shindler, J. (2016). Exploring the school climate--student achievement connection: making sense of why the first precedes the second. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 27, 35-51.
- Kalayci, S. (2014). *SPSS uygulamali cok degiskenli istatistik teknikleri* (6th ed.). Asil Publishing.
- Kalayci, H., & Ozdemir, M. (2013). Lise ogrencilerinin okul yasaminin niteligine iliskin algilarinin okul baglilikleri uzerine etkisi [The influence of students' perceptions toward quality of school life on their school engagement]. *Gazi University Education Faculty Journal/ Gazi Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 33(2), 293-315.
- Kaplan, M. (2007). *Motivasyon teorileri kapsaminda uygulanan ozendirme araclarinin isgoren performansina etkisi ve bir uygulama* [Motivation theories under the application of special program and equipments to measure performance of employer and a case study] [Unpublished master's dissertation]. University of Atılım.
- Karasar, N. (1994). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemleri* [Scientific research methods](6th ed). Arastirma Egitim Danismanlik Ltd. Şti.
- Kaynak, S., Ozhan, M. B., & Kan, A. (2017). Ortaokul ogrencileri icin okul motivasyonu olçegi gelistirme calismasi [A study on the development of a school motivation scale (SMS-MS) for middle school students]. *Turkish Studies*, 12(4), 293-312.
- Keys, W., & Fernandes, C. (1993). *What do students think about school? A report for the National Commission on Education*. National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(4), 319-333.
- Kondakci, Y., Kurtay, M. Z., Oldac, Y. İ., & Senay, H. H. (2016). Türkiye'de okul mudurlerinin sosyal adalet rolleri [The social justice roles of school principals in Turkey]. In K. Beycioglu, N. Ozer, D. Kosar & I. Sahin (Eds.), *Egitim yonetimi arastirmalari* [Education management research] (pp. 353-361). Pegem.

- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 485-516.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(5), 679-706.
- Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(5), 671-706.
- Lezotte, L. W., & McKee, K. M. (2006). *Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools*. Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- MacNeil, A. J., Spuck, D. W., & Ceyanes, J. W. (1998, October 30-November 1). *Developing trust between principal and teachers* [Paper presentation]. UCEA 1998, St. Louis, United States.
- Marshall, E. M. (2000). *Building trust at the speed of change: The power of the relationship based corporation*. American Management Association.
- Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006). Building the capacities of social justice leaders. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education* (pp. 1-15). Pearson Publishing.
- Marshall, C., Young, M. D., & Moll, L. (2010). The wider societal challenge: An afterword. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 315-327). Allyn & Bacon.
- Martin, A. J. (2004). School motivation of boys and girls: Differences of degree, differences of kind, or both?. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 56*(3), 133-146.
- McCabe, N. C., & McCarthy, M. M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy, 19*(1), 201-222.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., Gonzales, M. L., Cambron-McCabe, N., & Scheurich, J. J. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(1), 111-138.
- McInerney, D. M., Yeung, S. Y., & McInerney, V. (2001). Cross-cultural validation of the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM). *Journal of Applied Measurement, 2*(2), 134-152.
- Murray, C. (2009). Parent and teacher relationships as predictors of school engagement and functioning among low-income urban youth. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 29*(3), 376-404.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Sage.
- Oplatka, I. (2010). The place of "social justice" in the field of educational administration: A journal based historical overview of emergent area of study, In Ira Bogotch and Carolyn, M. Shields (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social* (pp. 15-36). Springer.
- Ozdemir, M., & Kutkut, B. (2015). Sosyal Adalet Liderligi Olcegi'nin (SALÖ) gelistirilmesi: Gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi [Development of social justice leadership scale (SJLS): the validity and reliability study]. *Ahi Evran University Kirsehir Education Faculty Journal/ Ahi Evran Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 16*(3), 201-218.
- Ozdemir, M. (2017). Sosyal adalet liderligi, okula yonelik tutum ve okul baglilik arastirilmis iliskilerin incelenmesi [Examining the relations among Social Justice Leadership, Attitudes towards School and School Engagement]. *Education and Science/ Egitim ve Bilim, 42*(191), 267-281.
- Ozdemir, M., & Pektas, V. (2017). Sosyal adalet liderligi ve okul akademik iyimserligi iliskisinin ogretmen goruslerine gore incelenmesi [Examining the relationship between social justice leadership and school academic optimism according to teachers' opinions]. *Ege Education Journal/ Ege Egitim Dergisi, 18*(2), 576-601.
- Ozer, N., & Atik, S. (2014). Ortaokul ve lise ogrencilerinin okul mudurlerine guven duzeylerinin incelenmesi [Analysis of secondary and high school students' trust in principal and teachers]. *Ahi Evran University Kirsehir Education Faculty Journal/ Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 15*(3), 87-106.
- Ozer, N., Donmez, B., & Atik, S. (2016). Ortaokul ve lise ogrencilerinin okul mudurune ve ogretmenlere guven duzeylerinin incelenmesi [Analysis of secondary and high school students' trust in principal and teachers]. *Cumhuriyet University Social Sciences Journal/ Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 40*(1), 259-280.
- Ozer, N., & Caglayan, Z. A. (2016). Ogretmenlerin mudurlerine duyduklari guven ve kronizm algilari arasindaki iliski [Relationship between teachers' trust in principal and perceived cynicism]. *Inonu University Educational Sciences Institute Journal/ İnönü Üniversitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 3*(5), 16-27.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539-569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>.
- Rasinski, K. A. (1987). What's fair is fair – or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(1), 201-211.
- Rivera-McCutchen, R. L. (2014). The moral imperative of social justice leadership: A critical component of effective practice. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 46(4), 747-763.
- Rucinski, D. A., & Bauch, P. A. (2006). Reflective, ethical, and moral constructs in educational leadership preparation: effects on graduates' practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(5), 487-508.
- Rutter, M., & Maughan, B. (2002). School effectiveness findings 1979-2002. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(6), 451-475.
- Sage, N. A., & Kindermann, T. A. (1999). Peer networks, behavior contingencies, and children's engagement in the classroom. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45(1), 143-171.
- Selsky, J. W. (1991). Lessons in community development: an activist approach to stimulating inter-organizational collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(1), 91-115.
- Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 111-134.
- Slater, C., Potter, I., Torres, N., & Briceno, F. (2014). Understanding social justice leadership: An international exploration of perspectives of two school leaders in Costa Rica and England. *Management in Education*, 28(3), 110-115.
- Sisman, M. (2011). *Ogretim liderliği [Instructional leadership]* (3rd ed.). Pegem Akademi Publishing.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.
- Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(3), 294-308.
- Tillman, L. C., Brown, K., Jones, F. C., & Gonzalez, M. L. (2006). Transformative leadership for social justice: Concluding thoughts. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16(2), 207-209.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Theoharis, G. (2009). *The school leaders our children deserve: Seven keys to equity, social justice, and school reform*. Teachers College Press.
- Tomul, E. (2009). İlköğretim okullarındaki sosyal adalet uygulamalarına ilişkin yönetici görüşleri [Opinions of administrators on social justice practices in elementary schools]. *Education and Science/ Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34(152), 126-137.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(1), 66-92.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2017). Principals, trust, and cultivating vibrant schools. In K. Leithwood, J. Sun, & K. Pollock (Eds.), *How school leaders contribute to student success* (pp. 153-174). Springer.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2019). *Gelir ve yaşam koşulları araştırması 2019* [Income and living conditions survey 2019]. <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/tr/main-category-sub-categories-sub-components2/>.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Relations between social competence and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 62(5), 1066-1078.
- Woessmann, L. (2011). Cross-country evidence on teacher performance pay. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3), 404-418.
- Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2007). *Educational psychology* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Yanpar, T. S. (1994). İlkokul 4. sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersinde akademik benlik kavramı, ders içi öğrenme ve ders dışı çalışma yolları arasında başarı ilişkisi [The relation between fourth grade students academic self-concept, their learning styles in the classroom, study styles out of the classroom and achievement in the social studies]. *Hacettepe University Education Faculty Journal/ Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10, 43-48.

- Yazici, H. (2009). Ogretmenlik meslegi, motivasyon kaynaklari ve temel tutumlar: Kurumsal bir bakis [Teaching profession sources of motivation and basic attitudes: A theoretical overview]. *Kastamonu Education Journal/ Kastamonu Eđitim Dergisi*, 17(1), 33-46.
- Zembylas, M. (2010). The emotional aspects of leadership for social justice: Implications for leadership preparation programs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(5), 611-625.
- Zhang, Y., Goddard, J. T., & Jakubiec, B. A. E. (2018). Social justice leadership in education: A suggested questionnaire. *Research in Educational Administration*, 3(1), 53-86.