



## UWS Academic Portal

### Towards an ethics of leadership

Gillies, Donald

*Published in:*  
Theorising Identity and Subjectivity in Educational Leadership Research

Published: 18/03/2020

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Gillies, D. (2020). Towards an ethics of leadership. In R. Niesche, & A. Heffernan (Eds.), *Theorising Identity and Subjectivity in Educational Leadership Research* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Theorising-Identity-and-Subjectivity-in-Educational-Leadership-Research/Niesche-Heffernan/p/book/9780367145293>

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [pure@uws.ac.uk](mailto:pure@uws.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Towards an ethics of leadership**

Donald Gillies, *University of the West of Scotland*

### **Introduction**

Leadership is hailed currently in policy discourse as the key to a whole number of outcomes desired of the education system, whether globally or locally. Accordingly, in advanced economies at least, there has been a proliferation of associated developments in educational leadership training, leadership standards, leadership colleges, and leadership qualifications. A history of its progress would need to acknowledge the failure of other hopes in educational governance for that which will secure imagined goals: the failure of professionalism, of administration, and of management. None of those has achieved what is desired by those in charge of state education. Now their hopes rest on leadership, largely through a process of elimination, and shaped by developing theory rooted in the business world, founded on a neoliberal worldview, where total quality management contends with new public management and with the ubiquity of human capital theory.

In deploying the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-84) to this field one must do so cautiously, if only because Foucault never wrote about leadership and only minimally about education. However, in recent times, scholars have had recourse to his work in critiquing the field of school leadership, in particular, and these developments have offered fruitful insight and analysis (Niesche, 2011, 2018; Gillies, 2013; Niesche & Keddie, 2016; Heffernan, 2016, 2018a; Mifsud, 2017). In addition to the specific use of Foucauldian ideas in researching school leadership, one also must recognise two key concerns in his work which have particular relevance to the focus of this book. While identity as a focus of philosophical thought was not an area of interest to Foucault, his latter years saw him increasingly concerned with the concept of the ‘self’ and notions such as ‘care of the self’, drawing heavily on classical texts. Secondly, he identified himself that the major focus of his work had been ‘a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects’ (Foucault, 2002a, p.326). In this regard, Foucault moved from an early concern with surveillance and discipline as means of subjectivation, to a later concern with self-discipline and its various manifestations. This traces a transition from individuals as ‘docile bodies’ worked upon by stronger forces, to individuals as active agents working on their own self-creation: ‘. . . I am now interested in how the subject constitutes itself in an active fashion through practices of the

self' (Foucault, 2000a, p.291). As Olssen (2009, p.78) summarises: '... there is on the surface a shift in Foucault's interest away from knowledge as a coercive practice of subjection, to being a practice of the self-formation of the subject as an art of self-government'.

### **Subjectivation, self-discipline, and technologies of the self**

Foucault moves, therefore, towards an understanding of subjectivation which acknowledges the involvement of forces beyond that of domination:

Let us not, therefore, ask why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours etc. In other words, rather than ask ourselves how the sovereign appears to us in his lofty isolation, we should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts etc.

(Foucault, 1994, p.97)

This sense of a 'multiplicity of forces' involves a recognition of the role of self-discipline, of the individual acting upon herself/himself to effect certain purposes. Foucault acknowledges that this involves a shift from his previous orientation:

If one wants to analyse the genealogy of the subject in Western civilisation, one has to take into account, not only techniques of domination, but also techniques of the self. One has to show the interaction between these types of technique. When I was studying asylums, prisons and so on, I perhaps insisted too much on the techniques of domination. What we call discipline is something really important in this kind of institution. But it is only one aspect of the art of governing people in our societies. Having studied the field of power relations taking techniques of domination as a point of departure, I would like, in the years to come, to study power relations starting from the techniques of the self.

Foucault terms these techniques ‘technologies of the self’:

. . . techniques that permit individuals to effect, by their own means, a certain number of operations on their own bodies, their own souls, their own thoughts, their own conduct, and this in a manner to transform themselves, and to attain a certain state. . .

(ibid.)

In this chapter, therefore, Foucault’s work primarily on self-formation, these technologies of the self, will be used in relation to the headteacher as subject, the practices that headteachers exercise in order to fulfil their understanding of that role and its expectations. In keeping with the two orientations of discipline outlined by Foucault above, it needs to be recognised that headteachers are also subject to external disciplinary power, some of which is perfectly legitimate in terms of democratic accountability. It seems to be unproblematic, in political terms, for taxpayers, for elected authority, to have expectations of headteachers within the state sector and for such persons to be accountable to higher authority. In addition, headteachers will be subject to processes of discipline which may involve the requirement to achieve certain qualifications, to undergo certain professional development activities, to meet certain prescribed criteria. This form of discipline, although real and significant, is not the focus of this chapter; rather, it is those technologies of the self, that headteachers deploy and live, and which are designed to enable them to conduct their role as they see appropriate. The headteacher is both governed and governor (of self and others) (Niesche, 2011, p.34; Niesche & Keddie, 2016, p.54).

Foucault sees discipline as a continuum, a form of governing that ranges from actions on oneself to actions on others, and so from the micro level to the macro (Foucault, 2007, p.135). The rationale for such action Foucault terms governmentality – ‘government of self by self and government of individuals by each other’ (Foucault, 2017, p.281). He further explains:

I am saying that “governmentality” implies the relationship of the self to itself, and I intend this concept of “governmentality” to cover the whole range of practices that constitute, define, organize and instrumentalize the strategies that individuals in their freedom can use in dealing with each other.

(Foucault, 2000a, p.300)

Technologies of the self must be seen therefore as exercises in governmentality, reasoned or deliberate action on oneself. This is clearly linked to power, as discipline involves the exercise of power either over oneself or others. Elsewhere, Foucault defines the exercise of power, or power relations as he preferred, as ‘the conduct of conduct’, ‘a mode of action’ either upon one’s own actions or those of others (Foucault, 2002a, p.341).

All in all, therefore, in Foucauldian terms, when someone shapes their own conduct, behaviour, actions, for a chosen purpose, there is governmental reason at play – governmentality; they are engaged in power relations (albeit with the self); (self-) discipline is involved; and these actions constitute technologies of the self. In headteacher terms, therefore, the concern of this chapter is with what headteachers do, and the rationale underpinning it, to fulfil the role of headteacher, as they see it.

Prior to exploring this, however, some attention needs to be paid to a further elaboration and clarification of Foucault’s ideas relevant to the particular topic of headteachers and school leadership.

### **Foucauldian principles**

Space does not permit anything more than a brief summary of aspects of Foucault’s thought which are relevant to considering headteachers and leadership. By means of background, Veyne (2010) identifies some fundamental characteristics of Foucauldian thinking which can be seen as pertinent to school leadership. Firstly, his primary position as a sceptic (p.1-2); secondly, the centrality of critique in his work (p.2); thirdly, his rejection of universals (p.9-10); fourthly, his favouring of ‘a kind of hermeneutic positivism’ (p.16), founded on his concept of discourse.

These four aspects of his work are essential to understanding the way in which Foucault’s work can be applied to the field of school leadership. Foucault, thus, looks at human practices with a perspective of doubt, especially in terms of accepting what is presented as true, essential, unproblematic, given. Such an outlook requires critique for it to be enacted: it is through the application of critique that assumptions can be challenged and questions raised (Gillies, 2013, p.22-23). In terms of school leadership, therefore, a Foucauldian approach would be to question

its stated nature, value, impact and effectiveness. Furthermore, his rejection of universals – which in this case would be ‘leadership’ itself – has a significant effect on the sort, and method, of critique which can be undertaken. In referring to his work on madness, Foucault explains his approach:

The method consisted in saying: Let’s suppose that madness does not exist. If we suppose that it does not exist, then what can history make of those different events and practices which are apparently organized around something that is supposed to be madness?

(Foucault, 2008, p.3)

Addressing school leadership from a Foucauldian perspective, therefore, would be to assume that leadership was an empty term, that it signified nothing in reality. This does not end the matter, however, because what then becomes the object of study, of critique, are the detailed practices, all that is said and done around the notion of leadership (Veyne, 2010, p.10). Why Veyne refers to hermeneutic positivism is because Foucault, despite his scepticism, finds in what he terms ‘discourse’ an object about which there is no doubt as to its existence. Wider metaphysical or ontological issues can be side-stepped because what one is concerned with is not reality but what people understand of reality and what they do and create (discourse) as a result of that understanding.

Foucault (2002b, p.121) defines discourse as a ‘group of statements which belong to a single system of formation’ so that leadership discourse is a specific way of looking at, understanding, and structuring an aspect of human activity. It is important to note that discourse is not merely textual evidence but also, by use of the term *dispositif* - sometimes defined as ‘apparatus’ or ‘set-up’ - the whole host of non-textual elements, discursive practices, which are dependent on the discourse. Thus, in school leadership terms, the discourse covers not just the vast library of literature generated by the topic but the management structures, qualifications, CPD courses and events, administrative functions, and so on, which arise out of it. In hermeneutic terms, therefore, it does not matter if the concept of leadership itself is vacuous or chimerical (Lakowski, 1999), the discourse – what is said, done, and constructed around it – is an object which can be subjected to critique, and whose existence is not open to question, except in the wilder reaches of solipsistic idealism.

It should be noted that in offering critique, the Foucauldian purpose is primarily to problematize:

Criticism consists in . . . showing that things are not as obvious as people believe, making it so that what is taken for granted is no longer taken for granted. To do criticism is to make harder those acts which are now too easy.

..

. . . criticism is utterly indispensable for any transformation. . . as soon as people begin to have trouble thinking the way things have been thought, transformation becomes at the same time very urgent, very difficult, and entirely possible. . .

. . . I believe that the work of deep transformation can be done in the open and always turbulent atmosphere of a continuous criticism.

(Foucault, 2002c, p.457)

As can be seen in the quoted section, while Foucault does not advance a normative alternative, his critique is purposeful. It aims at effecting change, although he does not specify or promote what that should be. Thus, we should not expect a Foucauldian critique of school leadership to identify other ways of acting or being – that is not its nature (Biesta, 2008; Wang, 2011; Ball, 2017, p.42). However, what it does do is open up possibilities for change, for transformation, to be pursued. It is here that Foucault argues that critique is ‘akin to virtue’ (2007, p. 43), certainly in the sense that it can create the freedom for others to pursue, or effect, what they deem to be better or preferable. In this sense, like Socrates’ questioning, critique can serve a maieutic purpose without itself being creative.

### **Foucault’s ethics**

In common parlance, ethics and morality are synonymous. However, for Foucault, ‘ethics’ was a specialised term which became increasingly important in his last works:

. . . the kind of relationship you ought to have with yourself, *rapport à soi*, which I call ethics, and which determines how the individual is supposed to constitute himself as a moral subject of his own actions.

(Foucault, 2000c, p.263)

As can be deduced, the management of this relationship constitutes a governmental exercise in power over oneself. In his final works Foucault explored in depth, and at great length, the history of self-disciplinary practices in the ancient world and in early Christendom. In terms of

ethics, Foucault (1992, p.26-28; 2000c, p.263ff.) identifies four aspects of this relationship to oneself, the formulation of which can be viewed as ethical governmentality.

*Ethical substance.* This is the part of oneself or one's behaviour which is to be considered for the purposes of moral conduct. Foucault gives the example of fidelity in his history of sexuality.

*Mode of subjection.* This is the way by which individuals recognise their moral obligations (Foucault, 1992, p.27; 2000c, p.264). Foucault gives examples of divine law, natural law, a rational rule. He stresses that there are many different ways in which individuals will practise this. For example, followers of different religions will have different approaches to, and understandings of, the notion of divine law.

*Ethical work.* Foucault also terms this 'self-forming activity'. It refers to what the individual does 'to bring one's conduct into compliance with a given rule' and 'to transform oneself into the ethical subject of one's behaviour' (Foucault, 1992, p.27). It may, for example, involve self-denial in different ways.

*Telos.* This refers to the kind of moral being that the individual aspires to be. It is the aim or purpose of this ethical activity, the sort of person one wishes to be. Foucault explains:

A moral action tends towards its own accomplishment; but it also aims beyond the latter, to the establishing of a moral conduct that commits an individual, not only to other actions always in conformity with values and rules, but to a certain mode of being, a mode of being characteristic of the ethical subject.

(Foucault, 1992, p.28)

This framework, which Foucault summarises as 'forms of subjectivation' comprises the technologies which individuals use to shape the self in terms of ethical practice. These can be deployed to illuminative effect in relation to school leadership, headteacher practice, understood as the 'ethical substance' (Niesche, 2011; Gillies, 2013; Niesche & Keddie, 2016; Heffernan, 2018a). A consideration of this now follows.

### **Subjectivation and an ethics of leadership**

In applying this Foucauldian framework to the field of school leadership, the following transposition is required. As has been noted, in terms of *ethical substance* is understood the practice of headteacher leadership. The *mode of subjection* is understood as the criteria, the standards, against which headteachers choose to evaluate their own actions. Of course, they will also be assessed in terms of their employers' criteria but the focus here is on their subjectivation, how they shape themselves. The third aspect is *ethical work* or self-forming



activity which means the forms of self-discipline, the activities or practices, which headteachers effect to enable them to meet the standards they are applying to themselves. The final element in the framework is that of *telos*, which can be understood as the sort of leader, headteacher, one wishes to be or to become, the ethical aim to which one aspires.

This framework, then, can assist the analysis of headteacher practice in several ways. Firstly, it helps to unpick, to surface, the sort of considerations which headteachers require to address in their 'leaderly' work. Secondly, for anyone in an educational leadership role, the framework can assist self-analysis and professional reflection. Thirdly, it can aid approaches to leadership development and professional learning. What must be stressed, as with all Foucauldian theory, is that there is no normative position advanced, nothing suggested as to what headteachers should do. Foucault (1992, p.26) heavily stresses 'differences' in his outline of the framework. It permits an infinite range of possibilities to be enacted and, by definition, it is up to the individual as to what self-formation is undertaken. Some of these issues of difference are now considered in what follows.

- *Ethical substance*

Identifying headteacher leadership, or similar, as the *ethical substance* may seem unproblematic (Niesche & Keddie, 2016, p.56). However, if one bears in mind Foucault's stress on 'differences', it becomes clear that this term can mean many varied things, some of which will be contradictory. What we understand by leadership is by no means agreed and so headteachers themselves, and everyone else, will hold divergent views on what it means and, more importantly, what it means in practice. The discourse is full of countless leadership varieties or styles and so, whether or not these have any conceptual or practical basis, they do reflect discursive reality. Thus, before any self-forming activity can take place meaningfully, headteachers need to be clear about what they understand their leadership role to be. In terms of providing external professional development, there is a similar need for absolute clarity, as there is on the part of employers. The range and scope of the activities and responsibilities expected of headteachers, in the West at least, has mushroomed in recent years and so, it could be argued, the anxiety and stress reported regularly around the headteacher role could be seen helpfully in the light of the notion of 'ethical substance' (Phillips, Sen & McNamee, 2007). It could be argued that workload in its multitudinous complexity not only overburdens headteachers but also confuses and confounds any clarity about the role itself. In Foucauldian

terms, a headteacher's *ethical work* is compromised and undermined by an *ethical substance* which is so difficult to identify, far less contain or circumscribe.

A further issue which troubles the notion of ethical work and self-forming activity is the increased external discipline to which headteachers are subjected (Moos, Krejsler, & Kofod, 2008; Heffernan, 2018b). Within such a context, it is difficult for headteachers to find the space for their own slant, their own values to be enacted. The *ethical substance* is largely dictated to them and so any self-formation they do may become focused merely on compliance with the external expectations (an imposed *mode of subjection*), rather than any expression of *rapport à soi*. There is always room in Foucauldian power relations for counter-conduct but in many instances this will be very limited for headteachers, and its practice may put their employment at risk.

This, to some extent, does present an important challenge to headteachers, and aspiring headteachers, perhaps particularly in the state system. Given their status as employees, and so with rightful commitments to their employers and wider society, there is a spectrum of behaviours available from that of the functionary and apparatchik at one end, to the rogue, the maverick, and the anarchic at the other. Individuals need to consider their own position in regards to the external disciplinary forces they face, and important factors in this are the *mode of subjection* and nature of the *telos* they espouse. The headteacher they wish to be, the standard by which they judge themselves, in any rational sense, must also be concomitant with what they understand the headteacher role to be, its *ethical substance*. For example, while oppressed by a burdensome accountability regime, one of the headteachers in the study of Niesche and Keddie (2016, pp.91-98) espoused advocacy leadership (Anderson, 2009) which saw her stand up, and agitate, for the interests of the disadvantaged in her school and so challenge dominant political forces. This was not in her job remit but was rather how she understood the *ethical substance* of her role, and so helped define both her *ethical work* and her *telos*. Her *mode of subjection* was not limited to her job description but involved wider values and her own ethical criteria.

Foucault was not categorical about the inter-relationships between the four aspects of the framework: ' . . . there are both relationships between them and a certain kind of independence' (2000c, p.265). However, it seems uncontroversial to suggest that, in terms of governmental rationality, there must be a strong connection between them if leaderly practice is not to be

prey to caprice or whim. Indeed, given what was argued above about the alignment between *mode of subjection* and *telos*, one could suggest that these are antecedent to *ethical work*. The self-forming activity involved is to enable one to achieve the *telos* and to satisfy oneself that one has met the standards set in the *mode of subjection*. Activity is consequent to them.

- *Mode of subjection*

The theme of ‘differences’ stressed by Foucault in his work on technologies of the self is central to any consideration of a school leader’s *mode of subjection*. Not only will these be varied in themselves but it is highly likely that an individual school leader will make judgements against different standards at different times. Their role is beset by wicked problems and moral and professional dilemmas. Even an obsequious and servile headteacher, keen to comply with authority, will find it difficult at times to find, never mind follow, a rule book, as it were. The world of schools is not simple, predictable, or repetitive; instead, as Schön (1983, p.49) states, it is a context marked by ‘uncertainty, complexity, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict’. Illustrative of this is the case of the two headteachers in Niesche (2011) whose work involves repeated agonising over decisions, making difficult judgements about which is the right action to take in each specific case. At the heart of this is personal conflict over the *mode of subjection*: looked at from the perspective of one set of criteria an action may look ill-advised; from another perspective it may seem morally right. Thus, while individuals will have a set of values and principles which will inform their chosen *mode of subjection*, that will be challenged on a daily basis. Professional integrity demands more than compliance with a rule.

Although one must distinguish between the work that headteachers do and their *ethical work* – the work they do on themselves – again, there must be an alignment between them. Thus the *mode of subjection* will apply both to the criteria against which headteachers judge themselves and the subsequent actions they take in terms of their wider power relations. For example, a headteacher who wishes to act in the service of the school population, who sees *telos* in terms of the good of others, will, if any professional integrity is at play, have a number of correlative altruistic issues affecting their role. In terms of *ethical work*, one would expect that such a headteacher would seek to suppress selfish or egotistical action and motivation, perhaps to practise self-denial in different ways to ensure that the interests of others remain paramount, to see being dutiful and caring as central to their professional ethos. In practical terms, however, in their quotidian world, their actions would also be expected to conform with this overall philosophy. If altruism is the goal, then altruistic actions would be the practice. In broader

terms, for example, the Christian ascetic in Foucault's history not only aims to be a perfect Christian, to follow biblical teachings, but would also be expected to act in a Christian way. As that religion teaches, 'faith without works is dead'. In a similar sense, technologies of the self are dead, if consequent actions are not aligned. The altruistic headteacher, therefore, must not only uphold the ideals of altruism, must not only engage in self-formation to regulate their being accordingly, but must also engage in altruistic practice, if these technologies of the self are to have any rational meaning.

- *Ethical work*

As has been noted, Foucault also refers to this as 'self-forming activity'. In his histories, he spends a considerable amount of time and space on discussing all the different ascetic practices which were present in antiquity and in the early Christian period, where it can be understood as how to *become* a Christian, as opposed to leading a Christian life. However, as was noted in the previous section, the two must be in tandem if either is to have any sense. For the headteacher, therefore, *ethical work* is about being and becoming a headteacher as opposed to doing leaderly work. In the example lightly sketched above, it would answer the question 'what must I do to be altruistic'? To put the interests of others ahead of one's own, to be in the service of others, could have a whole range of different consequences for the self-forming activity of such a headteacher. For example, the headteacher could consider that to best serve the interests of the school population would entail ensuring the highest personal levels of relevant knowledge and understanding and so necessitate a commitment to ongoing professional development. The headteacher would want to be abreast of the latest developments and initiatives to ensure the best outcomes and experience for the school population. At the same time, this headteacher would need to judge if that might be thought selfish, and so should self-denial not be practised and CPD opportunities shared more widely?

Similar challenges might lie even in apparently minor issues such as managing one's diary. An open-door policy may seem aligned to an altruistic form of leadership, but then judgements need to be made about the interests of all as opposed to some. If that approach comes to be monopolised by a needy or demanding few, what limitations need to be created to enact fairness to all? *Ethical work*, thus, refers to a whole number of related issues such as an approach to managing time, establishing priorities, attitudes, behaviours, as well as simple things such as considering one's appearance and manner.

- *Telos*

This aspect of ethics is to do with the ideal to which one aspires but, as was noted, in some senses it should be seen as anterior to the other aspects of the technologies of the self. What one aspires to be will determine the *mode of subjection* and the *ethical work*, one would assume. While one can imagine a headteacher growing into the job, as it were, and coming later to a fuller sense of purpose, in terms of practising technologies of the self, that could not be the case. It requires a much more conscious and considered sense of (professional) self.

For the headteacher, therefore, the particular leader one wishes to be will have a significant influence on both *ethical work* and the *mode of subjection*. A headteacher who wished to be seen to be valued and respected by the school population would find that their self-forming acts would be very much guided by a perception of what the pupils and staff might think and their *mode of subjection* would be in relation to pupil/staff feedback and reaction. As was argued earlier, however, the headteacher is open to a whole number of disciplinary pressures, placing considerable strain on the desired ethical autonomy that may be available. The headteacher's world is fraught with dilemmas, and competing demands: an abiding aporetic arena.

*Telos* can be seen to be a particularly useful analytical tool in educational leadership discourse because so much of the literature emphasises 'vision' and strategic thinking. *Telos* is close to vision in that it is about headteacher being in the long-term. While 'vision' most often relates to the leader's view of the future of the establishment or institution, it does represent the same sort of thinking required to conceptualise a *telos*. The idea of *telos* is also helpful in exploring the vast range of 'leadership styles' which overpopulate the discourse. A headteacher who explicitly espouses a 'leadership style' is to some degree sketching a *telos*, but what is helpful from a Foucauldian perspective would be then to weave the framework of subjectivation around this chosen 'style' and give it some ethical bearing instead of the more vapid existence it seems to have in the literature. Rather than seeing the leader as deploying different styles of leadership within their practice, this perspective would see practice as centring on the chosen *telos* and decisions and choices made in relation to that core vision.

Such a consideration again stresses the prime importance of *telos*. Without it, a *mode of subjection* is hard to establish, and *ethical work* compromised. While leadership is often distinguished from management by being more about vision and direction as opposed to

stability and consistency, one can also see how *rapport à soi* also requires these qualities. A headteacher who is inconsistent and changeable is not just difficult to work with, but also demonstrates a lack of self-management. In Foucauldian terms, self-management is at the heart of leadership ethics; in some ways it defines what these technologies of the self aim to achieve.

### **Ēthos**

A final element in Foucault's consideration of ethics and technologies of the self is the notion of *ēthos*. *Ēthos* is a way of being and of behaviour: 'a mode of being for the subject, along with a certain way of acting, a way visible to others' (Foucault, 2000a, p.286), or 'individuals' ways of doing things, being, and conducting themselves' (Foucault, 2011, p.33). In transposing this philosophical stance to the world of the headteacher, one can interpret this as the physical and professional manifestation of what the technologies of the self construct. It is the public face of this private practice of self-formation. It could be said, therefore, that these ascetics of the technologies of the self, the *ethical work* practised on the self, is designed to form an *ēthos*, a way of behaving which is rooted in, and consistent with, them. The aim of these practices – concern for the self, care of the self – '... is to constitute an *ēthos*, a way of being and doing things, a way of conducting oneself corresponding to rational principles ...' (Foucault, 2011, p.338).

Foucault is clear that *ēthos* is very much concerned with one's dealings with others, and so in this context with the headteacher's actions within a leadership role. It 'implies a relationship with others, insofar as the care of the self enables one to occupy the rightful position in the community, or interpersonal relationships' (Foucault, 2000a, p.287). One can conclude that *ēthos* is the practice of headship, rationally aligned with the chosen *mode of subjection, ethical work, and telos*.

### **Consideration**

These analytical tools of Michel Foucault, sketched out in this chapter, have considerable traction in exploring the self-formation of headteachers. The ethical framework provided, along with the concept of *ēthos*, are tools which can aid the analysis of leadership practice and leadership (self) formation, and assist in understanding how headteachers conceptualise their own work and their subjectivity. In addition, as was alluded to earlier, they can be useful additions to the discourse of educational leadership, either in terms of professional development or of reflective practice.

While Foucauldian scholars may balk at the idea of employing Foucault's work in such practical and purposive ways, there is a warrant in Foucault's own writings that his ideas should be found useful and applicable, the hope of which also attends this chapter:

I should like my books to be a kind of tool-box in which others can go digging to find a tool with which they could do what they want, in their field . . . I am attached to this book, of course, because I have written it, but also because it has served as a toolbox to people different from one another . . . they searched it, found a chapter, a form of analysis, something of use to them later . . . I do not write for an audience, I write for users, not for readers.

(Foucault, 2001, p. 1391-2)

## References

- Anderson, G. (2009). *Advocacy leadership: toward a post-reform agenda in education*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S. (2017). *Foucault as educator*. Cham: Springer.
- Biesta, G. (2008). Encountering Foucault in lifelong learning. In A. Fejes and K. Nicoll (Eds.), *Foucault and lifelong learning: governing the subject* (pp.193–205). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Two lectures. In M. Kelly (Ed.), *Critique and Power* (pp.17–46). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foucault, M. (2000a). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics* (pp.281–301). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2000b). Sexuality and solitude. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics* (pp.175–184). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2000c). On the genealogy of ethics. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics* (pp.253–80). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2001) [1974]. *Dits et écrits, I. 1954-1975*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (2002a). The subject and power. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power* (pp. 326-348). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2002b). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (2002c). So it is important to think? In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power* (pp. 454-461). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *The politics of truth*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2011). *The courage of truth: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983-1984*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2017). *Subjectivity and truth: Lectures at the Collège de France 1980-1981*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gillies, D. (2013). *Educational leadership and Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.

- Heffernan, A. (2016). The emperor's perfect map: leadership by numbers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 43(3), 377-391.
- Heffernan, A. (2018a). *The principal and school improvement: theorising discourse, policy, and practice*. Singapore: Springer.
- Heffernan, A. (2018b). The accountability generation: exploring an emerging leadership paradigm for beginning principals. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 39(4), pp.509-520. DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2017.1280001
- Lakomski, G. (1999). Against leadership: a concept without a cause. In P. Begley & P. Leonard (Eds.), *The values of educational administration* (pp.37-51). London: The Falmer Press.
- Moos, L., Krejsler, J., & Kofod, K.K. (2008). Successful principals: telling or selling? On the importance of context for school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 341-352. DOI: 10.1080/13603120802183913
- Mifsud, D. (2017). *Foucault and school leadership research: bridging theory and method*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Niesche, R. (2011). *Foucault and educational leadership: disciplining the principal*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Richard Niesche (2018) Critical perspectives in educational leadership: a new 'theory turn'? *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, (50)3, 145-158, DOI: 10.1080/00220620.2017.1395600
- Olssen, M. (2009). Governmentality and subjectivity: practices of self as arts of self-government. In Peters, M., Besley, A., Olssen, M., Maurer, S., & Weber, S. (Eds.), *Governmentality studies in education* (pp.77-94). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Phillips, S., Sen, D., & McNamee, R. (2007). Prevalence and causes of self-reported work-related stress in head teachers. *Occupational Medicine*, 57(5), 367-376. doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqm055
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Veyne, P. (2010). *Foucault: his thought, his character*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wang, C-L. (2011). Power/knowledge for educational theory: Stephen Ball and the reception of Foucault. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(1), 141-156.