

Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #129, February 13, 2012.
© by CJEAP and the author(s).

SOCIAL JUSTICE: THE MISSING LINK IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHER INDUCTION¹

[Laura Elizabeth Pinto](#), *Niagara University*, John P. Portelli, *OISE, University of Toronto*,
Cindy Rottmann, *University of Manitoba*, Karen Pashby, *OISE, University of Toronto*,
Sarah Elizabeth Barrett, *York University*, and Donatille Mujuwamariya, *University of Ottawa*

Critical scholars view schooling as one piece of a larger struggle for democracy and social justice. We investigated 41 school administrators' perceptions about the role and importance of equity, diversity and social justice in new teacher induction in the province of Ontario. Interviews reveal that principals were interested in shaping teacher induction programming in their schools and school districts, but that they regularly prioritized technical issues like classroom management and pedagogy over systemic issues like equity and social justice. When asked directly about equity, principals spoke about learning styles, special needs and differentiated instruction, but they regularly ignored new teachers' abilities to counter systemic oppression—racism, sexism, and classism. Our findings suggest that without an explicit focus on equity and social justice in provincial policy documents, teacher induction programming runs the risk of reproducing a transmission model of new teacher education.

Introduction

Critical scholars view schooling as one piece of a larger struggle for democracy and social justice (Freire, 1998; Kincheloe & McLaren, 1998; Portelli & Solomon, 2001). In line with a critical-democratic perspective, we believe that attention to equity within the classroom, while laudable, is only part of the work that needs to be done. Equity and social justice must be

¹ Many thanks to the research assistants and associates who contributed to this project: Nathalie Di Francesco, Jordan Singer, Christine Cho, Fang Duan, Aparna Mishra Tarc, and Laura Lindo. We also thank the participants in this research who so generously offered their time. We acknowledge the financial support we received from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), and we thank the individual institutions, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, York University and University of Ottawa, that supported the research team in a variety of ways.

prominent in all aspects of education policy, including teacher induction and evaluation, and conceived of as a priority by educational leaders if we hope to make progress towards a truly democratic ideal. This paper investigates how forty-one Ontario school administrators perceive social justice, diversity and equity with respect to the induction of new teachers in the school system. Their perceptions about social justice are crucial, since, if we are to view education as democratic and not simply technical, administrator support of the inclusion of social justice as a priority is imperative. Their silence on these issues when prompted speaks volumes about the equity deficit operating in both policy and praxis.

Theoretical Stance: Critical Democracy Requiring Social Justice

This research is situated within a theoretical stance of critical democracy, which strives to establish a mode of living that “should show us how to transform our form of life in an emancipatory manner” (O’Neill, 2000, p. 503-504). To that end it is rooted in social justice:

...critical democratic theorists seek to explore how contentious issues of moral and cultural pluralism might be dealt with in a way that minimizes the potential for oppression, alienation and violence. This means that incommensurability must not be taken as a given, or as something to be celebrated. Nor should it be brushed aside as something that will inevitably be overcome. (O’Neill, 2000, p. 505)

As this passage illustrates, critical democracy necessarily leads to requirements of inclusion and empowerment, with particular attention to those who are often marginalized. Beyond conventional democracy’s narrow concern with equality, critical democracy embraces equity as a goal, through genuine and inclusive participation that “seriously and honestly acknowledges the importance of equity, diversity and social justice” (Portelli & Solomon, 2001, p. 15).

In the critical-democratic stance, social justice is connected to praxis such that education acknowledges internalized forms of oppression and privilege, and enacts practical strategies to

change social institutions in ways that overcome inequity (Kohli, 2005). A full conception of social justice must expand beyond distribution of goods in a society to include all aspects of institutional and systemic rules and relations (Gerwitz, 1998). Since social justice is a key component of critical democracy, it must be prominent in schools if we hope to achieve the critical-democratic ideal. In these ways, education is “inescapably political and ideological” (Cochran-Smith 2008, p. 3). Indeed, Hytten (2006) argues,

social justice is an integral feature of democratic life, as democratic societies are, at least in the ideal, just societies. They strive for equity, self-determination, and freedom. They educate students to become just citizens.... (Hytten, 2006, p. 221)

Similarly, Kohli (2005) envisions social justice education as a form of empowerment, in which issues of equity are addressed overtly. Thus, the praxis of socially just education, in our view, must include a theoretical account of oppression and privilege, as well as practical strategies for changing social institutions. Schools are primary sites for this critical transformation since they both reproduce inequality and provide a location to critique it. Educating students to challenge their assumptions and overcome internalized forms of oppression—such as racism, sexism, classism and homophobia—involves offering them a framework for understanding the external structures that are the source of these different oppressions, and empowering students to become agents of change. These are all important goals of social justice education (Kohli, 2005, p. 100), and provide strong rationales for its inclusion as a central component of democratic education.

To achieve these aims, socially just schooling requires teachers who share a commitment to social justice, equity and diversity, ideally reinforced by overt policy texts to support it as a priority. Teachers and administrators thus require the requisite skills, knowledge, and dispositions to address how to support, interrupt, or subvert exploitation, marginalization, and inequity (Gerwitz, 1998).

Our research investigates the degree to which those interviewed share this view of social justice as a priority. Within this conception of social justice, an understanding of diversity is crucial. An understanding of equity acknowledges marginalization in the larger social order and how differences are reflected in school routines, procedures, curriculum and textbook adoption, and classroom pedagogies. School administrators concerned with equity examine power relations within schools and society, scrutinize differential schooling, and critique systems that contribute to inequities among groups traditionally marginalized (Brown, 2004b).

Political Context: An Equity Deficit

This paper addresses the time period between 2000, the year that new teacher testing was introduced in Ontario, and 2006 when a new teacher induction program replaced the test.² In 1995, the Progressive-Conservative party took power after defeating the predecessor New Democratic Party government in the province of Ontario. Leading up to their victory, the party campaigned on a controversial, but straightforward, platform called the *Common Sense Revolution* that promised to solve Ontario's problems with lower taxes, smaller government and pro-business policies. The *Common Sense Revolution* reflects the "rhetoric of neoliberalism" that "insists on the importance of education to solve the problems of capitalism" (Gandin, 2006, p. 219). This rhetoric results in the application of business models to schooling, while replacing equity and social justice in education with a focus on individual ability and effort (Gandin, 2006), resulting in an equity deficit.

Among the first of the newly-elected government's tasks was to eliminate the Anti-racism, Equity and Access Branch, which was created within the Ministry of Education in 1992 (Carr, 2006; Bedard & Lawton, 2000). A substantial amount of promising social justice work

² Revisions to the program were made in 2010.

was consequently left unfinished or sent to the archives (Carr, 2006). This move was consistent with the neo-liberal public policy that guided the *Common Sense Revolution*, mirroring trends in many jurisdictions where priorities such as standardization, global competitiveness, and so forth, guide educational efforts at the expense of social justice, that has continued over the past decade despite the election of a new government. As Hytten (2006) points out,

While there have always been educators calling for a social justice approach toward education, this vision has never been a dominant one. This is especially true in our current climate, where teachers are increasingly asked to focus on a very narrow set of goals, in particular raising standardized test scores. (Hytten, 2006, p. 224)

The new emphasis on standardization, measurement, and accountability in Ontario that emerged in the 1990s and remains today, undermines social justice education, and is underscored by the symbolic gesture of the elimination of the Anti-racism, Equity and Access Branch. Resulting policies that work against social justice goals ultimately undermine critical-democratic aims (Levinson, 2009).

Ontario's New Teacher Induction Policy and Social Justice

As part of the conceptual framing, insight into the policy context and content are important. In this section, we provide an overview of the policy documents introduced in 2006, particularly the *Ministry of Education's New Teacher Induction Program Induction Elements Manual*. Thus, the purpose of this section is to situate the policy context that relates to the interview responses, rather than an analysis of policy.

By 2000, the controversial Ontario Teacher Qualifying Test (OTQT) was announced as mandatory for new graduates from initial teacher education programs as a means to establish teaching competency. The election of a Liberal government in 2003 resulted in the elimination of

the teacher testing program, though the newly-elected government continued the path laid by its predecessors with respect to greater emphasis on narrow forms of accountability across all facets of education.

In the fall of 2005, in an effort to standardize the evaluation of recent graduates of teacher education programs and their transition to teaching, the government introduced the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP). This program grew out of the preceding neo-liberal approach to education policy punctuated by an equity deficit. Politically, NTIP was purportedly designed to “improve the skills and confidence” and reduce the level of attrition among new teachers in response to needs articulated by stakeholders through orientation, formal mentoring, and a teacher performance appraisal (TPA).

Given the link to performance evaluation through the TPA, school administrators hold tremendous power (Cho et al., 2009; Cherubini, 2010) in the induction process, allowing principals to reproduce and reinforce existing school cultures, or transform the way teachers teach and students learn through their leadership roles and influence over their staff. Indeed, principals have expressed tensions and contradictions in their roles associated with teacher induction and evaluation (see, for example, Cherubini, 2010; Cherian & Daniels, 2008).

Methods of Inquiry

The data presented in this paper is part of a broader research project that investigated perceptions and priorities for new teacher induction in Ontario. The research team developed a semi-structured interview protocol to guide discussions with participants (Creswell, 1998). The questions invited school administrators to talk about social justice, equity and diversity in 2005 and 2006. The protocol was validated by expert review and piloting. One hundred and twenty-

three in-depth interviews were conducted with thirty-five new teachers, forty-one teacher educators, and forty-one school administrators from publicly-funded schools across the province. Interviews were recorded and transcribed, and data were analyzed inductively (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Analysis of the data included process coding, where codes reflect the common and various themes that emerged from the data. The data were analyzed using what Tesch (1990) characterizes as “de-contextualization” in order to identify themes and coding categories and “re-contextualization” to present a unified and coherent picture. This paper is limited to the responses of school administrators to questions and prompts pertaining to their priorities for new teacher induction, and how they see the role of social justice, equity and diversity within that process.

A total of forty-one Ontario school administrators (principals and vice principals) participated in interviews. Of these, twenty-seven were elementary school administrators, four were middle school administrators, and ten were secondary school administrators. Seventeen of the participants were male and twenty-four were female; thirty-two worked in English-speaking schools and nine in French schools. The diversity of those interviewed provides a cross-section of various school contexts in the province.

Findings and Discussion: Contradictory Conceptions of Equity, Diversity and Social Justice

Many researchers have called attention to the various challenges of educational leadership for social justice (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Marshall 2004; Brown, 2004a; Reihl, 2000). Indeed, as Marshall (2004) illustrated, educational administration has traditionally reflected a culture that marginalizes issues of social justice, and these

accountabilities reinforce the managerial aspect of their roles. But, as the literature suggests, shifting greater emphasis on issues of social justice among school administrators is critical to change at the school level (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Marshall, 2004; Shields, 2004).

Our research sought to determine whether school administrators share the view that social justice is a priority for teacher induction, and the extent to which they share a critical-democratic conception of social justice in education. While our study is qualitative, Figure 1 below summarizes the responses received from the 41 school administrators interviewed. To provide this visual summary of the range of responses, we coded transcripts holistically based on two factors: the degree to which the participant viewed social justice as a priority in induction, and the degree to which the participant's conception of social justice ranged from perfunctory to fully-articulated. Based on that coding, five perspectives emerged.

Figure 1: Range of school administrators' perspectives summarized

•••	• ••••• •••••	•••• ••••• •••••	•••• •••••	• •••••
⇐ Weaker conception of social justice and lower priority			Richer conception of social justice and higher priority ⇨	
n=3	n=11	n=13	n=8	n=6
Explicitly denies need for social justice on the grounds that their communities are homogenous, rendering social justice and equity “not that huge of an issue.”	Implicitly denies need for social justice by diverting discussion to say that other induction priorities (e.g., classroom management, knowledge of curriculum) are of utmost importance.	Offers very perfunctory conceptions of social justice by equating social justice with “type of assessment tools”, ELL, “multiple intelligences,” and other, similar constructs that deal largely with students’ learning styles.	Offers somewhat perfunctory notions of social justice and/or does not prioritize it as important for new teachers, equating it with “fairness”, “respect”, “communication”, and equality over equity.	Offers rich conception of social justice. Though statements vary in their level of sophistication, recognizes complexity and multiple forms of marginalization, and prioritizes social justice as essential to teacher induction.

Overwhelmingly, school administrators placed the greatest emphasis on classroom management/organization, teaching/learning to address learner differences, and curriculum/policy knowledge as priorities for new teacher induction over social justice. Representative statements made by two school administrators to describe their priorities for new teachers include:

My first bit of advice to new teachers, student teachers in fact is recognize that you are the alpha male when you step in there, and attend to those details... Everybody wants to please the alpha male.

Oh [classroom management is] huge. Discipline comes before instruction. You have to have an orderly environment in order to teach... And I mean it is so true, discipline comes before instruction. And I don't mean discipline in a bad way. I mean it in the true meaning of the word, order, and a chain of command and do something so it's predictability in the room.

They have to be knowledgeable enough about the curriculum if they can plan effectively whether it be with a colleague, but in many cases on their own they have to be independently enough to be able to put the curriculum together to put a unit plan together and to constantly interact with students in the classroom

These priorities identified by school administrators reflect the types of competencies required in the NTIP policy that privilege curriculum knowledge, assessment, and classroom management as most important. Our interviews revealed that at least some school administrators felt that they could not stray from the Ministry-mandated new teacher competencies. One reports, "there's very strict competencies that are listed [in the TPA policy] ... but I'm not sure how substantially it deals with equity."

School administrators' silence on the issue of social justice, equity and diversity reveals the lack of attention to a critical-democratic ideal among those interviewed. Some school administrators flatly denied that equity or diversity were concerns for them, on the grounds that attention to social justice, equity and diversity was only necessary when working with students

from conventionally marginalized populations. For example, three different school administrators stated:

Each school is so different. The skill-set for a teacher in my school which is deemed to be low socio economic, and a lot of social issues versus a high socio-economic school with a lot of parent pressure, you need two different skill-sets.

That's less of an issue for me, and I think it's because of where we are, [in this part of the province], not that huge of an issue.

I would say pretty minimal here. I know you are taping this but we would be a pretty red neck society here I would say, like we do not have a huge multicultural complement here [in this community].

The latter two school administrators use demographic homogeneity in their schools as a rationale for denying their responsibility to address social justice. Their position is that if the community lacks ethnic or racial diversity, no students experience marginalization (thus ignoring even issues of gender diversity). Moreover, this position suggests that the dominant groups need not be engaged in a discussion about broader societal issues of social justice and privilege.

When prompted to discuss the role of equity, diversity and social justice, the interviews revealed superficial, and at times contradictory, understandings of equity and diversity. Among school administrators who participated in the research, equity definitions tended to focus on learning styles or special needs rather than on issues of race, class, gender, and so forth. In fact, when asked specifically about equity and diversity, many school administrators ended up speaking about classroom management strategies. For example, when one participant was asked how to assess whether or not a teacher deals effectively with equity, diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, the participant went immediately to questions of assessment:

I look for the type of assessment tools... Am I only paper-and-pen? Do you put a variety of oral in there by having the kids produce various forms of work, presentations? What are you using to evaluate learning? That's from the equity standpoint, that's what I take a look at.

Another stated,

Is there a good rapport with everyone in the class, do the students have a good rapport with each other, do they treat each other with respect and it doesn't matter what cultural background or anything else like that. Does the teacher have a differentiated lesson? Is there something that the students with special needs can do or is provided with that's different from a student who is able to grasp materials right away?

In these two cases, equity was confounded with a variety of assessment tools and differentiated lessons, focusing on practical knowledge rather than broader discourses of social justice that would be consistent with critical-democratic understandings of equity and diversity. While assessment issues are definitely relevant to equity and diversity, in this case, the conflation of equity with a variety of assessment tools focuses teacher competency on narrow practical knowledge rather than broader discourses of social justice. Beyond their perfunctory understanding of equity and diversity, few school administrators prioritize social justice, equity and diversity as part of essential knowledge for new teachers. Instead, they favour classroom management techniques, individual learning styles, and curriculum policy knowledge. This state of affairs reflects a policy context that also uses "differentiated instruction" as code for social justice, and frees principals from responsibility for social justice beyond differentiating their instruction. In keeping with this theme, another conflated equity with the concept of multiple intelligences:

I think multiple intelligences are definitely equitable if they can learn to teach children no matter what way they learn to keep them that way regardless of cultural background. That would bring equity in to it if we really dealt with multiple intelligence.

This school administrator, like the school administrator who conflated equity with assessment, ignores broader issues of marginalization and systemic injustice by focusing on achieving equity by applying a particular pedagogical approach, suggesting that cultural diversity can be

adequately addressed through multiple intelligences. Other school administrators expressed an understanding of equity and diversity with respect to “fairness,” “respect” and equality. This was the most prominent theme that emerged. Two school administrator statements representative of this position include:

it is certain that everything in teaching must be fair, in your presentations you cannot be racist, you can't be sexist, you can't do more for girls than boys therefore equity is very important. For social justice, I think it is important to listen, if there are two versions, you need to listen to both versions.

I look to see that they teach students respectfully and that's the bottom line for me is that the students feel cared for and they're learning in the teacher's classroom and that they feel comfortable.

These statements reflect a narrow conception, lacking a broader understanding of social justice as a means for critical transformation. Indeed, the first quote implies the school administrator's belief that there are “two sides” to any equity issue, rather than the more complex phenomena that would require unpacking the subtleties and multiple issues and perspectives that shape any equity issue. While critical-democratic ideals point to the need for all teachers and students to explore social justice in substantive ways, regardless of their social position and school culture, our interviews revealed compartmentalized thinking.

This is not to say that all school administrators lacked a deep understanding of social justice, equity and diversity. Some of the school administrators we interviewed offered an understanding of complexities; however, they were by far the minority (less than one-fifth of our interviewees) within our research. For example, one participant spoke to the importance of making equity and diversity issues explicit:

I don't expect everyone to have all the answers around diversity, but unless it's out there an open discussion rather than being a hidden component, then, in fact, teachers will more comfortably venture out beyond the curriculum to deal with that as it arises.

Within the critical-democratic ideal, educators need not only to be able to counteract aspects of the overt and hidden curriculum but also to mobilize their students so that they feel empowered to act (Freire, 1998). This notion of social justice work as praxis and transformation is very different from the current dominant discourses emerging from dominant societal views, school administrators, and the Ministry of Education.

Discussion

School administrators' silence on the issue of social justice, equity and diversity—even when prompted to discuss such issues—is emblematic of the lack of attention paid to critical-democratic schooling for teacher and student empowerment. We find it problematic that narrow conceptions of what constitutes “essential knowledge” for teachers are revealed through the interviews, and that in some cases the need for attention to social justice, equity and diversity is flatly denied. These narrow conceptions result in a transmission model over a transformative model of new teacher induction. Such transmission models have the reproductive potential to socialize (or even indoctrinate) new teachers into established ways of knowing and pedagogy. In this case, the transmission model fails to adequately address social justice as an essential component of critical-democratic schooling.

This transmission model of induction in Ontario (Barrett et al., 2009) emphasizes shepherding new hires through the transition from student to teacher in a way that promotes conformity to the existing culture of schooling (see, for example, Feinman-Nemser, 2001; Cho et al., 2009). An emphasis on student success is understood as achieved through relational and individual action rather than including action aimed at addressing systemic inequities and social justice. The systemic context in which the teacher and students work is largely unexamined and

left as given and unchangeable. Thus, this model is reproductive, since it reinforces existing values, behaviours and structures. Societal inequities that enter the classroom with the students, such as racism, sexism and classism, are dealt with on an individual basis for the sake of individual achievement and smooth classroom processes. The new teacher is not encouraged to question the role of outside institutions or schooling itself in such societal ills but rather, at best, to simply monitor his or her own biases (Henry & Tator, 1994). As a consequence, teachers working in these settings (and particularly new, vulnerable teachers) may feel pressured to focus on classroom management and transmission models of education since those are the ones prioritized in TPA evaluation criteria articulated in the competencies identified (see also Cho et al., 2009; Barrett et al., 2009).

This type of knowledge transmission could lend itself to conformity and maintaining the status quo. Indeed, conformity goes against the notion of critical democratic teacher education and the need to engage in divergent and dialogical inquiry, critical questioning and open-mindedness (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Freire, 1998; Portelli & Solomon, 2001). However, as our data suggest, the narrow conceptions of social justice among those who responded to the prompts, as well as the lack of priority placed on such goals by school administrators, reveals the overwhelming presence of transmission models of new teacher induction in Ontario.

Evaluating new teachers in the Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA) process is a “high-stakes” situation, since poor evaluations can lead to revocation of a new teacher’s Certificate of Qualification. Thus, school administrators’ priorities and how they relate to the competencies defined by the Ministry are privileged. If social justice is left out, or is not prominent, it can easily be overlooked by school administrators and teachers. In this way, the NTIP model has the dangerous potential to limit school administrators’ and new teachers’ perceptions of areas for

personal and professional development. Our findings illustrate how social justice and equity fall by the wayside when school administrators feel obligated to adhere closely to the policy.

Moreover, the interviews with school administrators reveal that opportunities to explore divergent perspectives, competencies and skills become limited at best, or nonexistent. In this way, NTIP is “subservient to traditional power relations” (Cherubini, 2010, p. 28). School administrators have the power to apply TPA competencies (Cherubini, 2010; Cherian & Daniel, 2008); therefore, depending on the school administrator’s application/interpretation, teachers are assessed within a framework where divergent perspectives are marginalized and powerless, and explicit and meaningful attention to issues of social justice and equity in education are not even raised.

Together with these teacher-monitoring processes and accountability measures among school administrators, the prescriptive, standardized, outcomes-based curriculum policy and related accountability structures limit teacher autonomy (Wrigley, 2003). As such, when the administrative tasks of documenting standardized test courses, financial outcomes, and teaching expectations, privilege issues of facts, content, and career preparation, the very process poses a challenge for the inclusion of and commitment to social justice in education. In doing so, policies of this nature undermine critical democracy (Levinson et al., 2009; Winton, 2010; Hyslop-Margison & Pinto, 2007).

Certainly, we acknowledge that teacher agency, subversion and resistance have been shown to lead to different interpretations of “official” policy (see, for example, Berkhout & Weilmans, 1999; Raab, 1994; Levinson et al., 2009). Indeed, Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2010) eloquently argue that, in fact, teachers’ classroom performance is strengthened when they have professional autonomy to interpret and resist policy and dominant paradigms. Thus, education

policy texts that do not appear to promote social justice could be enacted in a way that would promote equity if teachers or school administrators have the freedom to interpret them. However, concern with accountability measures such as student literacy test outcomes results in school administrators prioritizing narrow conceptions of literacy and numeracy over social justice goals and democratic citizenship.

Given the apparent absence of social justice in school administrators' induction priorities, a critical-democratic new teacher induction policy might be designed to overtly address social justice, equity and diversity by emphasizing transformation over transmission. While a fully-formulated framework for a transformative induction program requires additional theoretical and empirical work, Cochran-Smith (2008) proposed four elements that might be utilized to formulate such a program: critique of knowledge, culturally-conscious interpretive frames, methods and strategies that overtly address equity/inequality, and advocacy and activism that call attention to systemic injustice. Without explicit attention to these four elements, social justice appears to remain ignored, reducing induction (and mentoring) to transmission of existing inequities.

Conclusion: From Transmission to Transformation Through Social Justice

If we are to view education as democratic and not simply technical, it is imperative that school systems provide support for social justice and equity work. Our critical investigation of how school administrators conceptualize social justice as a component of new teacher induction revealed not only perfunctory understandings, but a notable silence on the issue of social justice, equity and diversity despite prompts from the researchers.

Our research suggests, in addition to the superficial conceptions of equity and diversity reported, few school administrators prioritized social justice, equity and diversity as part of essential knowledge for new teachers, favouring instead classroom management themes and models emphasizing individual performance and adherence to standardized curriculum policy that reinforce meritocracy. Some even flatly denied any need for teachers and schools to concern themselves with social justice issues when the school and community were perceived to be homogenous and un-marginalized. An emerging democratic society needs teachers who engage in liberatory pedagogies that create a social environment preparing the next generation of democratic citizenry over standardization that reproduces inequity and ignores social justice.

The question of who schools serve needs to be examined and challenged (Barton, 2001). Furthermore, a social justice framework identifies and challenges the societal structures that perpetuate racism, sexism and classism (hooks, 1994; Carr, 2007; Cochran-Smith, 2008). Yet, these concepts are deliberately omitted from neo-liberal education policy, and particularly within the NTIP. Social justice gets lost in these sorts of high stakes educational policies, especially when combined with other, related policies such as the introduction of standardized testing in the province.

To address this shortfall, school administrators and teachers alike need to be encouraged not only to counteract aspects of the overt and hidden curriculum but also to mobilize educators and their students so that they feel empowered to act (Freire, 1998). In other words, a transformative model of new teacher induction must go beyond helping new teachers avoid reproducing social inequity. While helping them become liberatory teachers themselves, teachers should be inducted into a professional culture that questions the system that employs them. However, the current policy environment leaves new, vulnerable teachers pressured to focus on

classroom management and transmission models in order to perform well in the TPA at the expense of socially just aims. Similarly, critical educators may be selected or self-selected out of the system, while those new teachers who focus on a technical, transmission approach to education receive positive reinforcement.

Without a doubt, the influence of education policy texts in an environment characterized by accountability, surveillance and standardization points to a need for policy-makers to prioritize social justice in teacher induction programs if it is to be seriously considered by educators. As well, the perfunctory understanding of social justice, equity and diversity articulated by school administrators in this research suggests the need for discussion and continued learning on the part of all educators to cultivate a more robust understanding within the profession. School administrators must be encouraged by policy to account for social justice. Only then are they likely to give due attention to the issues within the context of their administrative and legal responsibilities. As we suggest in our discussion, a framework for critical-democratic teacher induction is a possibility, though further development of the elements of such a program are required.

Finally, potential attention to issues of social justice, equity and diversity in education appear in relatively recent policy documents in Ontario. The 2009 release of *Policy/Program Memorandum (PPM) No. 119: Developing and Implementing Equity and Inclusive Education Policies in Ontario Schools* and the subsequent *Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation* are promising developments, and further investigation will be necessary to determine the effects of their enactment.

References

- Barrett, S.E., Solomon, R.P., Singer, J., Portelli, J.P., & Mujuwamariya, D. (2009). The hidden curriculum of a teacher induction program: Ontario teacher educators' perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32, 677-702.
- Barton, A. C. (2001). Capitalism, critical pedagogy, and urban science education: An interview with Peter McLaren. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 38, 847-859. Retrieved from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/urbanscience/papers/calabrese_and_mclaren.pdf
- Bedard, G.J., & Lawton, S.B. (2000). The struggle for power and control: Shifting policy-making models and the Harris agenda for education in Ontario. *Canadian Public Administration*, 43, 241-269.
- Berkhout, S.J., and Wielemans, W. (1999). Toward understanding education policy: An integrative approach. *Educational Policy*, 13, 402-420.
- Biesta, G.J.J. (2004). Education, accountability, and the ethical demand: Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory*, 54, 233-250.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brown, K.M. (2004a). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 77-108.
- Brown, K.M. (2004b). Assessing preservice leaders' beliefs, attitudes, and values regarding issues of diversity, social justice, and equity: A review of existing measures. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 37, 332-342.
- Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M.M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19, 201-222.
- Carr, P.R. (2006). Social Justice and whiteness in education: Color-blind policymaking and racism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 4(2). Retrieved from <http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=77>
- Carr, P.R. (2007). Standards, accountability and democracy: Addressing inequities through a social justice accountability framework. *Democracy and Education*, 17, 7-16.
- Carr, P.R., & Thésée, G. (2007). Educational institutions negotiating democracy and social justice: The (im)balance of power and accountability. *Canadian and International Education*, 36, 32-45.

- Cherian, F., & Daniels, Y. (2008). Principal leadership in new teacher induction: Becoming an agent of change. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 3(2), 1-11.
- Cherubini, L. (2010). An analysis of the implications between the theoretical framework and the policy context of provincial education policy in Ontario. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, 5(1), 20-33.
- Cho, C., Barrett, S.E., Solomon, R.P., Portelli, J.P., & Mujawamariya, D. (2009). Mentorship and induction: Negotiating a Collaborative Enterprise or Apprenticing for Status Quo Maintenance? *Brock Education*, 8(2), 114-130.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2008, March). Toward theory of teacher education for social justice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Education for democracy. In W. C. Ayers & J. L. Miller (Eds.), *A light in dark times: Maxine Greene and the unfinished conversation*. New York: Teachers College Press (pp. 78-91).
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 17-30.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civic courage*. New York: Lantham, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gandin, L.A. (2006). Creating real alternatives to neoliberal policies in education: The Citizen School project. In M. W. Apple & K. L. Buras (Eds.), *The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power and educational struggles* (pp. 217-242). New York: Routledge.
- Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13, 69-484.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Henry, F., & Tator, C. (1994). The ideology of racism—democratic racism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 26 (2), 1-14.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as a practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hyslop-Marginson, E.J., & Sears, A.M. (2010). Enhancing teacher performance: The role of professional autonomy. *Interchange*, 41(1), 1-15.

- Hyslop-Margison, E.J., & Pinto, L. (2007). Critical literacy for democratic learning in career education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*, 193-210.
- Hyttén, K. (2006). Education for social justice: Provocations and challenges. *Educational Theory, 56*, 221-236.
- Jones, M. (2009). Transformational learners: Transformational teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(2), 14-27.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. L. (1998). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 260-299). London: Sage.
- Kohli, W. (2005). What is social justice education? In W. Hare & J.P. Portelli (Eds.), *Key questions for educators* (pp. 98-100). Halifax: Edphil Books.
- LeMaistre, C., & Paré, A. (2010). Whatever it takes: How beginning teachers learn to survive. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 559-564.
- Levinson, B.A.U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy, 23*, 767-795.
- Marshall, C. (2004). Social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 3-13.
- Ministry of Education. (2006). New teacher induction program: Induction elements manual. Retrieved 15 May 2008 <http://tpfr.edu.gov.on.ca/ntip/EM%20ENG%20-%20Final.pdf>
- O'Neill, S. (2000). The politics of inclusive agreements: Towards a critical discourse theory of democracy. *Political Studies, 48*, 503-521.
- Portelli, J. P., & Solomon, P. (Eds.). (2001). *The erosion of democracy in education: From critique to possibilities*. Calgary: Detselig.
- Raab, C.D. (1994). Theorizing the governance of education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 42*, 6-22.
- Reihl, C.J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*, 55-81.
- Ryan, J., & Rottmann, C. (2007). Educational leadership and policy approaches to critical social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 18*, 9-23.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Winton, S. (2010). Character development and critical democratic education in Ontario, Canada. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 9*, 220-237.

Wrigley, T. (2003). Is 'school effectiveness' anti-democratic? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 51*, 89-112.