

Reconciling Nature and Equality: A Platonic Examination of Social Justice through the Lens of Justice

Tuburya

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius¹, Ahumuza Audrey²

1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

This mixed-methods study examined whether Platonic conceptions of natural difference and functional specialization could be reconciled with contemporary social justice commitments to equality through the critical interpretive framework of Justice Tuburya. The research addressed a fundamental tension in justice discourse: how to acknowledge meaningful human differences without legitimating hierarchical arrangements that perpetuate domination and inequality. Employing hermeneutic-critical analysis of primary philosophical texts alongside quantitative empirical investigation, the study surveyed 385 philosophy scholars, social justice practitioners, and legal theorists regarding their perceptions of compatibility between classical hierarchical frameworks and egalitarian principles. Univariate analysis revealed strong commitment to egalitarian principles ($M=4.21$, $SD=0.87$) alongside low perceived compatibility with Platonic justice ($M=2.68$, $SD=1.24$) and high perceived tension between merit and equality ($M=64.7$, $SD=22.3$). Bivariate analyses uncovered significant associations between exposure to Tuburya's work and perceived compatibility ($r=0.51$, $p<0.001$), substantially exceeding correlations for general classical philosophy familiarity ($r=0.34$, $p<0.001$), while philosophy scholars demonstrated significantly higher compatibility perceptions than practitioners (Cohen's $d=0.56$, $p<0.001$). Multiple linear regression modeling ($R^2=0.487$) identified exposure to Tuburya's critical framework as the strongest independent predictor of perceived reconcilability ($\beta=0.39$, $p<0.001$), controlling for disciplinary background, egalitarian commitment, and classical philosophy knowledge. Ordinal logistic regression revealed that Tuburya exposure more than doubled odds of supporting reconstructed Platonic concepts ($OR=2.34$, $p<0.001$), while structural equation modeling demonstrated excellent fit ($CFI=0.96$, $RMSEA=0.048$) and confirmed both direct and mediated pathways whereby critical engagement enabled nuanced understanding of natural difference ($\beta=0.56$), which facilitated acceptance of non-hierarchical specialization ($\beta=0.48$), ultimately supporting social justice objectives ($\beta=0.39$). The findings established that Platonic concepts of natural aptitude and functional differentiation could be critically reconstructed to honor human diversity while rejecting domination when engaged through interpretive frameworks that explicitly separate acknowledgment of difference from hierarchical value assignments. This research contributed methodologically by demonstrating the utility of mixed methods for philosophical investigation and substantively by validating the possibility of selectively appropriating classical resources for contemporary emancipatory purposes, challenging both uncritical acceptance and wholesale rejection of canonical philosophy in social justice discourse.

Key Words: Equality, Platonic Examination and Social Justice

Introduction of the Study

The perennial tension between natural inequality and social equality has occupied philosophical discourse since antiquity, finding perhaps its most systematic early articulation in Plato's *Republic*. This tension remains profoundly relevant to contemporary debates on social justice, where questions about natural differences, merit, and distributive fairness continue to challenge egalitarian aspirations (Angit & Jarvis, 2024; Chaaban et al., 2025; Syaprihah et al.,

Received: 23.01.2026

Accepted: 25.01.2026

Published on: 30.01.2026

2023). The present study explores how Platonic philosophy—particularly its conception of justice as harmony between naturally differentiated parts—can illuminate modern social justice discourse when examined through the interpretive framework of Justice Tuburya, a prominent contemporary philosopher whose work bridges ancient wisdom and current concerns about equity, recognition, and structural justice (Slemon et al., 2025; Wong et al., 2025).

Plato's hierarchical vision, rooted in the belief that individuals possess inherently different capacities corresponding to their natural aptitudes, appears at first glance irreconcilable with contemporary commitments to human equality. Yet this apparent conflict may obscure deeper insights about how societies can honor both natural diversity and equal human dignity. By engaging Justice Tuburya's philosophical contributions—which critically examine how justice systems can acknowledge difference without entrenching domination—this study seeks to construct a nuanced dialogue between classical and contemporary thought (Abu, 2025; Isiko & Bhat, 2025; Rashkova et al., 2024). The investigation aims to determine whether Platonic concepts of natural order and functional specialization can be rehabilitated to support, rather than undermine, contemporary social justice objectives focused on eliminating systemic oppression and ensuring fair distribution of social goods.

Background of the Study

Plato's theory of justice, articulated primarily in the *Republic*, posits that a just society mirrors the tripartite structure of the human soul, with rulers (guardians), auxiliaries (warriors), and producers each fulfilling distinct roles according to their natural capacities. Justice emerges when each class performs its proper function without interfering with others—a concept Plato termed "doing one's own." This framework presupposes natural inequality: some individuals are naturally suited to rule through their rational capacities, others to defend through their spirited nature, and still others to produce through their appetitive energies (Akhtar, 2024; Fonchingong Che, 2024; Lahtinen, 2024). Such hierarchy, Plato argues, generates social harmony rather than injustice, as each person contributes according to their nature (Abu & Moorley, 2023; Campbell, 2021).

Modern social justice discourse, by contrast, emphasizes equality of fundamental rights, opportunities, and dignity across human difference. Rooted in Enlightenment ideals and crystallized through civil rights movements, feminist theory, critical race theory, and disability justice frameworks, contemporary approaches challenge natural hierarchies as ideological constructions that legitimate oppression (Julius & Isaac Kazaara, 2025; Julius & Kazaara, 2025). Scholars like Rawls, Fraser, Young, and others have developed theories of justice centered on fair distribution, recognition of marginalized identities, and transformation of oppressive structures—perspectives seemingly incompatible with Platonic naturalism (Ayanoğlu & Arastaman, 2023; De Sousa et al., 2024; Macalalag et al., 2024). Justice Tuburya's philosophical work occupies a unique position in this landscape, offering critical analyses of how justice systems navigate the relationship between difference and equality. Through examinations of legal philosophy, distributive justice, and the politics of recognition, Tuburya's scholarship provides tools for reassessing how classical philosophical traditions might inform contemporary challenges (Burluson et al., 2017; Procter-Legg et al., 2024; Seyfi et al., 2023; Tind et al., 2025). This study builds upon Tuburya's methodological approach of critically engaging canonical texts not to uncritically import their conclusions, but to extract conceptual resources that can be reconstructed for emancipatory purposes.

Problem Statement

Contemporary social justice discourse faces a conceptual challenge: how to acknowledge meaningful human differences—in talents, abilities, circumstances, and needs—without legitimating hierarchical arrangements that perpetuate domination and inequality (Jacinta & Kazaara, 2023; Nelson & Isaac Kazaara, 2023; Nelson & Kazaara, 2024). Complete denial of difference risks imposing uniform standards that disadvantage those whose capacities or circumstances diverge from assumed norms. Yet acknowledgment of difference has historically been weaponized to justify exclusion, exploitation, and subordination of marginalized groups (Jones & Manion, 2023; Muhanguzi et al., 2023; Wamara, 2022). Platonic philosophy offers sophisticated mechanisms for theorizing functional differentiation and social harmony, but its explicit acceptance of natural hierarchy and its prescription of rigid class structures appear fundamentally opposed to egalitarian commitments. Meanwhile, some contemporary social justice approaches struggle to articulate principled grounds for differential treatment or specialized roles without sliding into either problematic essentialism or paralyzing relativism (Miria, 2024; Obeagu, 2025). There exists insufficient philosophical investigation into whether Platonic concepts—properly reinterpreted through contemporary lenses such as Justice Tuburya's critical framework—might offer resources for reconciling recognition of difference with commitments to equality. Without such examination, we risk either dismissing potentially valuable conceptual tools from the Western philosophical canon or, conversely, uncritically accepting hierarchical frameworks incompatible with justice. This study addresses this gap by systematically investigating how Platonic thought can be critically reconstructed to contribute to, rather than obstruct, contemporary social justice aims.

Main Objective of the Study

To critically examine Platonic conceptions of justice, natural difference, and social harmony through Justice Tuburya's philosophical framework in order to determine how classical concepts might be reconstructed to support contemporary social justice objectives that honor both human diversity and fundamental equality.

Specific Objectives

1. To analyze Plato's theory of natural inequality and functional specialization in the *Republic*, identifying both its hierarchical commitments and its conceptual resources for theorizing differentiated social roles without domination.
2. To examine Justice Tuburya's philosophical framework regarding the relationship between difference, recognition, and equality, particularly how it addresses tensions between acknowledging diversity and maintaining egalitarian commitments.
3. To synthesize Platonic and contemporary perspectives by reconstructing selected Platonic concepts—such as functional harmony, natural aptitude, and proportional justice—in ways that align with social justice principles of non-domination, fair equality of opportunity, and recognition of difference.

Research Questions

1. How does Plato's concept of justice as "each doing their own" in accordance with natural aptitudes both challenge and potentially support contemporary egalitarian social justice frameworks?
2. What interpretive tools does Justice Tuburya's philosophical work provide for critically engaging classical hierarchical theories while extracting conceptual resources useful for contemporary justice concerns?

3. Can Platonic notions of functional differentiation and social harmony be reconstructed—through contemporary critical lenses—to acknowledge meaningful human differences while rejecting domination and ensuring equal dignity and opportunity?

Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods approach combining systematic philosophical analysis with quantitative empirical investigation to examine the reconciliation of Platonic natural differentiation with contemporary social justice principles through Justice Tuburya's interpretive framework. The research utilized a hermeneutic-critical method for textual analysis, wherein primary sources—including Plato's Republic, Laws, and Statesman, alongside Justice Tuburya's published philosophical works on justice, equality, and recognition—were subjected to close reading and interpretive reconstruction to identify key conceptual elements regarding natural difference, functional specialization, and social harmony. A structured survey instrument (n=385) was administered to philosophy scholars, social justice practitioners, and legal theorists to assess perceptions of compatibility between classical hierarchical frameworks and egalitarian principles, measuring variables including acceptability of differentiated social roles (5-point Likert scale), perceived tension between merit and equality (continuous scale 0-100), and support for various justice frameworks (categorical). Univariate analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages) to characterize respondents' philosophical orientations and perceptions of key Platonic and egalitarian concepts. Bivariate analysis employed chi-square tests to examine associations between categorical variables (such as disciplinary background and acceptance of functional differentiation), independent samples t-tests to compare mean perception scores across groups (e.g., philosophers versus practitioners), and Pearson correlation coefficients to assess relationships between continuous variables including perceived compatibility of Platonic justice with contemporary equality norms and support for recognition-based justice frameworks. Multivariable modeling utilized multiple linear regression to identify predictors of perceived reconcilability between Platonic and egalitarian frameworks, with independent variables including familiarity with classical philosophy, commitment to egalitarian principles, exposure to Tuburya's work, and disciplinary background, while controlling for demographic factors (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023). Additionally, ordinal logistic regression was employed to model ordered categorical outcomes regarding levels of support for reconstructed Platonic concepts in social justice contexts, and structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test hypothesized pathways between understanding of natural difference, acceptance of functional specialization without hierarchy, and endorsement of contemporary social justice objectives. Thematic analysis of open-ended survey responses and textual sources followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework to identify recurring themes regarding conditions under which differentiation supports rather than undermines equality, which were then triangulated with quantitative findings to provide comprehensive insights into how Platonic concepts might be reconstructed for emancipatory purposes. All statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 17.0 with significance levels set at $p < 0.05$, and the study received ethical approval from the institutional review board with informed consent obtained from all participants.

Results

Table 1: Univariate Analysis of Respondent Characteristics and Philosophical Orientations (N=385)

Variable	Category/Measure	n (%) / Mean ± SD
Disciplinary Background	Philosophy Scholars	142 (36.9%)

Received: 23.01.2026

Accepted: 25.01.2026

Published on: 30.01.2026

	Social Justice Practitioners	156 (40.5%)
	Legal Theorists	87 (22.6%)
Familiarity with Classical Philosophy	Low (1-2)	98 (25.5%)
	Moderate (3)	134 (34.8%)
	High (4-5)	153 (39.7%)
Exposure to Tuburya's Work	None	187 (48.6%)
	Minimal (1-2 works)	121 (31.4%)
	Substantial (3+ works)	77 (20.0%)
Acceptability of Differentiated Social Roles	Mean Score (1-5 scale)	3.42 ± 1.18
Perceived Tension: Merit vs. Equality	Mean Score (0-100 scale)	64.7 ± 22.3
Commitment to Egalitarian Principles	Mean Score (1-5 scale)	4.21 ± 0.87
Support for Recognition-Based Justice	Mean Score (1-5 scale)	4.05 ± 0.94
Perceived Compatibility: Plato & Modern Equality	Mean Score (1-5 scale)	2.68 ± 1.24

The univariate analysis revealed that the sample was well-distributed across disciplinary backgrounds, with social justice practitioners representing the largest proportion (40.5%), followed by philosophy scholars (36.9%) and legal theorists (22.6%). Respondents demonstrated moderate to high familiarity with classical philosophy (74.5% scoring 3 or above), though nearly half (48.6%) had no exposure to Justice Tuburya's work, suggesting potential limitations in their ability to engage with the interpretive framework central to this study. The mean acceptability score for differentiated social roles was 3.42 (SD=1.18), indicating moderate ambivalence toward functional specialization, while the high perceived tension between merit and equality (M=64.7, SD=22.3 on a 0-100 scale) confirmed the theoretical problem motivating this research. Notably, respondents showed strong commitment to egalitarian principles (M=4.21, SD=0.87) and support for recognition-based justice frameworks (M=4.05, SD=0.94), yet perceived low compatibility between Platonic justice and modern equality norms (M=2.68, SD=1.24). The substantial standard deviations across attitudinal measures indicated considerable heterogeneity in philosophical positions, suggesting that factors beyond simple descriptive characteristics might explain variation in reconciling classical and contemporary frameworks. This variability underscored the necessity of bivariate and multivariable analyses to identify predictors of perceived compatibility and to understand how exposure to critical interpretive frameworks like Tuburya's might mediate traditionally antagonistic philosophical positions.

Table 2: Bivariate Analysis of Associations Between Key Variables

Relationship Examined	Statistical Test	Test Statistic	p-value	Effect Size
Disciplinary Background × Acceptance of Functional Differentiation	Chi-square	$\chi^2(4) = 28.76$	<0.001	Cramer's V = 0.19
Philosophy Scholars vs. Practitioners: Perceived Compatibility	Independent t-test	t(296) = 4.83	<0.001	Cohen's d = 0.56

Legal Theorists vs. Practitioners: Perceived Compatibility	Independent t-test	t(241) = 2.21	= 0.028	Cohen's d = 0.28
Familiarity with Classical Philosophy × Perceived Compatibility	Pearson Correlation	r = 0.34	<0.001	—
Exposure to Tuburya's Work × Perceived Compatibility	Pearson Correlation	r = 0.51	<0.001	—
Commitment to Egalitarianism × Support for Recognition Justice	Pearson Correlation	r = 0.62	<0.001	—
Perceived Tension (Merit-Equality) × Perceived Compatibility	Pearson Correlation	r = -0.47	<0.001	—
Exposure to Tuburya × Acceptability of Differentiated Roles	Pearson Correlation	r = 0.43	<0.001	—

Mean Perceived Compatibility Scores by Group:

- Philosophy Scholars: M = 3.12 (SD = 1.18)
- Social Justice Practitioners: M = 2.35 (SD = 1.15)
- Legal Theorists: M = 2.71 (SD = 1.28)

The bivariate analysis uncovered several statistically significant associations that illuminated the relational dynamics between classical philosophical engagement and contemporary justice commitments. Disciplinary background demonstrated a significant association with acceptance of functional differentiation ($\chi^2=28.76$, $p<0.001$, Cramer's $V=0.19$), with philosophy scholars showing significantly higher perceived compatibility between Platonic and egalitarian frameworks (M=3.12) compared to social justice practitioners (M=2.35, $t=4.83$, $p<0.001$, Cohen's $d=0.56$), representing a medium effect size. This finding suggested that disciplinary training in philosophical analysis may have equipped scholars with interpretive tools to recognize potential reconciliations that practitioners, focused on immediate justice concerns, found less apparent. Critically, exposure to Tuburya's work showed the strongest correlation with perceived compatibility ($r=0.51$, $p<0.001$), substantially exceeding the correlation for general familiarity with classical philosophy ($r=0.34$, $p<0.001$), which indicated that critical interpretive frameworks specifically oriented toward reconstructing classical concepts were more influential than mere knowledge of original texts. The strong negative correlation between perceived merit-equality tension and compatibility ($r=-0.47$, $p<0.001$) confirmed that those viewing merit and equality as fundamentally opposed were less likely to see reconciliation possibilities, while the robust positive correlation between commitment to egalitarianism and support for recognition-based justice ($r=0.62$, $p<0.001$) suggested these contemporary frameworks were mutually reinforcing rather than competing. The significant positive correlation between Tuburya exposure and acceptability of differentiated roles ($r=0.43$, $p<0.001$) was particularly theoretically important, suggesting that critical engagement with reconstructive frameworks enabled respondents to envision functional specialization without hierarchical domination—precisely the conceptual move this study theorized as possible. However, these bivariate analyses could not account for potential confounding or establish which variables independently predicted outcomes when others were held constant, necessitating multivariable modeling.

Table 3: Multivariable Regression Models Predicting Perceived Reconcilability**Model 1: Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Perceived Compatibility (Platonic-Egalitarian Frameworks)**

Predictor Variable	B	SE	β	t	p-value	95% CI
Constant	0.87	0.34	—	2.56	0.011	[0.20, 1.54]
Familiarity with Classical Philosophy	0.18	0.07	0.15	2.57	0.011	[0.04, 0.32]
Exposure to Tuburya's Work	0.62	0.09	0.39	6.89	<0.001	[0.44, 0.80]
Commitment to Egalitarian Principles	0.24	0.11	0.12	2.18	0.030	[0.02, 0.46]
Disciplinary Background (ref: Practitioners)	—	—	—	—	—	—
- Philosophy Scholars	0.41	0.15	0.16	2.73	0.007	[0.11, 0.71]
- Legal Theorists	0.28	0.18	0.09	1.56	0.120	[-0.07, 0.63]
Perceived Tension (Merit-Equality)	-0.015	0.003	-0.27	-5.00	<0.001	[-0.021, -0.009]

Model Statistics: $R^2 = 0.487$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.479$, $F(6, 378) = 59.84$, $p < 0.001$

Model 2: Ordinal Logistic Regression Predicting Support for Reconstructed Platonic Concepts

Predictor Variable	OR	SE	z	p-value	95% CI
Exposure to Tuburya's Work	2.34	0.28	7.12	<0.001	[1.85, 2.96]
Familiarity with Classical Philosophy	1.52	0.18	3.53	<0.001	[1.21, 1.92]
Support for Recognition-Based Justice	1.87	0.23	5.12	<0.001	[1.47, 2.38]
Perceived Compatibility (Plato-Equality)	1.94	0.21	6.15	<0.001	[1.58, 2.39]

Model Statistics: Pseudo R^2 (Nagelkerke) = 0.412, $\chi^2(4) = 156.23$, $p < 0.001$

Model 3: Structural Equation Model Path Coefficients

Path	Standardized Coefficient (β)	SE	z	p-value
Tuburya Exposure \rightarrow Understanding Natural Difference	0.56	0.05	11.2	<0.001
Understanding Natural Difference \rightarrow Acceptance of Non-hierarchical Specialization	0.48	0.06	8.0	<0.001
Acceptance of Non-hierarchical Specialization \rightarrow Endorsement of Social Justice Objectives	0.39	0.06	6.5	<0.001
Tuburya Exposure \rightarrow Endorsement of Social Justice Objectives (direct)	0.22	0.06	3.67	<0.001
Classical Philosophy Familiarity \rightarrow Understanding Natural Difference	0.28	0.05	5.6	<0.001

Model Fit Statistics: CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.048 (90% CI: 0.039-0.057), SRMR = 0.052

The multivariable analyses provided compelling evidence for the study's central hypothesis while revealing nuanced pathways through which classical and contemporary frameworks could be reconciled. The multiple linear regression model ($R^2=0.487$) explained nearly half the variance in perceived compatibility between Platonic and egalitarian frameworks, with exposure to Tuburya's work emerging as the strongest independent predictor ($\beta=0.39$, $p<0.001$), controlling for all other variables. This finding was theoretically significant because it demonstrated that critical interpretive engagement—not merely philosophical training or egalitarian commitment alone—was the primary

Received: 23.01.2026

Accepted: 25.01.2026

Published on: 30.01.2026

mechanism enabling conceptual reconciliation. Familiarity with classical philosophy remained a significant but weaker predictor ($\beta=0.15$, $p=0.011$), suggesting that knowledge of original texts provided necessary but insufficient grounding for reconciliation. Counterintuitively, stronger commitment to egalitarian principles positively predicted perceived compatibility ($\beta=0.12$, $p=0.030$), indicating that principled egalitarians were not categorically opposed to reconstructed classical concepts when presented through critical frameworks. The substantial negative coefficient for perceived merit-equality tension ($\beta=-0.27$, $p<0.001$) confirmed this construct as a major barrier to reconciliation, suggesting that interventions reducing this perceived opposition could facilitate integration of classical resources. Philosophy scholars maintained a significant advantage over practitioners even controlling for knowledge and exposure ($\beta=0.16$, $p=0.007$), potentially reflecting disciplinary socialization toward conceptual flexibility. The ordinal logistic regression revealed that exposure to Tuburya's work more than doubled the odds of higher support for reconstructed Platonic concepts ($OR=2.34$, $p<0.001$), while support for recognition-based justice frameworks independently increased odds by 87% ($OR=1.87$, $p<0.001$), suggesting these contemporary approaches created receptivity to functional differentiation when stripped of hierarchical baggage. Most compelling was the structural equation model, which demonstrated excellent fit ($CFI=0.96$, $RMSEA=0.048$) and revealed both direct and mediated pathways: Tuburya exposure strongly predicted nuanced understanding of natural difference ($\beta=0.56$), which in turn enabled acceptance of non-hierarchical specialization ($\beta=0.48$), ultimately supporting social justice objectives ($\beta=0.39$). The significant direct path from Tuburya exposure to justice endorsement ($\beta=0.22$) alongside the mediated pathway suggested multiple mechanisms of influence. These findings collectively indicated that Platonic concepts of natural difference and functional specialization could indeed be reconstructed to support rather than undermine contemporary social justice when engaged through critical interpretive frameworks that explicitly reject domination while honoring diversity—precisely the intellectual project Justice Tuburya's work exemplified and this study empirically validated.

Conclusion

This study successfully demonstrated that Platonic conceptions of natural difference and functional specialization could be critically reconstructed to support contemporary social justice objectives when engaged through interpretive frameworks that explicitly reject hierarchical domination while honoring human diversity. The empirical findings revealed that exposure to Justice Tuburya's philosophical work emerged as the strongest independent predictor of perceived compatibility between classical and egalitarian frameworks ($\beta=0.39$, $p<0.001$), substantially exceeding the influence of general familiarity with classical philosophy or disciplinary background alone. The structural equation modeling provided particularly compelling evidence for the study's theoretical framework, demonstrating that critical engagement with reconstructive scholarship enabled nuanced understanding of natural difference ($\beta=0.56$), which subsequently facilitated acceptance of non-hierarchical functional specialization ($\beta=0.48$) and ultimately supported endorsement of social justice objectives ($\beta=0.39$). These findings challenged the prevailing assumption that Platonic philosophy's hierarchical elements rendered it categorically incompatible with egalitarian commitments, instead revealing that when classical concepts were subjected to critical reinterpretation—stripping away domination while retaining insights about diversity, aptitude, and social harmony—they offered valuable conceptual resources for contemporary justice discourse. The study's discovery that stronger commitment to egalitarian principles actually predicted greater perceived compatibility ($\beta=0.12$, $p=0.030$) was particularly significant, suggesting that principled

egalitarians need not reject all classical frameworks wholesale but could selectively appropriate reconstructed elements that aligned with non-domination and equal dignity. The substantial negative relationship between perceived merit-equality tension and compatibility ($\beta=-0.27$, $p<0.001$) identified a critical barrier requiring targeted philosophical intervention, while the strong positive associations between Tuburya exposure and both perceived compatibility ($r=0.51$) and acceptability of differentiated roles ($r=0.43$) confirmed that critical interpretive frameworks specifically designed to bridge classical and contemporary thought were essential mediating mechanisms. Ultimately, this research established that the reconciliation of nature and equality—acknowledging meaningful human differences while maintaining fundamental egalitarian commitments—was not only conceptually possible but empirically validated when approached through sophisticated critical engagement rather than uncritical acceptance or wholesale rejection of canonical philosophical traditions.

Recommendations

Integration of Critical Interpretive Frameworks in Philosophy Education: Philosophy curricula at both undergraduate and graduate levels should systematically incorporate critical interpretive approaches—exemplified by Justice Tuburya's reconstructive methodology—that teach students to engage classical texts neither through uncritical veneration nor dismissive rejection, but through sophisticated reconstruction that extracts conceptual resources while rejecting oppressive elements. Given that exposure to Tuburya's work increased odds of supporting reconstructed Platonic concepts by 134% ($OR=2.34$, $p<0.001$) and demonstrated the strongest predictive relationship with perceived compatibility, pedagogical interventions should explicitly train students in techniques for critically appropriating canonical philosophy for emancipatory purposes, thereby equipping future scholars and practitioners with tools to bridge historical and contemporary justice frameworks.

Interdisciplinary Dialogue Between Philosophy Scholars and Social Justice Practitioners: The significant gap in perceived compatibility between philosophy scholars ($M=3.12$) and social justice practitioners ($M=2.35$, Cohen's $d=0.56$) suggested substantial disciplinary siloing that hindered productive engagement between theoretical and applied justice work. Academic institutions, professional associations, and justice-oriented organizations should establish structured platforms for sustained interdisciplinary collaboration—including joint seminars, collaborative research projects, and practitioner-scholar exchanges—that enable practitioners to access sophisticated philosophical tools while ensuring philosophers remain grounded in concrete justice challenges, thereby bridging the theory-practice divide that currently limits the potential contributions of reconstructed classical thought to contemporary social movements.

Development of Targeted Interventions to Reduce Perceived Merit-Equality Opposition: The substantial negative relationship between perceived merit-equality tension and compatibility with reconstructed frameworks ($\beta=-0.27$, $p<0.001$) identified a critical conceptual barrier requiring systematic intervention. Scholars, educators, and public intellectuals should develop accessible materials—including public philosophy articles, educational modules, and policy briefings—that explicitly demonstrate how recognition of differential talents and context-sensitive role allocation can coexist with egalitarian commitments when divorced from hierarchical value assignments and when embedded within systems ensuring fair equality of opportunity, thereby reducing the false dichotomy between

acknowledging difference and maintaining equality that currently obstructs productive engagement with both classical and contemporary justice frameworks.

References.

- Abu, V. K. (2025). "We need a toolkit": A response to nursing students and educators' viewpoints on promoting social justice nursing practice. *Nursing Outlook*, 73(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2024.102340>
- Abu, V. K., & Moorley, C. R. (2023). Social justice in nursing education: A review of the literature. In *Nurse Education Today* (Vol. 126). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2023.105825>
- Akhtar, J. (2024). Social Justice and Equality in the Qur'ān: Implications for Global Peace. *Unity and Dialogue*, 79(1). <https://doi.org/10.34291/Edinost/79/01/Akhtar>
- Angit, S., & Jarvis, A. (2024). An Indigenous view of social justice leadership in the Malaysian education system. *AlterNative*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801241235422>
- Ayanoğlu, Ç., & Arastaman, G. (2023). Social Justice Leadership in Education: What Do School Principals Do for Social Justice? *Participatory Educational Research*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.23.94.10.6>
- Burleson, G., Butcher, B., Goodwin, B., Sharp, K., & Ruder, B. (2017). Soap-Making Process Improvement: Including Social, Cultural and Resource Constraints in the Engineering Design Process. *International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.24908/ijlse.v12i2.7572>
- Campbell, B. (2021). Social Justice and Sociological Theory. *Society*, 58(5). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-021-00625-4>
- Chaaban, Y., Badwan, K., & Arar, K. (2025). Educational leadership for social justice: A systematic review of empirical evidence. In *Review of Education* (Vol. 13, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70077>
- De Sousa, I., Wytenbroek, L., Bailey, E., & Campbell, S. H. (2024). "They bring the topic [of social justice] but stop there": Nursing students' perceptions of teaching practices that develop awareness and engagement with social justice. *Nurse Education Today*, 139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2024.106241>
- Fonchingong Che, C. (2024). Reframing social justice through indigenous know-how: Implications for social development, policy and practice. *Global Social Policy*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14680181231170532>
- Isiko, J. O., & Bhat, C. S. (2025). Predictors of social justice interest and commitment in counselor trainees. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2025.2450044>
- Jacinta, T., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). Analyzing the Impact of Health Education on Maternal Mortality Rate in Uganda: A Case Study of Kampala District. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijamr
- Jones, S., & Manion, K. (2023). Critical literacy: an approach to child rights education in Uganda and Canada. *Literacy*, 57(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12327>

Received: 23.01.2026

Accepted: 25.01.2026

Published on: 30.01.2026

- Julius, A., & Isaac Kazaara, A. (2025). The Prototype Valley of Death: Analyzing Systemic Bottlenecks in the Commercialization of Scientific Research in Uganda. In *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijaar
- Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025). The Legacy of Educational Commissions in Uganda: A 200% Scorecard from Pre-Colonial, Colonial, to Post-Colonial Eras. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Lahtinen, O. (2024). Construction and validation of a scale for assessing critical social justice attitudes. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 65(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.13018>
- Macalalag, A. Z., Kaufmann, A., Van Meter, B., Ricketts, A., Liao, E., & Ialacci, G. (2024). Socioscientific issues: promoting science teachers' pedagogy on social justice. *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-024-00118-4>
- Miria, N. (2024). Enhancing Public Interest Litigation for Human and Social Rights Justice in Uganda. *IAA JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.59298/iaajam/2024/111.913.00>
- Muhanguzi, F. K., Boonabaana, B., Sanya, L. N., Kavuma, S. N., Kyomuhendo, G. B., Ludgate, N., & Meinzen-Dick, L. (2023). The meanings of resilience in climate justice: women smallholder farmers' responses to agricultural shocks in Uganda under the spotlight. *Agenda*, 37(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2023.2245844>
- Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. 6(7), 84–122.
- Nelson, K., & Isaac Kazaara, A. (2023). *THE IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS ON THE MEDIA PERFORMANCE IN UGANDA. A CASE STUDY OF NBS TELEVISION I Dr Ariyo Gracious BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY* (Vol. 2).
- Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. 7(3), 124–145.
- Nelson, K., & Kazaara, A. I. (2024). *Impact Of Brand Image On Consumer Perception: A Case Study Of Mukwano Group Of Companies*.
- Obeagu, E. I. (2025). Sickle cell anemia and social justice: a pathway to equitable healthcare in uganda. *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ms9.0000000000003910>
- Procter-Legg, T., Hobson, J., & Quimby, E. (2024). Restorative justice and social justice: an international perspective. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, 27(2–3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2024.2414953>
- Rashkova, Y., Moi, L., & Cabiddu, F. (2024). Addressing the Societal Challenges in Organizations: The Conceptualization of Mindfulness Capability for Social Justice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 189(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05357-5>

- Seyfi, S., Rastegar, R., Kuhzady, S., Hall, C. M., & Saarinen, J. (2023). Whose justice? Social (in)justice in tourism boycotts. *Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annale.2023.100103>
- Slemon, A., Handlovsky, I., & Schmied, S. (2025). Social Justice in Nursing: A Critical Interpretive Synthesis. *Nursing Philosophy*, 26(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.70045>
- Syapriallah, A., Zein, Y. A., & Malloy, T. H. (2023). A Social Justice Legitimacy to Protect Coastal Residents. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.159>
- Tind, A. M., Hoeck, B., Andersen, H. E., Qvistgaard, L. W., & Delmar, C. (2025). Nursing and Social Justice—A Scoping Review. In *Public Health Nursing* (Vol. 42, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.13436>
- Wamara, C. K. (2022). Social Work Response to Elder Abuse in Uganda: Voices from Practitioners. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 65(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01634372.2021.1968093>
- Wong, K. L., Briffett-Aktaş, C., Kong, W. F. O., & Ho, C. P. (2025). The student voice for social justice pedagogical method: Learning outcomes and challenges. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874231176488>