1 Conceptualising constructions of educational-leader identity

Steven J. Courtney and Ruth McGinity

Introduction

In this chapter, we present and discuss a new typology of identity constructions in and for the field of educational leadership. Our aims are threefold: first, we seek to conceptualise being an "educational leader"; second, we aim through this to illuminate the ontological processes involved in identifying leaders and in how leaders might identify themselves. Third, heuristically, we want to prompt questions about what it means to "be" an educational leader, where the label itself is contested and does identity work (Gunter, 2012).

We make conceptual contributions through our presentation of six idealised identity types in educational leadership and through our explanation of identity construction. We contribute methodologically through suggesting new avenues of investigation, following Bolam's (1999) argument that mapping what is known is necessary to identify patterns, well-ploughed furrows and silences in the literature, such that new research agendas can be identified robustly.

Our focus is on how the field both presently constructs and might usefully construct educational leaders' identities: this interpretative scope includes and subsumes the somewhat narrower category of how leaders' identify themselves (insofar as such identifications are represented in the literature). Our justification for this approach is that identity concerns not only what actors claim or understand about themselves but also how those claims are received and variously contested or accepted through ongoing social negotiation. We go further than Crow, Day and Møller (2017), for instance, who are explicit about how their five proposed dimensions of leader identity formation are contingent and enacted through social interactions, claims and rebuttals. Nonetheless, ultimately these are still located in and primarily enacted by the individual, who in their analysis is the school principal.

We conceptualise identity, however, as communally constructed and just as *attributed to* as *located within* an individual. For example, we note that characteristics or labels may be applied *a priori* to social actors, regardless of their own wishes, that constitute or contribute to their identity. Whilst race, disability and gender are significant structural features that are susceptible to

being imposed in this way, this principle extends too to other labels, including scholars' or policy-makers' normative interpretations of leaders' identities. Followers, too, may impose, legitimate or perceive leaderful characteristics.

Such statements raise important questions concerning where and in whom an 'identity' is located and what interplay of structure and agency produces it. The literature is replete with examples where extrinsically derived labels such as 'distributed leader' (e.g. Courtney & Gunter, 2015) have become incorporated into the accounts of research participants and how they understand and narrate their identity.

Equally, there are instances of stigmatising identity markers concerning for example race (Johnson, 2016) and sexuality (Courtney, 2014) being attributed to those professionals constructed as school leaders, and these meanings being variously rejected or reimagined. Notwithstanding such rejections, those stigmatising identity features remain discursively available for imposed re-application at any moment. Despite embodying an identity, the educational leader doesn't get the final say over it. We are not claiming simply that the liminal space between 'leader' and 'follower' is busily vital in constructing the former's identity: we suggest that identity is a shared resource and a 'site of struggle' (Maclure, 1993, p. 312), where the struggle is as much with others as it is with oneself, as in Maclure's (1993) analysis. This should not surprise: despite these individualised times (Courtney, McGinity & Gunter, 2018), identity has always been relational. One identifies or is identified with another, not with oneself (Crimp, 1992). Identity is not private property and is not reducible to subjectivity.

Our inspiration by elements of the Hegelian understanding of identity – that is, that denotes it as a common rather than individual enterprise – prompts two observations that speak to our methodology. First, embodiment brings no particular privileges in processes of identification; and second, agency is necessary but insufficient in such processes. A third observation differentiates our approach from Hegelian objective idealism: we argue that embodiment is product and producer of a material reality that is interpreted nonetheless in incalculably multiple and socially contingent ways. So, for example, we hold that sex produces material differences that do not determine practice but that are susceptible to categorisable social responses, which may be conceptualised and experienced as gender. This is meaningful for the female educational leader and for our sociological analysis of her identity.

The methodological statements we set out above are consequential for the scope of our analysis, in that the field attributes leadership and hence leaderful identity more widely than only amongst those post-holders who form the object of analysis in most previous studies. Whilst it is our intention to capture and exemplify this through our typology below, we are clear that our aim is not to map the extant field: our typology draws on new conceptualisations to provide a trajectorial heuristic for the field to be used in the generation and analysis of future empirical projects. Our typology will also prove useful to educational professionals in senior roles, through indicating new directions

and possibilities for their own identity work; through legitimating practice that contra-indicates the characteristics and features of what we identify here as the dominant leader "character" constructed in policy; and through making explicit how critical reflexivity is a desirable disposition in leadership in prioritising educational purposes and values.

Our intellectual resources and methodology

We intend here to deploy two dimensions to illuminate identity and identifying in educational leadership (see Figure 1.1, shaded cells). The first is *leader stability*: this dimension speaks to the spectral ontological status of "leader" and the ways in which it is imbricated in its more "fixed" iterations with notions of "role", and in its less "fixed" iterations with "practice". The second dimension is *subject reflexivity concerning leadership*: this attempts to capture how the agency of those constructed as educational leaders is deployed more or less reflexively and the effects this has on identity. We explain these two dimensions in more detail below, along with the intellectual resources we have drawn upon to operationalise them as typological dimensions.

Through reported research projects, the field constructs the notion of "leader" as variously more or less stable, and so an ontological spectrum exists that stretches from *leader as role*, that is, fixed, to *leader as one doing leadership*, that is, where the concept of "leadership" is understood in different ways. In this second category, such understandings extend as far as *leadership as relational practice* (e.g. Eacott, 2015), where meaning-making practice is decoupled partly or entirely from the label of "leader" and where what is

		More ← **"Leader" Stability** → Less	
		Leader-as-Character	***Leaderfulness-as-Practice***
Subject Reflexivity Concerning Leadership	***Minimally reflexive***	The Right Fit	The Object of Analysis
	Self-reflexive	The Fabricator	The Reinterpreted
	Critical-reflexive	The Troublemaker	The Influencer
		Intrinsic ← *Location of leader identity* → Extrinsic	

Figure 1.1 A typology of conceptualisations of educational-leader identity

actually signalled through that label is a senior role holder (e.g. principal, headteacher or executive headteacher).

Much of the predominantly functionalist scholarship in the school-effectiveness and school-improvement leadership fields accepts and reproduces an assumption of leader stability, where "leader" reduces to role in signifying the person in the top job. There is considerable evidence, too, that this stability is reflected in the accounts of some educational leaders themselves. For example, Fuller's (2017) theorisation of "leadership monoglossia" (p. 18) aims to capture such instances of alignment between leaderful agency and the role constructed for leaders through policy. Such ontological buy-in results in the collapse of the meaningful distinction between leader role and leader identity, producing increased identity stability.

We now set out in more detail the two conceptual resources that inform our typology: *leader stability*, which we depict as either character or practice, and *subject reflexivity concerning leadership*, which we arrange spectrally from minimally to critically reflexive.

Leader stability: the leader as a MacIntyrean "character"

To theorise and typologise this aspect of identity, we have drawn on MacIntyre's (2013 [1981]) "dramatic metaphor" (p. 32) of the *character*. MacIntyre invokes a theatrical tradition exemplified in Japanese Noh and English mediaeval morality plays in which the use of stock characters fulfilled vital functions. These functions consisted in delimiting plot and action; enabling immediate audience recognition; facilitating the audience's interpretation of the behaviour and, importantly, morality of the protagonists playing these characters; and structuring the actions of these characters' co-players, along with their interpretation.

MacIntyre applies this metaphor also to certain social roles in particular cultures, such that understanding the character enables the interpretation of the actions of whoever inhabits that character. This means that in characters, "role and personality fuse . . . [and] the possibilities of action are defined in a more limited way than in general" (p. 32). Not all social roles qualify as characters: these latter "are a very special type of social role which places a certain kind of moral constraint on the personality of those who inhabit them in a way in which many other social roles do not" (MacIntyre, 2013, p. 32). Characters are therefore "the moral representatives of their culture" (p. 32). However, these embodied moralities do not achieve universal assent: indeed, characters may prompt the dissensus necessary to reinforce their status as the essence or standpoint against which oppositional moral definitions or stances are made or taken.

For MacIntyre, Weber's (2012 [1947]) idealised type of the bureaucratic manager constituted a character owing to its domestication – and thus recognition – across industrialised economies internationally and to the way in which the manager's objectives – to apportion resources rationally, effectively

and efficiently – denote not neutral, valueless objectivity but rather an implicit morality. This is because rationality and particularly effectiveness concern ends, and 'questions of ends are questions of values' (MacIntyre, 2013, p. 30).

Inspired by important scholarship from, for example, Rogers (2017), we suggest that this morality was transferred from management to educational leadership from the 1990s in what we call the Great Leadership Turn (GLT), where the moral objective to improve children's outcomes entered educational leadership's definitional gates in a Trojan horse of unthreatening blandness. As Rogers (2017) points out, however, "moral purpose as a trope served to reinforce that one [i.e. school leaders] had no choice but to be on board with the programme" (p. 140). Through this, the *educational leader* was simultaneously endowed as a MacIntyrean character in its own right and the morality it represented was defined in alignment with what has been characterised as the neoliberal global education reform movement (GERM) (Sahlberg, 2011). Our example, using Rogers (2017), is from England, and whilst we argue that the leader character, like the Weberian Bureaucratic Manager, is international, it will not be identical internationally. Its characteristics will be suffused with features of the state-level policy environment and with local historical traditions and expectations of what it means to be an educational leader.

We argue through incorporating it into our typology that educational leaders may enact their agency to embody the leader not as a role but as a character, where it becomes indistinguishable from other elements of their professional identity. We therefore use it here to exemplify and illuminate the more stable end of our dimension of *leader stability* in our typology.

Leader stability: leaderfulness as practice

To conceptualise the other, less stable end of this identity dimension, we have applied two guiding typological principles. First, since it must provide an ontological counterpoint to the notion of leader-as-character, and following Hegelian principles of communally held identity, it must entail the possibility of the "leader" in question being unaware of the label being applied to him or her either at all *or* in that particular way. This element of the stability dimension therefore privileges imposed over claimed identity and so is derived *extrinsically* in contrast to the MacIntyrean character's *intrinsic* location. Consequently, typological examples might include professionals not in formal "leadership" roles.

Our second methodological principle was that such an imposed identity must nonetheless reflect how the field constructs leadership and understands those who undertake it. Here, we draw on Raelin's (2011) conceptualisations of *practice* as an alternative. Raelin (2011) binarises leadership-as-practice and leaderful practice: for him, the former refers to the collective actions that group members undertake to achieve a goal, whereas the latter, through "collectiveness, concurrency, collaboration, and compassion . . . is based on a

democratic ideology that calls for the co-creation of a community by all who are involved interdependently it its development" (p. 2014). Our usage of leaderful practice depicts these two states as a spectrum rather than a binary, with our overlaying concept of subject reflexivity helping to explain how and why one shifts to the other. Our purpose in deploying practice typologically builds on Raelin's (2011) in having the concept illuminate not simply activity but identity construction in the field. This dimension captures those instances where what a professional does may be understood and sometimes re-packaged as leadership. Our following Raelin (2011) in calling these *practices* comes also from our sociological grounding: we intend this category to speak as well to those parts of the educational-leadership field that call these *behaviours*. The range captured is epistemologically wide, extending from critical and/or constructionist accounts of relational leadership and leaders (Eacott, 2014) to functionalist activities (Fullan, 2008), practices (Leithwood, 2005) or trait-based conceptualisations. In all cases, however, decisions are made extrinsically (e.g. by scholars or policy-makers) about what constitutes leadership practice, and the identity label of leader is attached to those demonstrating or who are in a position to demonstrate such practices.

Subject reflexivity concerning leadership

For the second dimension, we look beyond educational leadership to the field of critical management studies to draw and build on Cunliffe's (2003, 2009) elucidations of reflexivity. We have selected this concept because it enables us to build into our model an explanation of agency and how its enactment might serve to reproduce or disrupt sanctioned professional identities. Cunliffe (2009) divides reflexivity into two sub-forms: self-reflexivity and critical-reflexivity. The former is defined as

> recognizing that we shape and are shaped by our social experience, and involves a dialogue-with-self about our fundamental assumptions, values, and ways of interacting: a questioning of our core beliefs, our understanding of particular events, and how these shape our own and others' responses. Through this self-reflexive process we may become responsive to others and open to the possibilities for new ways of being and acting.
> (Cunliffe, 2009, p. 98)

In using self-reflexivity to typologise leader identity, we aim to capture instantiations, products of and motivators for forms of responsive and pro-active agency that, first, take into account features of the structural landscape, and second, contribute to identity formation.

For Cunliffe (2009), critical-reflexivity goes further in that it involves "examining and unsettling our assumptions, actions and their impact and, from a broader perspective, what passes as good leadership and management practice" (p. 98). Taking our cue from the critical-scholarship tradition where

we locate ourselves epistemologically and axiologically, we argue that critical-reflexivity should seek to disrupt practices, cultures and other reified power relations such that more equitable and just outcomes are achieved, or processes are followed. So if self-reflexivity is about changing the self in response to or anticipation of the social world's features or functions, then critical-reflexivity is about attempting to improve the social world through how and who we are in it.

We have added a "minimally reflexive" row to our typology to categorise two sorts of instance, depending on their location on the "leader stability" dimension. The first is where the leader character is adopted agentically and seemingly unproblematically, or at least is performed that way in the data generation, or is so reported in the literature. The second set of cases is where a leader identity has been imposed extrinsically upon a group of professionals evincing practices that they didn't know qualified them for the label of "leader" in the analysis of certain scholars or in policy documents. They cannot but be minimally reflexive of such an act of identification.

In creating this dimension of reflexivity, we aim to reflect typologically what we see as a key producer of leaderful identity. That is, the degree and effects of professionals' subjective understanding of and engagement with *embodied power relations* and how this understanding and engagement speak to their identity and/or practices. Our reading and our research lead us to suggest tentatively that minoritised status may produce such awareness. We argue that finding that elements of one's background, culture or identity are "othered" in relation to default conceptualisations of "leader" may prompt reflection on these norms, how one is to negotiate them, how such norms came to be constructed and what they reveal of the society that created them. The label "leader" *tout simple* does not capture the entirety of these professionals' identities because they understand its limitations and/or see how their presence as conditionally included "others" symbolically and materially changes the category. An interplay results between the leader role as discursively constructed and practised and an identity that is *problematic* in some way when considered in relation to this role, including the ways in which, for example, female sex, along with the way this is interpreted through a gendered and gendering lens; the disabled body; or homosexuality are rendered as conceptually less compatible or even incompatible with leadership.

Of course, minoritised status is not a pre-condition of self-reflexivity: Bourdieu's (1990) concept of *habitus* – consisting in the embodied structural conditions, experiences and interpretations of one's present and former existence and, therefrom, one's reasonable expectations of the future – enables a much richer way of conceptualising the myriad paths through life that might dispose one to recognise more or less readily and to feel more or less acutely the hard edges of normalising discourses and to question them as well as one's place in relation to them. Following Bourdieu (1990), we centre through our typology the importance of agency in analysing how actors respond differently to structural conditions.

Our approach here is purposively meta-interpretive: it aims at what research indicates might be common across group-identity features predicated on, for example, race (Johnson, 2016), sex and the gendered meanings attached to it (Ball & Reay, 2000; Bradbury & Gunter, 2006; Fuller, 2013) or sexual orientation (Blount, 2003; Courtney, 2014; Lugg & Tooms, 2010). Our approach produces losses: collectively, we two are minoritised through *inter alia* sex, sexual orientation and (hidden) disability, and so we are aware of the particular histories and possibilities of oppression that are marginalised or rendered unsayable through conceptualising them through an over-arching dimension. Nonetheless, this loss of singularity enables the articulation of a more generalised type and so may speak more widely across and to the field.

Illuminating identity through the typology

First, a methodological disclaimer: like any typology, ours reduces social reality through selective representation and juxtaposition to illuminate and explain certain features that we argue to be important (see Bruce & Yearley, 2006; Courtney, 2015; Ribbins & Gunter, 2002). Consequently, whilst our focus is the field of educational leadership, the entire field is not here. In this, we follow Weber (2012 [1947]), who, in elucidating his three types of legitimate authority, noted:

> The fact that none of these three ideal types . . . is usually to be found in historical cases in "pure" form, is naturally not a valid objection to attempting their conceptual formation in the sharpest possible form.
>
> (Weber, 2012 [1947], p. 329)

Indeed, a striking conclusion that we draw through our typologising in this way is that certain parts of the field are under-represented in the identity literatures.

In searching through the literature to inform our typology, we have ensured that each of the four educational-leadership knowledge domains identified by Gunter (2001) is represented through our selection of research-project outputs; that is, critical (Ball, 2000), humanistic (Stevenson, 2006), instrumental (Fullan, 2008) and scientific (Hopkins, 2008). Our evidence base is predominantly drawn from England, through which we generate a conceptual heuristic capable of prompting questions internationally. Our methodological focus is biographical data generating accounts of identity, supplemented by scholarly conceptualisations of identity and policy documents.

In the next sections, we typologise six possibilities suggested by our selection and deployment of two dimensions of identity (see Figure 1.1), exemplifying each with references to reported research and policy documents. In proposing idealised types, we do not imply that movement between them is impossible, particularly over time, nor that one person might not demonstrate

elements of more than one type simultaneously, particularly when contrasting identity-as-claimed with identity-as-conferred.

The Right Fit

This type exemplifies the *minimally reflexive leader-as-character*. The leader identity is conferred, accepted and legitimated through the label of leader that comes collocated with the post. This label is therefore an automatic corollary of recruitment into such positions as principal, head teacher, executive head teacher, chief executive officer of, for instance, a multi-academy trust or charter management organisation. Nonetheless, accepting such a label and choosing to work within the discursive boundaries implied through the character it denotes signifies agentic decisions, and the Right Fit repeatedly enacts his or her agency in this way such that the leader character becomes the professional identity. This might be through disposition, history, corporeal good fortune, for example, in possessing a white, male, able and fit body (see Sinclair, 2005, for an example from organisation studies); these constitute reasons (not) to notice and/or question a normalising leadership discourse that positions the Right Fit unproblematically as *fit to lead*.

The Right Fit's focus of practice is whatever leaders are "supposed" to do as revealed by the constituting features, suggested activities and characteristics of the leader character in that society at that time. This will be heavily influenced through the policy landscape and other structuring influences.

Examples of the Right Fit from the field of research can be found in Armstrong, Ko and Bryant (2018), Courtney (2017), and McGinity (2015).

The Fabricator

This type exemplifies the *self-reflexive leader-as-character*. Here, the Fabricator understands that background, policy environment, agency and disposition influence "leadership" practice and identity and how these are perceived. The name 'Fabricator' invokes Ball's (2000) concept of fabrications, later applied to school leaders by Courtney (2016), where auditable identities are constructed for the purpose of performative accountability. We extend the metaphor here to include any reflexive attempt to perform the leader character, where (1) there is a gap between the character's identity features and those of the role-holder attempting to pass, and (2) the role-holder is aware of this. Fabricating requires continuous work on the self: a ceaseless renegotiation between what presently is and what will be required to pass convincingly as the leader character. Passing is the goal of all Fabricators, for their leader identity, like that of the Right Fit, is legitimated through the label of leader and the extent to which the label is perceived to fit. This takes effort, and consequently this identity work is also the focus of the Fabricator's leaderful practice, particularly where the leader character shifts owing to policy/cultural or ideological reasons, leaving the identities of those inhabiting it behind. This

has been theorised using Bourdieu's concept of hysteresis (Courtney, 2017; Lythgoe, 2017): those who persist in trying to re-align their identity with the new requirements of the field are, in our analysis, Fabricators.

The literatures contain many references to Fabricators, variously conceptualised, for three reasons. First, many leaders are reasonably self-aware; second, many want to "be" the best leader they can, and the most freely available discursive template is the leader character; and third, many articulate in research accounts the dissonance between this character and their own attempts to live up to it. This dissonance may arise owing, *inter alia*, to recent appointment (e.g. Stevenson, 2006); to the desire to "overcome" the "disadvantages" (for educational leadership) of being, for example, a woman (see Fuller, 2013); or to intensifying performative demands on the self (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2017).

The Troublemaker

This type exemplifies the *critically reflexive leader-as-character*. The Troublemaker's leader identity is legitimated through the leader label and practices, insofar as these pertain to educational rather than managerial or corporatised goals. In this sense, the Troublemaker has a somewhat different idea of what the leader character should and might be from how it is constructed in policy texts and in discursively approved practices. Some feature of the Troublemaker's own background, perhaps an identity status that is minoritised in some way, or some other acquired disposition to question normalising discourses of power (see Bourdieu, 1990), produces dissonance with the hegemonic leader identity and an agentic disposition to "be"/"do" otherwise.

The focus of the Troublemaker's practice is consequently the leader character itself: the Troublemaker works on himself or herself to change this character through inhabiting it differently. Identity work, as revealed through practice, is consequently an overtly political act. The Troublemaker is exemplified in Courtney (2017), where a dissenting identity disavows corporatised leadership.

The Object of Analysis

This type exemplifies *minimally reflexive leaderfulness-as-practice*. Here, professionals undertake practices that are extrinsically conceptualised as leadership. Such identifications may be by policy-makers or by researchers. Depending on the provenance of the identification, practitioners' understanding that this identity label is being applied to them may be more likely (in the case of policy-derived labels that might contribute to an accountability framework) or less likely (in the case of researcher-derived labels, which might or might not gain traction outside the field of intellectual knowledge production). The leader identity is achieved through conceptual re-organisation, and its purposes might be analytical, for example, where educational-leadership scholars

make descriptive or normative interventions in the ontology of identity. Alternatively, its purposes may be political, for example, where policy-makers re-classify identities to influence professional practice or the discursive framework within which such practice occurs.

An example of this in the field of educational leadership is the "teacher leader", where practices and values historically associated with teaching are re-attributed to leadership (see Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2008). These include "coaching peers . . . encouraging parent participation, working with colleagues in small groups and teams, modelling reflective practice, or articulating a vision for improvement" (York-Barr & Duke, 2004, p. 263).

Through this process of ontological re-taxonomy, "teaching" becomes conceptually impoverished and "leadership" inflated. Arguably, it is part of the same process that has hollowed out the concept of management and transferred the more glamorous elements to leadership (Bush, 2008; Gunter, 2012).

The Reinterpreted

This type exemplifies *self-reflexive leaderfulness-as-practice*. The Reinterpreted type occurs where holders of posts constructed as "leadership" are sufficiently aware of their own practice to engage in what they see as leader-identity-constructing activities; however, these are reinterpreted by policy-makers or scholars such that a new identity label is created and applied with social or scholarly significance. As for the Object of Analysis, the purpose of this process may be scholarly, where new understandings of leaderful identity may be illuminated through reinterpretation of existing praxis, or political, where ontological identity re-classification is intended to produce changes in leaders' practice and/or the structural conditions in which they work.

Examples of the former include Gewirtz and Ball's (2000) welfarist and new managerialist head teachers, Courtney's (2015a) corporatised school leaders and Hallinger's (1992) transformational leaders (applied to the education field from Burns' (1978) conceptualisation). Policy-derived examples include distributed leaders (e.g. DfES, 2004) and system leaders (DfE & NCTL, 2018) and are significant in how they are also promoted normatively in the fields of research (Hopkins, 2008) and adopted into some school leaders' accounts of their identity (Hall, Gunter & Bragg, 2013). Where such ontological buy-in becomes significant, the Reinterpreted can become re-oriented away from the practice-based and towards the leader-as-character dimensional aspect, prompting the evolution of that character.

The Influencer (critically reflexive leaderfulness-as-practice)

This type exemplifies *critically reflexive leaderfulness-as-practice*. The Influencer is unlikely to be in a formal leadership role for two reasons. First, the limitations of the leader character prevent him or her from engaging in the

practices he or she sees as necessary to effect change; and/or second, the Influencer does not see what he or she does as leadership at all: it is simply good practice in *improving professional processes through relationship-building*. The focus of the Influencer's practice is consequently practice itself: it is *this* about which the Influencer is critically reflexive, but only insofar as such practice influences others to the benefit of the organisational unit.

These benefits are realised only indirectly, through the Influencer acting agentically to influence others' reality through, for example, selecting the "frame" through which issues will be considered; and through taking care to position himself or herself and others in speech and activities such that professional relationships are enhanced (see Crevani, 2015). Leadership as an instrumentally oriented project is therefore rejected: the focus is on process, with positive outcomes a corollary rather than the objective. This constitutes a disruption of role-driven, teleological notions of leader and leading and so differentiates this type from the Object of Analysis, who reinforces existing power structures and roles (Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2008).

Such intentional relational practices have been discussed in the literatures, both in educational leadership (e.g. Eacott, 2015) and organisational leadership (Crevani, 2015; Cunliffe & Eriksen, 2011; Hosking, 2011). In relational leadership, the objectives are to alter colleagues' understanding of what is real and what is important through relationship-building to achieve organisational and/or professional-developmental objectives. Identity is developed in conversation with this disposition and these skills rather than with an actor's (mostly senior) location in the organisational hierarchy.

Taking the typology forward

Our conceptualisation of constructions of educational-leader identity, presented through this mapping, has implications for both practice and research and so advances the conversation in a number of important ways. We suggest that it offers a new conceptual framework for researchers to think about identity and for those constructed as educational leaders to do identity work on themselves. In casting our interpretive net beyond the identity claims of the leader-as-subject, we have opened up the arenas of analysis and practice to new understandings of features that are in the literatures but that are not necessarily understood as identity issues; for example, Raelin's (2011) work on leaderful practice has not previously been explicitly and productively linked to identity in this way. Through our conceptualisation, we have shown how claims in the wider identity literatures that identity is performative (e.g. Jenkins, 2014) and relational (Crimp, 1992) can function ontologically, through developing and foregrounding an identity-in-practice dimension to our mapping: we see this as an invitation to practitioners in educational "leadership" roles to understand themselves and what they do – and what they *might* do – differently. The potential for change in professional praxis is clearly indicated by this typology but only if two conditions

are met. First, if professionals who are presently minimally reflexive or self-reflexive recognise themselves in it and act to move towards critical reflexivity. Second, if the critically reflexive engage more deeply or frequently in practices that shift elements of the leader character and/or that enhance professional relationships, which serve in turn to improve educational processes for learners, teachers and administrators. This is asking a lot, since the leader character has been established and enforced through countless policy documents, ministerial speeches, professional standards and other accountability frameworks in education systems internationally over the last 40 years. Despite local differences, there are recognisable similarities in how they tend to construct a professional "leader" identity that is functionalist, instrumental and in thrall to a standards agenda.

This contribution provides a methodological heuristic for the field of research in pointing out new directions for conceptual and empirical projects and in prompting questions concerning the necessity of new methods for revealing and constructing identities. For instance, the typology shows that critical-reflexivity is not presently a common or necessary attribute in the field of practice: new research projects framed by inventive methodologies are consequently required to capture it or to report it where located. A further scholarly contribution of this chapter through our typology is to provide a robust conceptual framework to enable the field to respond to Thrupp and Willmott's (2003) call for research in educational leadership less to reflect ideological and policy-driven imperatives. The intellectual work we have undertaken through our typology enables us to build on their call by asking more precisely for new projects and conceptual contributions that seek to locate and theorise critically reflexive forms of leaderful identity, including "through-practice" forms with an explicit democratic orientation (Raelin, 2011), and to develop ways of working as scholars that bring these new, critical forms to the attention of the field of practice in the way that the Distributed or Transformational Leader created new possibilities for "being" and "doing" in educational leadership.

References

Armstrong, P. W., Ko, J., & Bryant, D. A. (2018). Values-driven leadership through institutional structures and practices: How successful schools in England and Hong Kong "absorb" policy. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *17*(3), 360–372.

Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards the performative society. *Australian Educational Researcher*, *27*(2), 1–23.

Ball, S. J., & Reay, D. (2000). Essentials of female management. *Educational Management & Administration*, *28*(2), 145–159.

Blount, J. M. (2003). Homosexuality and school superintendents: A brief history. *Journal of School Leadership*, *13*(1), 7–26.

Bolam, R. (1999). Educational administration, leadership and management: Towards a research agenda. In T. Bush, L. Bell, R. Bolam, R. Glatter, & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice* (pp. 193–206). London: Paul Chapman.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bradbury, L., & Gunter, H. M. (2006). Dialogic identities: The experiences of women who are headteachers and mothers in English primary schools. *School Leadership & Management*, *26*(5), 489–504.

Bruce, S., & Yearley, S. (2006). *The Sage dictionary of sociology*. London: Sage Publications.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership: Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *36*(2), 271–288.

Courtney, S. J. (2014). Inadvertently queer school leadership amongst lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) school leaders. *Organization*, *21*(3), 383–399.

Courtney, S. J. (2015a). Corporatised leadership in English schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *47*(3), 214–231.

Courtney, S. J. (2016). Post-panopticism and school inspection in England. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *37*(4), 623–642.

Courtney, S. J. (2017). Corporatising school leadership through hysteresis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *38*(7), 1054–1067.

Courtney, S. J., & Gunter, H. M. (2015). Get off my bus! School leaders, vision work and the elimination of teachers. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, *18*(4), 395–417.

Courtney, S. J., McGinity, R., & Gunter, H. M. (2018). *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times* (S. J. Courtney, R. McGinity, & H. M. Gunter, Eds.). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Crevani, L. (2015). Relational leadership. In B. Carroll, J. Ford, & S. Taylor (Eds.), *Leadership: Contemporary critical perspectives* (pp. 188–211). London: Sage Publications.

Crimp, D. (1992). Right on, girlfriend! *Social Text*, *33*, 2–18.

Crow, G., Day, C., & Møller, J. (2017). Framing research on school principals' identities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *20*(3), 265–277.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2003). Reflexive inquiry in organizational research: Questions and possibilities. *Human Relations*, *56*(8), 983–1003.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2009). The philosopher leader: On relationalism, ethics and reflexivity: A critical perspective to teaching leadership. *Management Learning*, *40*(1), 87–101.

Cunliffe, A. L., & Eriksen, M. (2011). Relational leadership. *Human Relations*, *64*(11), 1425–1449.

Department for Education, & National College for Teaching and Leadership. (2018). *Teaching schools and system leaders: Get support for you and your school*. London: Department for Education. Retrieved from www.gov.uk/guidance/system-leaders-who-they-are-and-what-they-do

DfES. (2004). *National standards for headteachers*. London: DfES.

Eacott, S. (2014). *Educational leadership relationally: A theory and methodology for educational leadership, management and administration*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Eacott, S. (2015). The (Im)possibility of "leadership". In *Educational leadership relationally*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Fitzgerald, T., & Gunter, H. M. (2008). Contesting the orthodoxy of teacher leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *11*(4), 331–340.

Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fuller, K. (2013). *Gender, identity and educational leadership*. London: A&C Black.

Fuller, K. (2017). Theory sex to leadership heteroglossia: Using gender theories to surface discourses of headteacher compliance and transgression. In S. J. Courtney, R. McGinity, & H. M. Gunter (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times* (pp. 12–26). London: Routledge.

Gewirtz, S., & Ball, S. J. (2000). From "Welfarism" to "New Managerialism": Shifting discourses of school headship in the education marketplace. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *21*(3), 253–268.

Gunter, H. M. (2001). Critical approaches to leadership in education. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, *2*(2), 94–108.

Gunter, H. M. (2012). *Leadership and the reform of education*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Hall, D., Gunter, H. M., & Bragg, J. (2013). Leadership, new public management and the re-modelling and regulation of teacher identities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *16*(2), 173–190.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *30*(3), 35–48.

Hammersley-Fletcher, L. (2017). Re-figuring the world of educational leadership: Struggles with performance, disenfranchisement and critical consciousness. In S. J. Courtney, R. McGinity, & H. M. Gunter (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times* (pp. 27–41). London: Routledge.

Hopkins, D. (2008). Realizing the potential of system leaders. In B. Pont, D. Nusche, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Improving school leadership, volume 2: Case studies on system leadership* (pp. 21–35). Paris: OECD.

Hosking, D. M. (2011). Telling tales of relations: Appreciating relational constructionism. *Organization Studies*, *32*(1), 47–65.

Jenkins, R. (2014). *Social Identity* (4th ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Johnson, L. (2016). Boundary spanners and advocacy leaders: Black educators and race equality work in Toronto and London, 1968–1995. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *15*(1), 91–115.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *43*(6), 619–629.

Lugg, C. A., & Tooms, A. K. (2010). A shadow of ourselves: Identity erasure and the politics of queer leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *30*(1), 77–91.

Lythgoe, A. (2017). Theorising senior leader identity in schools in areas of economic hardship. In S. J. Courtney, R. McGinity, & H. M. Gunter (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times* (pp. 42–55). London: Routledge.

MacIntyre, A. (2013). *After virtue* (Revelation). London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Maclure, M. (1993). Arguing for your self: Identity as an organising principle in teachers' jobs and lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, *19*(4), 311–322.

McGinity, R. (2015). Innovation and autonomy at a time of rapid reform: An English case study. *NordSTEP: Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, *1*(28652), 62–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v1.28652

Raelin, J. (2011). From leadership-as-practice to leaderful practice. *Leadership*, *7*(2), 195–211.

Ribbins, P., & Gunter, H. M. (2002). Mapping leadership studies in education: Towards a typology of knowledge domains. *Educational Management & Administration*, *30*(4), 359–385.

Rogers, S. (2017). Behind and beyond "moral purpose" in contemporary school leadership reform: The challenges for critical research? In S. J. Courtney, R. McGinity, & H. M. Gunter (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times* (pp. 138–150). London: Routledge.

Sahlberg, P. (2011). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change*, *12*(2), 173–185.

Sinclair, A. (2005). Body possibilities in leadership. *Leadership*, *1*(4), 387–406.

Stevenson, H. (2006). Moving towards, into and through principalship: Developing a framework for researching the career trajectories of school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(4), 408–420.

Thrupp, M., & Willmott, R. (2003). *Education management in managerialist times: Beyond the textual apologists*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Weber, M. (2012). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Mansfield, CT: Martino Publishing.

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(3), 255–316.