Psychology, Society & Education

Dimensions of social justice: beliefs about integration in education and different types of prejudice in Argentine

Edgardo Etchezahar*[1][2], Miguel Ángel Albalá Genol[1][3], Joaquín Ungaretti[2][3] & Antonio Maldonado Rico[1]

[1] *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid (Spain)*
[2] *CONICET (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentine)*
[3] *Universidad Internacional de Valencia, Valencia (Spain)*

KEYWORDS

ABSTRACT

Perceptions of social justice are recognized as a key element in the formation of attitudes and behaviors towards certain social groups. The social justice dimensions (recognition, redistribution, and representation) interact differentially with demographic and psychosocial characteristics; however, few studies have delved into the differences in their association. This study had three aims: 1) to analyze the social justice dimensions according to age, gender, region, and educational level; 2) to study the correlation of social justice dimensions with beliefs about the educational inclusion of migrants, agreement with attitudes towards paying taxes and gender; and 3) to explore whether the social justice dimensions contribute to the levels of prejudice towards different social groups (people in poverty, immigrants, and homosexuals). A total of 1,810 subjects from Argentina, aged 18 to 80 years (M_{age} = 45.76 years; 53.7% women) participated in the study. Differences in the social justice dimensions were observed according to gender, age, and educational level, but not according to region. Social justice dimensions correlated with beliefs about educational inclusion of migrants, gender, equality in education, and attitudes toward paying taxes. Social justice dimensions contributed to higher/lower levels of prejudice toward different social groups. The scope and limits of the relationships between the three-dimensional model of social justice with demographic and psychosocial variables explored in this study are discussed.

Dimensiones de la justicia social: creencias sobre la integración en educación y diferentes tipos de prejuicio en Argentina

PALABRAS CLAVE

RESUMEN

Las percepciones de justicia social se reconocen como un elemento clave en la formación de las actitudes y comportamientos hacia determinados colectivos sociales. Las dimensiones de justicia social (reconocimiento, redistribución y representación) interactúan de forma diferencial con características demográficas y psicosociales, no obstante, son pocos los estudios que han profundizado en las diferencias en su asociación. Este estudio tuvo tres objetivos: 1) analizar las dimensiones de la justicia social según edad, género, región y nivel educativo; 2) estudiar la correlación de las dimensiones de justicia social con las creencias sobre la inclusión educativa de los migrantes, la concordancia con las actitudes hacia el pago de impuestos y el género; y 3) explorar si las dimensiones de justicia social contribuyen a los niveles de prejuicio hacia diferentes grupos sociales (personas en situación de pobreza, inmigrantes y homosexuales). Un total de 1,810 sujetos de Argentina, de entre 18 y 80 años (M_{edad} = 45.76 años; 53.7% mujeres) participaron en el estudio. Se observaron diferencias en las dimensiones de justicia social según género, edad y nivel educativo, pero no según la región. Las dimensiones de justicia social correlacionaron con creencias sobre la inclusión educativa de los migrantes, género, igualdad en la educación y actitudes hacia el pago de impuestos. Las dimensiones de la justicia social contribuyeron a los niveles más altos/más bajos de prejuicio hacia diferentes grupos sociales. Se discuten los alcances y límites de las relaciones entre el modelo de tres dimensiones de la justicia social con variables demográficas y psicosociales exploradas en este estudio.

In recent decades, numerous injustices and situations of inequity have affected different social groups, both economically and in terms of diversity recognition (gender, sexuality, migrants, among others) (Corporación Latinobarómetro, 2023; CEPAL, 2023; ECLAC, 2020; Milanovic, 2023; UN Women, 2021). The social justice theory model is one of the main theoretical approaches to studying inequalities. It has garnered attention from social science scholars, including those in education (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Westheimer, 2015).

According to Fraser (2008, 2012), social justice comprises three related dimensions. The first one is redistribution or economic justice (Nussbaum, 2012; Rawls, 2001; Sen, 2009), which raises the need not only for a fair distribution of goods and material resources but also for culture and capabilities. In this sense, the principle of equal opportunities, deeply rooted in Western democracies (Unterhalter & Brighouse, 2010), has not been fulfilled in many countries and has led to population impoverishment. The second dimension is recognition or cultural justice (Fraser & Honneth, 2006), which refers to the need for sociocultural respect, promoting human diversity and fair relations among people. From this perspective, social and cultural domination is rejected based on the recognition of different social groups and people excluded for reasons such as sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, origin, race, and culture, among others (Ratts et al., 2010). Considering that current definitions of prejudice are based on the maintenance of hierarchical and status differences between groups (Dovidio et al., 2010), the notion of recognition or cultural justice is relevant to understand prejudice towards different social groups, particularly against migrants and LGBTIQ+ people (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Graham-Bailey et al., 2019). Finally, the third dimension is representation or political justice (Fraser, 2008; Miller, 2001; Young, 2000). In other words, to ensure that people can exercise active and equal participation in society to guarantee decision-making capacity in any aspect of their lives. However, even in liberal democracies part of the citizenry still suffers limitations to fully achieve the principle of democratic participation (Fung, 2015).

Previous research found significant gender differences in social justice (Elenbaas et al., 2020; Malti et al., 2017; Murillo et al., 2014; Thrift & Sugarman, 2019), with a tendency for women to score higher than men in the three dimensions (Albalá Genol et al., 2021; Etchezahar et al., 2022; Ratts et al., 2010). As for age, although the data are not yet conclusive, it seems that the older the age, the higher the levels of representation (Parés & Subirats, 2016).

Although the social justice approach is applicable to various fields such as philosophy, economy, sociology, and psychology, it has gained significant relevance in education due to its potential for intervention (Albalá Genol et al., 2021; Murillo et al., 2014). Previous research has primarily been conducted in socio-educational contexts in Spain and Argentina, with the research sample consisting of trainee teachers and other professionals or social groups affected by injustices. In these research contexts, the sample is often predominantly female, as observed in the field of education. Additionally, the age range in the described contexts is typically from adulthood to early adulthood (18-40 years old) and with medium to high socioeconomic status. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct studies like this one to confirm the analysis in a more diverse sample (Lingard & Mills, 2007; Pope et al., 2019).

Social justice and education: the role of beliefs about equality

In recent years, the role of education for social justice has been emphasized and multiple research also included relevant variables such as educational inclusion, attention to diversity, or school segregation (Dowd, 2018). Through education for social justice, people will be more inclusive and, therefore, will be able to reduce and eliminate socio-educational exclusion, as well as enhance human rights and develop critical judgment towards equality (Belavi & Murillo, 2016). Achieving social justice in education requires the active participation of different collectives. This implies a change in approach within educational communities to transform the culture, policies, and practices of educational institutions (Azorín & Ainscow, 2020). Furthermore, social justice education aims to prevent school segregation. The recognition dimension can increase visibility and integration opportunities for minorities (Simón et al., 2019). Additionally, the redistribution dimension is a central aspect of social justice (Albalá Genol et al., 2021). Those who believe that taxes are appropriately redistributed to reduce inequalities will support tax payment (Rezrazi & Gangloff, 2020). In contrast, individuals who oppose social justice tend to support tax reduction or abolition from an individualistic perspective (Gandolfi & Mills, 2022).

In addition to social philosophy, politics, and education, the field of social psychology has made important theoretical contributions to understanding social justice and its current applications. Thus, interpersonal justice occurs when people are treated with courtesy, dignity, and respect by their immediate or superior leaders (Albalá-Genol et al., 2023; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Furthermore, distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the resources received (Törnblom & Vermunt, 1999) and suggests that justice is achieved when there is proportionality between worker's wages and their contributions (Thiago et al., 2023). More recently, the concept of "restorative justice" has emerged from the socio-educational field (United Nations, 2006) and is defined as a way of holding offenders accountable, repairing the harm caused to victims, and providing support and assistance to offenders to encourage their reintegration into the community (Suvall, 2009).

According to this model, the three dimensions of social justice are related to prejudice against various social groups, such us migrants and LGBTIQ+ individuals, both within and outside of the educational environment (Etchezahar et al., 2014).

The association of beliefs on social justice: prejudice towards different social groups

Several macro-social causes influence the development and maintenance of beliefs and prejudices towards those who experience unjust situations (Freire, 2005). These factors perpetuate

the status quo and hinder the achievement of social justice for vulnerable groups (McWhirter & McWha-Hermann, 2021). Previous studies (Graham-Bailey et al., 2019; Guo-Brennan & Guo-Brennan, 2020) have demonstrated that varying degrees of social justice can impact different forms of prejudice (towards migrants, people in poverty, and people belonging to the LGBTIQ+ community, among others). On the one hand, regarding prejudice towards people living in poverty (Bastias et al., 2022), beliefs about redistribution are critical since they are based on individualistic attributions, which may exclude the possibilities offered by a given context for economic development. On the other hand, prejudice towards migrants may be associated with the recognition dimension, as it can be used to explore openness to diversity (Paiba Alzate, 2022). Finally, prejudice towards LGBTIQ+ individuals (Etchezahar et al., 2016) may be linked to both the recognition and representation dimensions (Herek, 2000). Although the empirical study of the association between social justice and prejudice (Etchezahar et al., 2014) is very recent, it is an essential ongoing field to prevent and reduce the consequences within and outside educational environments.

The present study had three objectives: first, to analyze differences in levels of social justice based on age, gender, region, and educational level of the participants; second, to explore the relationships between dimensions of social justice, beliefs about educational inclusion of migrants, beliefs about gender equality in education, and the attitudes towards tax payment; and finally, to examine to which extent each dimension of social justice contributes to different forms of prejudice.

This study had three research hypotheses: 1. Differences in the dimensions of social justice will be found as a function of age –with older individuals scoring higher–, gender –with women scoring higher–, and educational level –with more educated individuals scoring higher–; 2. Positive relationships will be found between the three dimensions of social justice and beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education, beliefs about gender equality in education, and attitudes towards tax payment; 3. Each dimension of social justice will negatively predict related prejudices (redistribution will predict prejudice against poor people; recognition and representation will predict prejudice against homosexual people and migrants).

Methods

Participants

The present study included a non-probabilistic sample of 1,810 participants aged from 18 to 80 years. The mean age was 45.76 (*SD* = 15.6), 53.7% were female (*n* = 972), 46.3% were male (*n* = 819), and 1% were other (*n* = 19). In addition, 10.28% (*n* = 186) completed elementary school, 57.57% (*n* = 1,042) completed secondary school, 16.79% (*n* = 304) completed tertiary education, and 15.36% (*n* = 278) completed university studies. The sample distribution was based on INDEC (2019) and the data were collected between March and April 2023. Despite the control of many demographic variables, it should be noted that the sample is not representative of the general population.

Measures

Data were collected through a self-administered questionnaire that ensured participant anonymity and included the following variables:

Social Justice Scale (SJS). The SJS (Etchezahar et al., 2022) has three dimensions and 15 items (five for each dimension): redistribution, recognition, and representation. The response format is a five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (redistribution: α = .78; recognition: α = .75; and representation: α = .71).

Blatant and subtle prejudice towards people living in poverty. We use the adapted and validated version for the Argentine context (Bastias et al., 2022) of the original *Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale*. The Argentine version has ten items. Higher scores indicate more prejudice against people living in poverty. The response format is a five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .79).

Prejudice towards homosexuality. We use the Argentine adaptation (Etchezahar et al., 2016) of the *Attitudes Toward Gays Scale* (ATG) (Herek, 2000). The scale has ten items, with higher scores indicating more prejudice towards homosexuality. The response format has a five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .82).

Prejudice against Latin American immigrants. The Argentine adaptation (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Muller et al., 2017) of the *Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale* (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) was used to assess this construct. The scale consisted of eight items, whit higher scores indicating more prejudice against Latin American immigrants. The response format is five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .81).

Beliefs about the educational inclusion of migrants. Seven items containing beliefs about the educational inclusion of migrants (Albalá Genol et al., 2021) were used. Higher scores indicate more favorable beliefs towards inclusion in education. The response format is five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .79).

Beliefs about gender equality in education. Beliefs about gender equality (Albalá Genol et al., 2021) were assessed using eight items. Higher scores indicate more favorable beliefs towards inclusion in education. The response format is five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .83).

Tax payment. The *Attitudes Towards Tax Payment Scale* (Etchezahar et al., 2022), consisting of five items, was used. Higher scores indicate more disagreement with paying taxes.

The response format is a five-anchor Likert-type scale, on a continuum ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*. The original version of the scale showed adequate reliability (α = .84).

Educational level. Participants were asked about their highest level of education attained, with four response options: 1. Elementary school, 2. Secondary school, 3. Tertiary education, and 4. University studies.

Questionnaire of Sociodemographic Variables (ad hoc). The gender, age, and region of residence of the participants were asked.

Procedure

People who met the criteria of age (over 18 years of age) and geographic region were invited to participate via social media (Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) based on the quotas established for the sample distribution (with a sampling error of ±2.5% and a confidence level of 95%). A convenience, non-representative sample was used. Participants were informed beforehand about the purpose of the study and the institution responsible for it and were provided with an e-mail address in case they required further information. They were also informed that the data collected would only be used for academic-scientific purposes and that they would be protected in accordance with Argentine's National Law 25.326 on the Protection of Personal Data. All procedures carried out in our study were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Institutional and Research Committee and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1964 and its subsequent amendments or comparable ethical standards. Participants then completed the online questionnaire.

Data analysis

The statistical analysis was carried out with SPSS 20 software. First, to test H1, sex (*t*-test and Cohen's *d*), educational level (ANOVA's and Tuckey b post hoc contrast), and age (Pearson correlation) with social justice dimensions were analyzed. Subsequently, to test the H2 about the relationships between the three dimensions of social justice and beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education, beliefs about gender equality in education, and attitudes towards tax payment, Person's correlations were used. Finally, regarding H3, linear regressions were used

to analyze the extent to which each dimension of social justice predicts related prejudices. In all cases, the normality criteria and the outliers of the structured variables were calculated to perform the parametric analyses.

Results

Social justice, gender, age, level of education, and region of residence

First, gender differences in the dimensions of social justice were analyzed (Table 1). Statistically significant differences were observed in all three dimensions, with women scoring higher than men, as hypothesized. Second, the relationships between the social justice dimensions and age were calculated and found to be significant and negative in all cases but with low strength (Table 1).

Third, we analyzed differences in the dimensions of social justice according to participants' level of education. Statistically significant differences were found in recognition ($F = 6.666$; $p < .001$) and representation ($F = 10.401$; $p < .001$). No significant differences were found for the redistribution dimension. Regarding recognition, post hoc contrasts reveal two groups: participants with "elementary school" and "secondary school" ($M = 3.16$) show lower scores compared to participants with "tertiary education" and "university studies" ($M = 3.4$). On the contrary, participants with "tertiary education" and "university studies" achieved the lowest scores ($M = 3.66$) in the representation dimension, which differed from a second group composed of "elementary school" and "secondary school" ($M = 3.89$). These results partially support the hypothesis that the higher the level of education, the higher the social justice scores, except in the redistribution dimension (no differences were found). Finally, no statistically significant differences were found between the social justice dimensions and the regions of Argentine where the participants live.

Inclusion of migrant and gender equality in education and attitudes towards tax payment

The next step was to analyze the relationships between the dimensions of social justice, beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education, gender equality in education, and attitu-

Table 1

Gender differences between the three dimensions of social justice

	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*t*	Cohen's *d*	Age (*r*)
Redistribution	Female	3.46	1.13	3.745	.2	-.18
	Male	3.22	1.2			
Recognition	Female	3.43	1.01	6.186	.34	-.2
	Male	3.08	1.03			
Redistribution	Female	3.9	0.79	5.97	.33	-.13
	Male	3.62	0.88			

Note. All correlations are significant a *p* < 001.

des towards paying taxes (Table 2). Regarding the social justice dimensions, redistribution was positively related to recognition and representation. Similarly, recognition correlates with representation. These results are consistent with previous data reported on the scale (Albalá Genol et al., 2021; Etchezahar et al., 2022), which indicate the independence of the three dimensions of social justice, although they are related. Likewise, beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education and gender equality in education correlate positively with all three dimensions of social justice, while attitudes about paying taxes correlate negatively. Note that the correlations in the representational dimension are consistently weaker than those in the other two dimensions of social justice (refer to Table 2).

Social justice and prejudice against different groups

Finally, a series of linear regressions were performed to observe whether the social justice dimensions contribute to the variance of the different expressions of prejudice (Table 3).

As shown in Table 3, the dimensions of social justice explain to varying degrees the variance of prejudice against the poor (42.2%). Specifically, redistribution contributes to a greater extent compared to recognition and representation. Regarding prejudice against Latin American immigrants (21% of the variance), recognition appears to have the largest contribution,

followed by redistribution and, to a lesser extent, representation. Similarly, prejudice against homosexuals (23.1% of the variance) is mainly influenced by recognition and then followed by redistribution. No significant effects were found for representation.

Discussion

First, the relationships and statistical differences between the dimensions of social justice, gender, age, educational level, and region were analyzed. Regarding Hypothesis 1, gender differences were observed in all three dimensions of social justice. Women scored significantly higher than men in the dimensions of recognition and representation, and still significant but with a smaller effect in the dimension of redistribution. These results suggest that it may be more complicated for people to consider social justice in terms of redistribution, possibly because this dimension implies a more plausible economic impact for both genders (e.g., payment of taxes and distribution of material goods, among others). These results replicate those found in previous studies (Albalá Genol et al., 2021; Etchezahar et al., 2022) and show that women are more prosocial than men in general and especially in the dimensions of social justice (Bénabou & Tirole, 2006). About age, negative relationships were observed with all three dimensions, although with

Table 2

Relations between the dimensions of social justice, beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education, gender equality in education, and attitudes towards tax payment

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Redistribution	.77	.7	.41	.61	.6	-.62
2. Recognition		.81	.44	.76	.62	-.54
3. Representation			.72	.3	.33	-.11
4. Beliefs about the inclusion of migrants in education				.8	.64	-.52
5. Beliefs about gender equality in education					.78	-.47
6. Attitudes towards tax payment						.84

Note. Cronbach's alpha in the diagonal. All correlations are significant a $p < 001$.

Table 3

Regression models between the social justice dimensions and three expressions of prejudice

Dependent variables	Independent variables	N. Stand. Coef.		Stand. Coef.		
		B (95% CI)	*SE*	*β*	*t*	R^2
Prejudice towards poor people	Redistribution	-.47	.03	-.55	-18.17*	
	Recognition	-.2	.03	-.2	-6.65*	.42
	Representation	.21	.03	.17	7.28*	
Prejudice towards Latin-American Immigrants	Redistribution	-.17	.03	-.22	-6.21*	
	Recognition	-.3	.03	-.33	-9.37*	.21
	Representation	.2	.03	.17	6.28*	
Prejudice towards homosexuals	Redistribution	-.12	.03	-.13	-3.82*	
	Recognition	-.41	.04	-.39	-11.03*	.23
	Representation	.03	.04	.02	0.76	

*p < 001.

low strength: the younger the person, the higher the scores in social justice. Previous studies are unclear on this issue: while some studies observed partial relationships between age and the dimensions of social justice (Albalá Genol et al., 2021), others did not (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Murillo et al., 2014). Regarding participants' educational level, statistically significant differences were observed for recognition and representation but not for redistribution. These results could imply that the educational system plays a crucial role in promoting beliefs in intergroup equality (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Sutton & Douglas, 2005) and fostering the development of diverse group representation (Graham-Bailey et al., 2019; McWhirter & McWha-Hermann, 2021). In terms of redistribution, it does not seem to be related to the educational level of the participants. This could indicate an unclear concept of justice circumscribed to a certain level of education (Nussbaum, 2012), but in each subgroup we can find different ideological perspectives (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Sapon-Shevin, 2013). Finally, no differences were found in any of the three dimensions of social justice according to the region of residence. This result was not expected, given the variability of beliefs hypothesized in each region of the country in terms of recognition, redistribution, and representation (Féliz & Millón, 2022; INDEC, 2019).

In any case, a conclusion is that the analysis of representations of social justice should not be limited to age alone but should also take into account other psychosocial factors such as prosocial thinking (values, ideology, among others). The results indicate that the representations of social justice are not always uniform across the three dimensions studied. This highlights the importance of considering their relationship with other variables. The level of education is key to developing ways of thinking that are more linked to social justice (especially in terms of recognition and representation), which could position education as an environment that promotes more just societies. The lack of significant differences according to the geographical regions within Argentine should be contrasted in future studies. In this way, a more balanced and nationally representative sample is suggested as necessary. It is important to note that this study did not consider variables such as ideology, socioeconomic level, and ethnicity of the participants. Future studies should considerer these variables.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, we examined the relationship between the dimensions of social justice and beliefs about the inclusion of immigrants and gender-diverse individuals in the educational environment, as well as attitudes towards paying taxes, through the lens of Westheimer's (2015) advocacy for inclusive education from a comprehensive, contextualized standpoint. As postulated by Belavi and Murillo (2016), the three dimensions of social justice are significantly related to the variables examined in this study. Both redistribution and recognition play a central role in promoting the inclusion of migrants and people with diverse gender identities in the educational sphere while influencing attitudes towards tax payment. Redistribution is correlated with attitudes towards paying taxes –a cornerstone of retributive justice– because it involves a greater

financial contribution from those in a more favorable economic position to support those most in need (Rezrazi & Gangloff, 2020). Furthermore, it emphasizes the need to incorporate diversity in public spheres, especially in education (Dainez & Smolka, 2019). Therefore, both dimensions of social justice –redistribution and recognition– are essential for the success of this process. Representation is also significantly correlated with the three variables under study, although to a lesser extent. Previous studies (Etchezahar et al., 2022; Honneth, 1997) have indicated that although representation is crucial to the exercise of social justice, individuals often do not perceive it as relevant, as greater emphasis is placed on addressing inequalities stemming from economic and cultural injustices. In our study, a weak relationship was observed between this dimension and attitudes towards paying taxes. It is plausible that, as suggested by Rezrazi and Gangloff (2020), if taxpayers perceive a lack of quality public services in return for their taxes, they may not feel adequately represented and may lean towards a more individualistic perspective (Gandolfi & Mills, 2022).

Third, Hypothesis 3 was confirmed, as all dimensions of social justice influence different forms of prejudice. Regarding prejudice against people living in poverty, the role of redistribution is paramount, while recognition and representation also play a secondary role. Societies such as Argentine, where nearly 42% of the population lives in poverty (INDEC, 2019), require the redistribution of wealth to ensure that it is returned to the population in the form of essential public services (Fraser, 2008; Fraser, 2012; Sen, 2009), which is particularly crucial for people living in poverty (Unterhalter & Brighouse, 2007). A common thread in this type of prejudice is the attribution of causality (Bastias et al., 2022; Etchezahar et al., 2022), which often focuses on internal factors within individuals (e.g., "Poor individuals are unwilling to work") (Féliz & Millón, 2022). This attribution overlooks external conditions that typically pose significant barriers for individuals to escape poverty (e.g., access to better job opportunities or possibilities for personal growth in the workforce). Consequently, public support for resource redistribution operates on the premise of attributing external causality, underscoring that societal change does not depend solely on individual efforts but requires collective strategies backed by institutional support (McWhirter & McWha-Hermann, 2021; Sutton & Douglas, 2005). Based on this empirical research evidence, the development of programs aimed at promoting intercultural coexistence is essential. Future socio-educational programs should promote the three dimensions of social justice, fostering a more prosocial and intercultural perspective on migration among citizens.

Regarding prejudice against Latin American immigrants, as posited, recognition plays a fundamental role, with redistribution and representation also contributing to a lesser extent. Migrant individuals often have a especial need for recognition, as the reasons for migratory processes and the inherent vulnerabilities associated with migration are often overlooked (Féliz & Millón, 2022). Argentine, in particular, is experiencing different waves of migration, with recent influxes coming from

Latin American countries (Etchezahar et al., 2022). Recognizing differences and empathizing with their circumstances are crucial steps towards fostering more equitable societies (Belavi & Murillo, 2016; Elenbaas et al., 2020). Our study shows that individuals' beliefs about recognition directly impact prejudicial attitudes towards Latin American immigrants. However, it is essential to emphasize that the items used to measure the recognition dimension primarily focus on the inclusion and respect of migrant individuals. Therefore, they may be contributing to a better prediction of prejudice against Latin American immigrants. It is important to note that this study does not differentiate between countries. Future studies could explore whether there is a difference in prejudice towards Latin American immigrants based on their country of origin.

Finally, regarding prejudice toward homosexual people, our results indicate that recognition plays the most important role, followed to a lesser extent by redistribution. However, no differences were observed concerning representation. Prejudice towards gender diversity, along with migration issues, serves as a key indicator of recognition of diversity in a broader sense (Albalá Genol et al., 2021). However, despite the social justice policies associated with this issue (e.g., equal marriage laws, transgender quotas in government agencies, etc.), we expected the representation dimension to have a predominant impact, but its contribution was not significant. Therefore, it may be necessary to increase the visibility of various gender and sexual diversity policies, as many individuals may be currently unaware of them (Etchezahar et al., 2022). It is relevant to consider evidence, such as that presented in the current study, regarding various policies promoting coexistence and tolerance. Educational policies should focus on providing a more comprehensive education that acknowledges the significant impact of the conceptualization of social justice (redistribution, recognition, representation) on the development of prejudice levels.

Until now, previous studies have not worked with the three dimensions of social justice (Etchezahar et al., 2023), at least not from Fraser's (2008) perspective, to analyze their relationships with variables such as the educational inclusion of migrants, attitudes towards paying taxes, and gender. This new research perspective (see Albalá Genol et al., 2021) has emerged following the development of the *Social Justice Scale*. Additionally, the study is original because there has been scarce empirical research on social justice in Latin America and in Argentine in particular. Furthermore, no studies have been found that analyze the influence that each dimension of social justice could have on different expressions of prejudice (e.g., people in poverty, immigrants, and homosexuals). These aspects highlight the relevance and originality of the work, which calls for future studies to further delve into.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: E.E., J.A., M.A.G., A.M.R.
Data curation: E.E., J.A., M.A.G., A.M.R.
Methodology: E.E., J.A., M.A.G., A.M.R.

Writing – original draft: E.E., J.A., M.A.G., A.M.R.
Writing – review & editing: E.E., J.A., M.A.G., A.M.R.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of interests

The authors declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

References

Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality, and behavior.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Albalá-Genol, J., Díaz-Fúnez, P. A., & Mañas-Rodríguez, M. Á. (2023). Resilience and job satisfaction: Effect of moderated mediation on the influence of interpersonal justice on the performance of public servants. *International Journal of Environmental Research in Public Health, 20*(4), Article 2957. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20042957

Albalá Genol, M. A., Etchezahar, E., & Maldonado Rico, A. (2021). Creencias sobre la inclusión y la justicia social en la educación: factores implicados. *Revista Prisma Social*, *33*, 162-182.

Azorín, C., & Ainscow, M. (2020). Guiding schools on their journey towards inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(1), 58-76. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1450900

Bastias, F., Ungaretti, J., Barreiro, A., & Etchezahar, E. (2022). Adaptación y validación de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto hacia personas en situación de pobreza. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, *28*(1), 352-366. https://doi.org/10.31876/rcs.v28i1.37696

Belavi, G., & Murillo, F. J. (2016). Educación, democracia y justicia social. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, *5*(1), 13-34. https://revistas.uam.es/riejs/article/view/4371/4805

Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and prosocial behavior. *American Economic Review*, *96*(5), 1652-1678. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1652

Bentler, P. (2007). On tests and índices for evaluating structural models. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*(5), 825-829. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.024

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for INCLUSION: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education. https://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/Index%20English.pdf

Brighouse, H., & Unterhalter, E. (2010). Primary Goods versus Capabilities: Considering the debate in relation to equalities in education. In H. U. Otto & H. Ziegler (Eds.) *Capabilities – Handlungsbefähigung und Verwirklichungschancen in der Erziehungswissenschaft. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften* (pp. 69-81). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91909-6_4

CEPAL. (2022). *Preliminary overview of the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean 2022*. https://hdl.handle.net/11362/48575

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education*, *115*(3), 347-370. https://doi.org/10.1086/597493

Corporación Latinobarómetro. (2023). *Informe 2023*. https://www.latinobarometro.org/latContents.jsp

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the Maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (vol. 12)* (pp. 317-372). John Wiley & Sons.

Dainez, D., & Smolka, A. L. B. (2019). A função social da escola em discussão, sob a perspectiva da educação inclusiva. *Educação E Pesquisa*, *45*, Article e187853. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1678-4634201945187853

Dovidio, J., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: theoretical and empirical overview. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 3-28). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200919

Dowd, J. (2018). Education and everyday life: McLuhan's 'city as classroom' as a practice of social justice in social change. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *13*(2), 105-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2018.1439947

Eagly, A. H., Nater, C., Miller, D. I., Kaufmann, M., & Sczesny, S. (2020). Gender stereotypes have changed: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of U.S. public opinion polls from 1946 to 2018. *American Psychologist*, *75*(3), 301-315. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000494

Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., & Killen, M. (2020). A developmental-science perspective on social inequality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *29*(6), 610-616. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420964147

Etchezahar, E., Barreiro, A., Albalá Genol, M. Á., & Maldonado Rico, A. F. (2022). Assessment of social justice dimensions in young adults: The contribution of the belief in a just world and social dominance orientation upon its rising. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, Article 997423. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.997423

Etchezahar, E., Prado-Gascó, V., Jaume, L., & Brussino, S. (2014). Validación argentina de la escala de Orientación a la Dominancia Social. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, *46*(1), 35-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0120-0534(14)70004-4

Etchezahar, E., Ungaretti, J., Prado-Gascó, V., & Brussino, S. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Attitudes Toward Gay Men scale in Argentinian context: The influence of sex, authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, *9*(1), 21-29. https://revistas.usb.edu.co/index.php/IJPR/article/view/2097

Etchezahar, E., Ungaretti, J., & Marchiano, F. (2022). "Economic support? They don't really need it". Prejudice towards Latin American immigrants in Argentina. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *87*, 37-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2022.01.007

Féliz, M., & Millón, M. E. (2022). Crisis and class inequality in Argentina: a new analysis using household survey data. *Review of Evolutionary Political Economy*, *3*, 405-433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43253-022-00080-9

Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Columbia University Press.

Fraser, N. (2012). La política feminista en la era del reconocimiento: un enfoque bidimensional de la justicia de género. *Revista de Historia de las Mujeres*, *19*(2), 267-286. https://doi.org/10.30827/arenal.v19i2.1417

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2006). *Redistribution o reconocimiento?* Morata.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogía del oprimido* (2 ed.). Siglo XXI Editores.

Gandolfi, H. E., & Mills, M. (2022). Teachers for social justice: exploring the lives and work of teachers committed to social justice in education. *Oxford Review of Education, 49*(5), 569-587. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2022.2105314

Guo-Brennan, L., & Guo-Brennan, M. (2021). Leading welcoming and inclusive schools for newcomer students: A conceptual framework. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *20*(1), 57-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1838554

Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *9*(1), 19-22. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00051

Honneth, A. (1997). *La lucha por el reconocimiento: por una gramática moral de los conflictos sociales*. Crítica.

INDEC (2019). *Incidencia de la pobreza y la indigencia en 31 aglomerados urbanos*. https://www.indec.gob.ar/uploads/informesdeprensa/eph_pobreza_01_19422F5FC20A.pdf

Lingard, B., & Mills, M. (2007). Pedagogies making a difference: Issues of social justice and inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 11*(3), 233-244. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701237472

Lizasoain, L, & Joaristi, L. (2003). *Gestión y análisis de datos con SPSS*. Ites-Paraninfo.

Malti, T., Dys, S. P., Cui, L., & Buchmann, M. (2017). Moral and social antecedents of young adults' attitudes toward social inequality and social justice values. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies, 8*(1), 5-19. https://doi.org/10.14301/llcs.v8i1.397

Maurizio, R., Beccaria, L., & Monsalvo, A. (2022). Labour formalization and inequality: The distributive impact of labour formalization in Latin America since 2000. *Development and Change*, *53*(1), 117-165. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12653

McWhirter, E. H., & McWha-Hermann, I. (2021). Social justice and career development: Progress, problems, and possibilities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *126*, Article 103492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103492

Milanovic, B. (2023). *Visions of inequality from the French Revolution to the end of the Cold War*. Harvard University Press.

Miller, D. (2001). *Principles of social justice*. Harvard University Press.

Müller, M., Ungaretti, J., & Etchezahar, E. (2017). Validación argentina de la Escala de Prejuicio Sutil y Manifiesto hacia villeros. *Revista de Psicología*, *26*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-0581.2017.46204

Murillo, F. J., Hernández-Castilla, R., Hidalgo, N., & Martínez-Garrido, C. (2014). Elaboración y evaluación psicométrica de la Escala de Actitudes hacia la Justica Social en Educación (EAJSE). *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, *3*(2), 215-233. http://www.rinace.net/riejs/numeros/vol3-num2/art11.pdf

Nussbaum, M. (2012). *Crear capacidades: propuesta para el desarrollo humano*. Paidós.

Paiba Alzate, N. (2022). La esencia multidimensional del reconocimiento: Fraser y Honneth. *Revista Boletín Redipe, 11*(3), 72-81. https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v11i3.1707

Parés, M., & Subirats, J. (2016). Muy jóvenes, jóvenes y menos jóvenes: El lío de la juventud y la política. *Revista de Estudios de Juventud*, *114*, 45-58.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*(1), 57-75. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420250106

Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2019). *Multicultural competence in student affairs: Advancing social justice and inclusion*. John Wiley & Sons.

Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *49*(1-2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9448-8

Ratts, M. J., Anthony, L., & Santos, K. N. T. (2010). The dimensions of social justice model: Transforming traditional group work into a socially just framework. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, *35*(2), 160-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/01933921003705974

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Harvard University Press.

Rezrazi, A., & Gangloff, B. (2020). Relations among gender, status and various dimensions of the belief in a just world and justice sensitivity. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 24*(2), 93-121. https://doi.org/10.24193/cbb.2020.24.06

Sapon-Shevin, M. (2013). La inclusión real: Una perspectiva de justicia social. *Revista de Investigación en Educación*, *11*(3), 71-85. http://webs.uvigo.es/reined/

Sen, A. (2009). *La idea de la justicia*. Taurus.

Simón, C., Barrios, Á., Gutiérrez, H., & Muñoz, Y. (2019). Equidad, educación inclusiva y educación para la justicia social. ¿Llevan todos los caminos a la misma meta? *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social, 8*(2), 17-32. https://doi.org/10.15366/riejs2019.8.2.001

Sutton, R., & Douglas, K. (2005). Justice for all, or just for me? More evidence of the importance of the self-other distinction in just-world beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*(3), 637-645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.010

Thiago, F., Paquito, B. L., Gonçalves, C., & Maciel, W. R. E. (2023). Satisfacción, justicia en el trabajo e intención de rotación en los trabajadores del transporte público. *International Journal of Organizations, 30*, 157-177. https://raco.cat/index.php/RIO/article/view/417448

Törnblom, K. Y., & Vermunt, R. (1999). An integrative perspective on social justice: Distributive and procedural fairness evaluations of positive and negative outcome allocations. *Social Justice Research, 12*(1), 39-64. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023226307252

United Nations. (2006). *Handbook on restaurative justice programmes*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

UN Women (2021). *United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women Strategic Plan 2022-2025*. https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n21/186/22/pdf/n2118622.pdf?token=YtlY2PW5x9FvFcGKn1&fe=true

Westheimer, J. (2015). *What kind of citizen? Educating our children for the common good*. Teachers College Press.

Young, I. M. (2004). Responsibility and global labor justice. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, *12*(4), 365-388. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2004.00205.x

Young, I. M. (2000). *La justicia y la política de la diferencia*. Cátedra.

Edgardo Etchezahar, Miguel Ángel Albalá Genol,
Joaquín Ungaretti, Antonio Maldonado Rico

Dimensions of social justice: beliefs about integration in education and different types of prejudice in Argentine
Dimensiones de la justicia social: creencias sobre la integración en educación y diferentes tipos de prejuicio en Argentina