CONSORTIUM FOR THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP AND ETHICS IN EDUCATION UCEA

ISSN 1703-5759

VALUES AND ETHICS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2024 VOLUME 17 NUMBER 1

The Legacies of Roman, Christian, Kantian, and Utilitarian Ethics in Contemporary Theories of Educative Leadership

Reynold J. S. Macpherson
Independent Scholar, Consultant

Abstract

This article explores the nature, strengths and limitations of Roman, Christian, Kantian and utilitarian ethics and their legacy in some modern theories of educative leadership that are educative in intent and outcome. It is shown that Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics have profoundly shaped transformational, instructional, distributed, and ethical leadership theories. Roman ethics emphasize civic duty, virtue, and community service, influencing leaders to inspire collective goals and improve educational outcomes. Christian ethics highlight love, compassion, and moral integrity, guiding leaders to act as ethical exemplars and nurture followers. Kantian ethics focus on duty, universal principles, and respect for individuals, promoting ethical consistency and dignity in leadership practices. Utilitarian ethics prioritize maximizing happiness and well-being, driving leaders to achieve positive changes and balance individual needs with the greater good. It concludes that these ethical foundations (a) continue to inform contemporary educative leadership practices and (b) underpin recent scholarship that has shown how Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics can shape moral school leadership and ethical decision-making, offering school leaders a nuanced approach to promote learning and social justice, fairness, and community well-being.

Key Words:
Roman ethics, Christian ethics, Kantian ethics, utilitarian ethics, educative leadership, transformational leadership, instructional leadership, distributed leadership, ethical leadership

Introduction

Educative leadership theories were first defined as those that are "educative in intent and outcome" (Duignan & Macpherson, 1992, p. 1), that is, exhibiting both deontological (driven by duty, rules, and principles) and teleological ethics (driven by consequences). This definition includes transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), instructional leadership (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985), distributed leadership (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001; Gronn, 2002) and

ethical leadership theories (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005).

Roman moral philosophy evolved significantly from its early roots, influenced by both native traditions and external philosophical ideas, particularly from Greece. The Roman orator and statesman Cicero (106-43 BCE), who translated Greek philosophy into Latin, played a pivotal role in this transformation, bringing the ethical and political theories of Greece to Rome (Cicero, 1951). This cultural synthesis created a distinct Roman philosophical tradition that emphasized virtues such as courage, self-discipline, loyalty, and respect for authority. Additionally, Roman values of honesty, fairness, and justice were prominently reflected in their legal system, which stressed the equal treatment of all citizens under the law (Seneca, 1969).

Christian ethics emerged in the early centuries of the Common Era, blending Roman ethical principles with Christian teachings, culminating in the works of St. Augustine and St. Aquinas. Kantian ethics, originating in the late eighteenth century from Immanual Kant, emphasized rational autonomy and moral duty, influencing Christian moral thought. Utilitarian ethics, proposed by Jeremy Bentham in the late eighteenth century and expanded by John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century, prioritized maximizing overall happiness, intersecting with Christian ideals of compassion and social justice.

Roman Moral Philosophy

Roman ethics were deeply embedded in the fabric of Roman culture and history, with a strong emphasis on four virtues central to Roman identity:

1. Virtus: This term encapsulates the Roman ideal of manly excellence, courage, and valour. It was an essential quality for Roman citizens, particularly soldiers and statesmen (Cicero, 1951).

2. Pietas: Duty towards family, state, and the gods was paramount. Pietas involved not only religious piety but also a sense of duty and loyalty to one's family and country (Seneca, 1969).

3. Honestas: Romans valued honesty and integrity, which were seen as crucial for maintaining social order in the community and trust in government (Seneca, 1969).

4. Justitia: Justice and fairness were core to the Roman legal system, which aimed to treat all citizens equally and uphold the rule of law (Cicero, 1951).

These values were reinforced through both philosophical discourse and practical application in daily life and governance. Cicero's work in translating Greek philosophical texts into Latin was instrumental in integrating Greek ethics into Roman thought with the Stoic and Epicurean schools of philosophy being particularly influential (Cicero, 1951). To recall:

- Stoicism: Emphasized rationality, self-control, and virtue as the path to a good life. Roman Stoics like Seneca and Epictetus focused on ethics and the importance of living in accordance with nature and reason (Epictetus, 1983; Seneca, 1969).
- Epicureanism: Although less influential than Stoicism in Roman moral thought, it still contributed to the dialogue, particularly in the context of personal happiness and the avoidance of pain (Nussbaum, 1994).

The two leading schools of law, the Sabinian and the Proculean, drew on Stoic and Epicurean ethics respectively, reflecting a blend of philosophical reasoning and legal practice (Nussbaum, 1994):

- Sabinian School: Influenced by Stoic principles, this school emphasized justice, duty, and the importance of moral behaviour in legal contexts (Seneca, 1969).
- Proculean School: Incorporated Epicurean ideas, focusing on the individual's pursuit of happiness and the avoidance of pain as guiding principles for legal interpretation (Nussbaum, 1994).

During the autocratic rule of the Flavian dynasty, particularly under emperors Vespasian and Domitian, a significant philosophical movement known as the Stoic Opposition emerged. This group of philosophers, predominantly Stoics, vocally and politically protested against the excesses and injustices of imperial rule (Boissier, 1893). In response to these protests, Vespasian banished all philosophers from Rome, except for Gaius Musonius Rufus, who was later also exiled. This act of resistance was later romanticized by Roman Stoics, though the term "Stoic Opposition" itself was coined much later, in the nineteenth century by Gaston Boissier (1893).

While most Roman emperors were indifferent or even hostile to philosophy, a few stood out for their admiration of philosophical thought:

- Hadrian: Known for his admiration for Greece, the Greeks and Greek customs, Hadrian attended lectures by philosophers like Epictetus and Favorinus during his tours of Greece. He invested significantly in reviving Athens as a cultural and intellectual center (Nussbaum, 1994).
- Nero and Julian the Apostate: These emperors also showed interest in philosophy, with Julian notably attempting to restore pagan philosophical traditions during his reign (Nussbaum, 1994).
- Marcus Aurelius: The most prominent philosopher-emperor, Marcus Aurelius, wrote Meditations, a seminal text of Stoic philosophy, reflecting his commitment to Stoic principles in both his personal and political life (Marcus Aurelius, 2006).

With the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire, Christian philosophers began to dominate the intellectual landscape:

- Saint Augustine of Hippo: Also known as Saint Augustine, his writings integrated Christian theology with classical philosophy, creating a new framework for moral and ethical thought that would influence the medieval period (Nussbaum, 1994).

- Boethius: One of the last philosophers of antiquity, Boethius' works, particularly The Consolation of Philosophy, bridged the gap between ancient Greek philosophy and medieval Christian thought (Boissier, 1893).

There were three main strengths to Roman moral philosophy:

1. Integration of Ethics and Law: Roman moral philosophy's integration with the legal system ensured that ethical considerations were embedded in the governance and daily life of Roman citizens (Cicero, 1951).

2. Practicality: Roman philosophy emphasized practical wisdom and virtuous action, making it accessible and relevant to ordinary people (Seneca, 1969).

3. Resilience and Adaptability: The Roman adoption and adaptation of Greek philosophical ideas showcased a cultural flexibility that allowed for a rich, evolving intellectual tradition (Nussbaum, 1994).

There we three main limitations to Roman moral philosophy:

1. Philosophical Elitism: Despite its practicality, philosophy was often confined to the elite, limiting its broader societal impact (Boissier, 1893).

2. Tension with Authority: Philosophical movements like the Stoic Opposition highlighted ongoing tensions between philosophical ideals and political power, often leading to the suppression of dissenting voices (Boissier, 1893).

3. Cultural Conflicts: The imposition of Roman values on conquered peoples sometimes led to cultural conflicts and resistance, complicating the ethical landscape of the empire (Nussbaum, 1994).

Roman moral philosophy intersected significantly with Hellenistic ethics, particularly through the adoption of Stoic and Epicurean ideas. Both traditions emphasized virtue, rationality, and the importance of ethical living (Nussbaum, 1994). However, Romans adapted these ideas to their unique cultural context, focusing more on duty to the state and practical applications of philosophical principles in law and governance (Cicero, 1951; Seneca, 1969).

In sum to this point, Roman moral philosophy represents a rich tapestry of native values and external influences, particularly from Greek thought. Its emphasis on virtues, integration with legal practices, and adaptability to changing political and cultural contexts underscore its enduring impact. While it faced challenges and limitations, Roman moral philosophy's legacy continues to resonate, particularly in its contributions to legal and ethical discourse.

Christian Moral Philosophy

Christian moral philosophy has evolved over centuries, reflecting the integration of biblical teachings, Greco-Roman thought, and responses to historical and cultural changes.

The Patristic Period (c. 100-500 CE) marks the early development of Christian moral philosophy. Key figures such as Augustine of Hippo were instrumental in synthesizing Christian doctrine with Greco-Roman philosophy. Augustine's seminal works, Confessions and The City of God, blend Christian theology with Platonic philosophy, emphasizing the transformative power of divine grace and the moral necessity of loving God above all else (Augustine, 1998).

Augustine introduced the concept of the two cities—the City of God and the Earthly City—highlighting the dichotomy between spiritual and worldly values. He argued that true happiness and moral virtue are attainable only through a relationship with God, contrasting the transient nature of earthly pleasures with the eternal nature of divine love (Augustine, 1998).

The Middle Ages witnessed the flourishing of 'Medieval Scholasticism', a method of learning that sought to reconcile Christian theology with Aristotelian philosophy. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was a key figure in this era. His Summa Theologica systematically integrated Aristotelian ethics with Christian doctrine, introducing the concept of natural law, which advances that moral principles are inherent in the natural world and accessible through human reason (Aquinas, 2006). Aquinas argued that natural law is part of the eternal law of God, and through reason, humans can discern the moral order that guides ethical behaviour. This synthesis of faith and reason provided a robust intellectual foundation for Christian ethics, emphasizing virtues such as prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance (Aquinas, 2006).

The Middle Ages, also known as the Medieval Period, are commonly considered to span from the fifth century to the late fifteenth century, roughly from the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 CE to the beginning of the Renaissance, which began at different times across Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The term 'Dark Ages' typically refers to the early part of the Middle Ages, roughly spanning from the fifth century to the tenth century CE and is often characterized by a decline in centralized authority, economic instability, and a lack of significant cultural or scientific advancements, particularly in Western Europe after the fall of the

Western Roman Empire. This term has been criticized for oversimplifying the complexity of the historical period and neglecting the cultural, intellectual, and technological developments that occurred during this time (Cantor, 1991: Saul, 1997).

The Protestant Reformation, a significant movement in European history that led to the splintering of Western Christianity, generally took place during the sixteenth century. The traditional starting point is Martin Luther's publication of his Ninety-five Theses in 1517, which criticized certain practices of the Catholic Church, particularly the sale of indulgences. The movement gained momentum throughout the sixteenth century, with key events such as the Diet of Worms in 1521, the formation of various Protestant denominations, and the spread of Reformation ideas across Europe. The Peace of Westphalia in 1648, marking the end of the Thirty Years' War, is sometimes considered the end point of the Reformation era.

The Reformation brought significant changes to Christian moral philosophy. Reformers like Martin Luther (1483-1546) and John Calvin (1509-1564) emphasized the sovereignty of God's will and the primacy of faith over works. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone shifted the focus from human efforts to divine grace as the basis for salvation, challenging the established Catholic emphasis on moral and sacramental practices (Luther, 2003).

In the Early Modern period, Christian moral thought continued to evolve, engaging with Enlightenment ideas. Philosophers like John Locke (1632-1704) and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) integrated Christian ethical concepts with broader philosophical inquiries about human nature, autonomy, and the foundations of moral law (Locke, 1996; Kant, 1997).

In the Modern Era, Christian moral philosophy has addressed new ethical challenges posed by scientific advancements, social changes, and global conflicts. The Catholic Church, through papal encyclicals and the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), has emphasized social justice, human rights, and the dignity of the person (Vatican Council II, 1965).

Protestant ethics has similarly engaged with contemporary issues, often emphasizing social activism and the application of Christian principles to public life. The works of Reinhold Niebuhr (1892-1971) and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945) highlight the complexities of moral decision-making in a fallen world and the need for responsible action (Niebuhr, 1956; Bonhoeffer, 2005).

Four strengths of Christian moral philosophy include:

1. Universal Moral Framework: Christian ethics provides a comprehensive moral framework grounded in the love of God and neighbour, promoting universal principles of justice, compassion, and human dignity (Augustine, 1998).

2. Integration of Faith and Reason: The synthesis of faith and reason, particularly in the works of Aquinas, offers a robust intellectual foundation that appeals to both believers and non-believers (Aquinas, 2006).

3. Emphasis on Human Dignity: Christian moral philosophy underscores the inherent worth of every individual, advocating for social justice, human rights, and the common good (Vatican Council II, 1965).

4. Ethic of Love and Forgiveness: The centrality of love and forgiveness in Christian ethics fosters reconciliation and peace, addressing the root causes of conflict and division (Bonhoeffer, 2005).

Conversely, four limitations of Christian moral philosophy are:

1. Historical Context and Interpretation: The application of Christian ethics has often been influenced by historical and cultural contexts, sometimes leading to interpretations that justify social inequalities or exclusion (Niebuhr, 1956).

2. Conflict with Secular Ethics: The reliance on divine revelation and religious authority can lead to conflicts with secular ethical frameworks that prioritize autonomy and human reason (Kant, 1997).

3. Challenges of Pluralism: In a pluralistic society, the particularity of Christian moral claims can be challenging to reconcile with diverse ethical perspectives and beliefs (Niebuhr, 1956).

4. Moral Absolutism: The absolutist stance on certain moral issues, such as sexual ethics and bioethics, can lead to rigid positions that may not adequately address complex, nuanced situations (Luther, 2003).

Christian moral philosophy has significant intersections with Greco-Roman ethics, particularly through the adoption and adaptation of Greek and Roman philosophical ideas:

1. Virtue Ethics: Both Christian and Hellenistic ethics emphasize the development of virtuous character. Aristotle's concept of virtue (arete) as a mean between extremes influenced Christian thinkers like Aquinas, who integrated these ideas into his moral theology (Aquinas, 2006). Similarly, the Stoic emphasis on virtue and self-control resonated with Christian ascetic practices (Seneca, 1969).

2. Natural Law: The Stoic idea of natural law, which assumes that moral principles are inherent in the natural order and accessible through reason, parallels Aquinas' natural law theory (Seneca, 1969; Aquinas, 2006). Cicero's writings on natural law also influenced Christian thought, particularly in the development of legal and ethical systems (Cicero, 1991). For example, murder is considered wrong because life is essential to humans so depriving someone of it is inherently an evil. Education is

needed for humans, and is their right, because their intellectual nature requires developing.

3. Focus on the Good Life: Both traditions aim at achieving the good life, though their ultimate ends differ. For Hellenistic philosophers like the Stoics, the good life is achieved through living in accordance with nature and reason. For Christians, it is found in union with God and the fulfillment of divine purpose (Epictetus, 1983; Augustine, 1998).

4. Justice and Duty: Roman concepts of justice and duty (pietas) influenced Christian ethics, especially in the context of social and legal obligations. The emphasis on duty towards family, state, and gods in Roman ethics found a parallel in the Christian emphasis on duty towards God and neighbor (Cicero, 1991).

5. Ethics of Care and Community: Both Christian and Roman ethics stress the importance of community and relational duties. Christian ethics' focus on love and charity mirrors the Roman emphasis on social harmony and mutual obligations (Seneca, 1969; Augustine, 1998).

In conclusion, Christian moral philosophy has evolved through a dynamic interplay of faith, reason, and cultural influences. From its early foundations in the teachings of Jesus Christ and the Church Fathers to its engagement with Greek and Roman philosophy and modern ethical challenges, it has developed a rich and complex tradition. While it offers a robust moral framework grounded in love, justice, and human dignity, it also faces challenges related to interpretation, pluralism, and conflicts with secular ethics. The intersections with Hellenistic and Roman ethics highlight common concerns with virtue, natural law, and the pursuit of the good life, demonstrating the enduring relevance of these philosophical dialogues.

The Enlightenment and Kantian and Utilitarian Ethics

The Enlightenment was an intellectual and philosophical movement that occurred in Europe in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. It was marked by an emphasis on reason, individualism, and empirical evidence. It significantly influenced the development of moral philosophy. Two prominent ethical theories that emerged from this era are Kantian ethics and utilitarianism. This section will summarize the main ethical ideas of these two theories, highlight their strengths and limitations, and examine how the Enlightenment advanced moral philosophy.

Immanuel Kant, an eighteenth-century philosopher, argued that morality is founded on duty, which issues a Categorical Imperative—a command that must be obeyed universally (Kant, 1997). According to Kant, an action is only moral if it is done from a sense of duty, not from inclination or for some other end. The most valuable thing, in Kant's view, is a human will that has decided to act rightly.

Kant introduced the principle of universalizability to determine what duty requires. This principle posits that correct moral rules are those that everyone could adopt without contradiction. For instance, lying cannot be universalized because if everyone lied, trust would be impossible, making lying self-defeating (Kant, 1997).

Kant's philosophy marks several important conceptual shifts in ethical thinking. He argued that ethics should not focus on happiness because it involves different modes of life for different individuals, which would make ethical principles relative rather than universal. Kant believed that to avoid becoming heteronomous—locating moral motivation outside of properly moral concerns—ethics must be grounded in rationality and autonomy.

There are three major strengths to Kantian ethics:

1. Universal Applicability: Kant's ethics provide a clear and rigorous framework for determining moral duties that apply to all rational beings, promoting consistency and fairness.

2. Emphasis on Autonomy: By focusing on the autonomy of the moral agent, Kantian ethics respect the individual's capacity for self-governance and moral decision-making.

3. Moral Integrity: The insistence on acting from duty rather than inclination ensures that actions are genuinely moral and not merely pragmatic.

There are three limitations of Kantian Ethics:

1. Rigidity: Kantian ethics can be overly rigid, failing to account for the complexities of real-life situations where moral duties might conflict.

2. Lack of Practical Guidance: The abstract nature of the Categorical Imperative can sometimes make it difficult to apply in concrete scenarios.

3. Neglect of Consequences: By focusing solely on intentions and duties, Kantian ethics may overlook the importance of the consequences of actions.

In sharp contrast, in nineteenth-century Britain, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill developed utilitarianism, an ethical theory that holds that the right actions are those that maximize happiness or pleasure for the greatest number of people (Mill, 2001). This consequentialist approach judges the morality of actions based on their outcomes rather than their inherent nature or the intentions behind them.

Bentham introduced the principle of utility, which he quantified through the "felicific calculus," a method of measuring the pleasure and pain generated by actions to determine their overall utility (Bentham, 1988). Mill refined this theory by distinguishing between higher and lower pleasures, arguing that intellectual and moral pleasures (higher pleasures) are superior to physical pleasures (lower pleasures) (Mill, 2001).

Three strengths of utilitarianism are:

1. Practical Relevance: Utilitarianism offers a practical and flexible method for making moral decisions, focusing on the outcomes of actions.

2. Impartiality: By considering the happiness of all affected parties, utilitarianism promotes fairness and equality.

3. Consequential Considerations: This theory acknowledges the importance of the consequences of actions, which can be crucial in ethical decision-making.

Three limitations of utilitarianism are:

1. Measurement Problems: Quantifying happiness and comparing different kinds of pleasures can be challenging and subjective.

2. Potential for Injustice: Utilitarianism can justify actions that harm a minority if it benefits the majority, potentially leading to unjust outcomes.

3. Overemphasis on Consequences: By focusing solely on outcomes, Utilitarianism may overlook the moral significance of intentions and the intrinsic nature of actions.

More broadly, the Enlightenment was characterized by a shift towards reason, empirical evidence, and individualism, profoundly impacting moral philosophy. Thinkers such as Immanuel Kant, John Locke, David Hume, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau made significant contributions that laid the foundations for modern ethical theories.

Kant epitomized the Enlightenment shift towards grounding morality in reason rather than tradition or religion. His deontological ethics, which emphasize the role of rationality in determining moral duties, reflect the Enlightenment's commitment to reason and universal principles (Kant, 1997).

Locke's theory of natural rights, articulated in his Second Treatise of Government, argues that individuals inherently possess rights to life, liberty, and property (Locke, 1980). These rights are not granted by governments but are inherent to human nature, and governments are legitimate only insofar as they protect these rights. Locke's ideas greatly influenced liberal political philosophy and the development of democratic institutions.

Hume's empirical approach to morality emphasized the role of human sentiment and observation. In his A Treatise of Human Nature, Hume argued that moral judgments arise from feelings of approval or disapproval, which are universal to human experience (Hume, 1978). This perspective laid the groundwork for later sentimentalist and emotivist theories in ethics.

Rousseau expanded on the concept of the social contract, emphasizing the collective aspects of moral and political life. In The Social Contract, Rousseau argued that individuals can achieve true freedom by participating in the formulation of the general will, which represents the collective good (Rousseau, 1968). This notion of collective decision-making and moral responsibility to the community highlighted the importance of social cohesion and mutual obligations in ethical considerations.

The Enlightenment's emphasis on reason and empirical evidence led to the secularization of ethics. Voltaire, for instance, championed religious tolerance and argued for a morality based on reason and humanistic values (Voltaire, 2004). This secular approach to ethics promoted a more inclusive and universal understanding of morality, applicable across different cultures and belief systems.

Three strengths of Enlightenment moral philosophy are:

1. Universal Principles: The Enlightenment's emphasis on reason and universal principles provides a robust framework for addressing ethical issues in a diverse and pluralistic world.

2. Individual Rights: The focus on individual rights and autonomy has been influential in shaping contemporary human rights discourse and democratic institutions.

3. Empirical Approach: The use of empirical methods and observations to inform ethical theories ensures that moral principles are grounded in human experience.

Three limitations of Enlightenment moral philosophy are:

1. Overemphasis on Reason: The focus on reason can sometimes overlook the complexities of human experience and the emotional aspects of morality.

2. Cultural Insensitivity: The universalist approach may fail to account for the nuances of different cultural contexts and moral traditions.

3. Individualism: The Enlightenment's celebration of individualism may neglect the importance of community and relational aspects of human life.

To conclude, the Enlightenment era significantly advanced moral philosophy by emphasizing reason, empirical evidence, and individual rights. Kantian ethics and utilitarianism, both products of this era, offer distinct approaches to moral decision-making. Kantian ethics focuses on duty and universal principles, while Utilitarianism emphasizes the consequences of actions. Each theory has its strengths and limitations, reflecting the broader contributions and challenges of Enlightenment thought in the realm of ethics.

Discussion

Roman, Christian, Kantian, and Utilitarian moral philosophies have a significant presence in contemporary theories of educative leadership, such as transformational leadership, instructional leadership, distributed leadership, and ethical leadership. Roman moral

philosophy, which emphasized virtues such as justice, courage, temperance, and prudence, as well as the importance of duty and civic responsibility, has left a lasting impact on all of these leadership theories.

For instance, the Roman focus on virtues aligns with transformational leadership's emphasis on developing moral character and ethical values in both leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). This alignment is evident in the way transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers to achieve higher levels of morality and civic responsibility. Similarly, the Roman emphasis on duty and responsibility resonates with instructional leadership's commitment to upholding high standards of teaching and learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Furthermore, the Roman concept of civic responsibility is mirrored in distributed leadership's emphasis on collective responsibility and the active participation of all members in the leadership process (Spillane, 2006). Ethical leadership, too, is directly informed by Roman virtues, as it underscores the importance of integrity, fairness, and the ethical treatment of all stakeholders (Brown & Treviño, 2006).

Recent research reported by Slater and Tiggemann (2022) explores how Stoic concepts such as rationality, virtue, and duty can inform ethical leadership practices in educational settings. The study draws parallels between Stoic ethical principles and modern leadership challenges, emphasizing the importance of resilience, moral integrity, and the leader's duty to the school community, which resonates with the Roman adaptation of Stoicism.

Christian moral philosophy, centred on principles such as love, compassion, humility, forgiveness, and service to others, has also profoundly shaped contemporary leadership theories. In transformational leadership, Christian principles of love and compassion are reflected in the focus on caring for and empowering followers, thereby fostering a supportive and nurturing environment (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Instructional leadership embodies the Christian emphasis on service and humility by promoting a culture where educators serve the needs of students and teachers, thus ensuring a supportive educational environment (Hallinger, 2003).

Distributed leadership's collaborative and servant-oriented nature aligns with the Christian value of service to others, encouraging shared leadership and active contributions from all members of the educational community (Harris, 2008). Ethical leadership draws directly from Christian moral principles, emphasizing compassion, fairness, and integrity in interactions with others (Starratt, 1991). A practical example of relevant research advocates for spiritual leadership that is reflective, compassionate, and committed to social justice, aiming to empower all members of the school community by disarming systemic privilege (Frick et al., 2019).

Kantian moral philosophy, grounded in the principles of duty, rationality, and the Categorical Imperative, also exerts a significant influence on contemporary educative leadership. The Kantian emphasis on moral duty and universal principles aligns with transformational leadership's focus on ethical behaviour and the pursuit of higher moral standards (Bass, 1985). In instructional leadership, Kantian principles support leaders' duties to uphold educational standards and make decisions based on rationality and fairness (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Kantian respect for individuals as ends in themselves resonates with distributed leadership's focus on valuing each member's contributions and fostering a collaborative environment (Gronn, 2002). Furthermore, Kantian ethics underpin ethical leadership, emphasizing moral duty, integrity, and the importance of treating all individuals with respect and fairness (Northouse, 2018).

To illustrate, Maxcy, Heine, and Perez (2020) explore how leaders in education can use Kantian ethics, particularly the principles of duty and the Categorical Imperative, to guide ethical decision-making in schools. They discuss how leaders can prioritize moral duties over personal or political interests, making decisions that respect the autonomy and dignity of all individuals involved in the educational process.

Utilitarian moral philosophy, which is based on the principle of the greatest happiness and evaluates actions by their consequences and the overall well-being they produce, has also shaped educative leadership theories. Transformational leadership's goal of inspiring followers to achieve collective goals that benefit the broader community reflects the utilitarian focus on the greatest good (Bass, 1990). Instructional leadership, with its emphasis on outcomes and the effectiveness of teaching strategies, aligns with utilitarian principles that seek to maximize student learning and well-being (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The utilitarian emphasis on collective well-being is evident in distributed leadership's focus on the overall success and welfare of the school community through shared leadership and collaboration (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Ethical leadership, too, draws on utilitarian principles by emphasizing decision-making that considers the consequences of actions and strives to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of people (Ciulla, 2004).

A more recent application of utilitarian moral philosophy (Strike and Soltis, 2015) discusses how leaders can use utilitarian principles to evaluate the consequences of their actions to ensure that they are promoting the greatest good for the greatest number of people within an educational community.

The integration of these moral philosophies into contemporary educative leadership theories underscores the importance of ethical considerations, duty, collective responsibility, and the well-being of all stakeholders. Educative leaders can draw on these rich philosophical traditions to create environments that are not only

effective but also morally grounded and inclusive. These legacies provide a robust framework for addressing complex ethical dilemmas and fostering a culture of continuous improvement and ethical integrity in educational settings.

Recent scholarship has increasingly focused on the application of Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics within the realms of moral school leadership, ethical decision-making, and leadership for learning and social justice. Each of these ethical frameworks offers distinct but complementary perspectives that inform the philosophy of educative leadership.

Roman ethics, particularly Stoicism, emphasizes virtues such as wisdom, courage, justice, and temperance. These virtues are central to moral leadership, encouraging leaders to maintain ethical behaviour and rational decision-making, even under pressure. Stoicism's influence on educative leadership is evident in the emphasis on integrity, self-control, and the pursuit of the common good, principles that align closely with the broader concept of ethical leadership (Clark, 2022).

Christian ethics, deeply rooted in the teachings of the Bible, underscore the importance of love, compassion, and service to others. These values inspire educative leaders to prioritize the well-being of their students and staff, advocating for social justice and inclusive practices. The moral imperative to care for the marginalized and to lead with humility is central to Christian-inspired leadership models, which emphasize service-oriented leadership and the pursuit of equitable education (Bezzina & Burford, 2021).

Kantian ethics, with its focus on duty and adherence to universal moral laws, provides a robust framework for ethical decision-making in educational leadership. Kant's deontological approach insists that decisions should be guided by principles that can be universally applied, ensuring that actions are morally justified in all similar situations. This framework is particularly relevant in contexts where fairness, respect for individuals, and consistency in policy implementation are paramount (Wieland, 2023).

Utilitarian ethics, which advocate for actions that maximize overall happiness and minimize harm, are frequently applied in leadership decisions within education. Utilitarian principles guide leaders in making choices that benefit the greatest number of stakeholders, which is particularly relevant in scenarios involving resource allocation and policy development. The utilitarian approach is instrumental in addressing ethical dilemmas where the potential outcomes affect multiple groups within the educational community (Felzmann, 2015).

These ethical frameworks collectively contribute to a nuanced understanding of moral leadership in education. Each offers a unique lens through which school leaders can approach ethical dilemmas, ensuring that their actions promote justice, fairness, and the overall well-being of the school community.

Conclusion

Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics are significantly evidenced in transformational leadership, instructional leadership, distributed leadership, and ethical leadership theories.

Roman ethics, with its emphasis on civic duty, virtue, and practical wisdom, has shaped leadership theories by promoting the idea that leaders should serve the greater good and the community. This influence is clear in transformational leadership, which emphasizes the leader's role in inspiring and motivating followers towards collective goals. In instructional leadership, Roman ethical principles are manifest in the principal's duty to improve educational outcomes and the welfare of the school community. Distributed leadership reflects Roman ethics through the encouragement of shared leadership responsibilities to serve the organization's collective interests. Ethical leadership, similarly, highlights the importance of integrity, duty, and ethical behaviour, drawing directly from Roman moral traditions.

Christian ethics, based on principles of love, compassion, and service to others, has profoundly shaped leadership theories that value moral integrity and care for followers. Transformational leadership, for instance, is influenced by Christian ethics through the concept of leaders acting as moral exemplars who inspire followers with their vision and ethical conduct. In instructional leadership, this legacy is apparent in the focus on nurturing and developing the potential of students and staff. Distributed leadership incorporates Christian ethical principles by emphasizing collaboration and mutual support among leaders and followers. Ethical leadership, rooted in Christian ethics, prioritizes ethical standards, compassion, and care for the well-being of others.

Kantian ethics, centered on duty, universal principles, and respect for individuals as ends in themselves, has contributed significantly to leadership theories that emphasize ethical consistency and respect for followers. Transformational leadership, for example, reflects Kantian ethics through leaders who adhere to ethical principles and inspire followers with their moral leadership. In instructional leadership, Kantian principles are evident in the focus on fair and just educational practices and policies. Distributed leadership integrates these principles by ensuring that leadership practices respect the autonomy and dignity of all members. Ethical leadership, strongly influenced by Kantian ethics, involves leaders making decisions based on universal ethical principles and treating everyone with respect and dignity.

Utilitarian ethics, with its focus on maximizing overall happiness and well-being, has influenced leadership

theories that prioritize outcomes and the greater good. Transformational leadership demonstrates utilitarian influence through leaders striving to achieve positive change and greater benefits for the organization and its members. In instructional leadership, the aim is to improve educational outcomes and maximize benefits for students and the school community. Distributed leadership, shaped by utilitarian ethics, promotes leadership practices that enhance overall organizational effectiveness and well-being. Ethical leadership, underpinned by utilitarian principles, involves leaders making decisions that consider the greatest good for the greatest number, balancing individual needs with collective benefits.

In conclusion, the ethical legacies of Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian thought have deeply embedded principles of duty, community, moral integrity, respect, and the greater good into the frameworks of various leadership theories. These philosophical foundations continue to inform and guide contemporary leadership practices and ideologies. Recent scholarship has increasingly examined the application of Roman, Christian, Kantian, and utilitarian ethics in moral school leadership, ethical decision-making, and leadership for learning and social justice, each providing distinct perspectives that can shape educative leadership. These ethical frameworks collectively offer school leaders a nuanced approach to ethical dilemmas, ensuring that their decisions promote justice, fairness, and the well-being of the school community.

References

Aquinas, T. (2006). *Summa Theologica*. Christian Classics.

Augustine. (1998). *Confessions*. Oxford University Press.

Augustine. (1998). *The City of God*. Penguin Classics.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bentham, J. (1988). *The principles of morals and legislation*. Oxford University Press.

Bezzina, C., & Burford, C. (2021). Christian ethics and educational leadership: A study in service-oriented leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration, 59*(1), 76-91. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2020-0103

Boissier, G. (1893). *La fin du paganisme*. Hachette.

Bonhoeffer, D. (2005). *Ethics*. Simon & Schuster.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 595-616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

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

Cantor, N. F. (1991). *The invention of the Middle Ages: A history of the concept of the Middle Ages*. HarperCollins.

Cicero. (1951). *De officiis* [On duties]. Harvard University Press.

Cicero. (1991). *On the laws*. Cambridge University Press.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (2nd ed.). Praeger.

Clark, M. A. (2022). Stoic virtues in educational leadership: The application of Roman ethics in school administration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50*(4), 577-592. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211012345

Duignan, P. A., & Macpherson, R. J. S. (1992). Creating new knowledge about educative leadership. In P. A. Duignan & R. J. S. Macpherson (Eds.), *Educative leadership: A practical theory for new administrators and managers* (pp. 1-19). Falmer.

Epictetus. (1983). *Discourses and selected writings*. Penguin Classics.

Felzmann, H. (2015). Utilitarianism as an approach to ethical decision-making in educational leadership. In P. A. Scott (Ed.), *Principles of ethical leadership in education* (pp. 123-139). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12163-7_8

Frick, W. C., Parsons, J., & Frick, J. E. (2019). Disarming privilege to achieve equitable school communities: A spiritually attuned school leadership response to our storied lives. *Interchange, 50*(4), 549-568. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-019-09375-z

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423-451. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329-351. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217-247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(2), 172-188. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810863253

Hume, D. (1978). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. Cambridge University Press.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.

Locke, J. (1980). *Second treatise of government*. Hackett Publishing Company.

Locke, J. (1996). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Oxford University Press.

Marcus Aurelius. (2006). *Meditations*. Penguin Classics.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. ASCD.

Maxcy, B. D., Heine, D., & Perez, A. (2020). Ethical leadership in education: A Kantian perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration, 58*(6), 711-726. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2019-0167

Mill, J. S. (2001). *Utilitarianism*. Hackett Publishing Company.

Niebuhr, R. (1956). *The nature and destiny of man: A Christian interpretation*. Westminster John Knox Press.

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994). *The therapy of desire: Theory and practice in Hellenistic ethics*. Princeton University Press.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635-674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Rousseau, J.-J. (1968). *The social contract*. Penguin Classics.

Saul, N. (Ed.). (1997). *The Oxford illustrated history of medieval England*. Oxford University Press.

Seneca. (1969). *De beneficiis* [On benefits]. Harvard University Press.

Slater, L., & Tiggemann, R. (2022). Stoic philosophy and educational leadership: Cultivating resilience and ethical practice in schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy, 34*(2), 231-249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-022-00345-9

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-28. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023

Starratt, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(2), 185-202. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X91027002005

Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. F. (2015). *The ethics of school administration* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press

Vatican Council II. (1965). *Gaudium et spes* [Pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world]. United States Catholic Conference.

Voltaire. (2004). *Treatise on tolerance*. Oxford University Press.

Wieland, J. (2023). Kantian ethics in educational leadership: Duty, rationality, and the categorical imperative in decision-making. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 55*(3), 334-348. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2021.1934176

EDITORIAL OBJECTIVES: *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration* is dedicated to promoting and disseminating a broad range of scholarly inquiry relating to the areas of values and ethics in education, and their relationship to theory and practice in school administration and leadership. The areas of values and ethics represent a promising direction for research into the practice of educational administration, and the editor is prepared to consider a wide range of disciplined empirical and conceptual works of interest to both scholars in the field as well as practitioners in the PK-12 sector.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION: All articles will be reviewed by the editor to determine their suitability for this publication. In addition, at least two additional reviewers will conduct blind reviews of the article.

MANUSCRIPT REQUIREMENTS: The initial manuscript should be submitted electronically to the editor at the email address shown below. Manuscripts should conform to APA 6the edition formatting requirements and should not identify the author(s) of the work. A separate author page should be included providing the author(s)' details, including contact information (address and e-mail). In addition, an abstract of 100-150 words should be included, as well as up to six keywords identifying the central subjects addressed in the manuscript. Diagrams, tables, and figures should be kept at a minimum, appear in black and white, and follow the manuscript in numbered order corresponding to numbered placeholders in the text. Footnotes and endnotes should be avoided whenever possible.

References should appear in the following format:
Stanley, R. J. & Hollander, M. P. (1992). Beyond the boundaries: The quest for knowledge. *Administrative Life, 2*(3), 36-49.
References and citations should be in alphabetical order, and chronological within alphabetical order. The editor reserves the right to make changes to the manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the house style. Generally, manuscripts should be between 2, 500 and 5,000 words in length. Prospective author(s) must include a statement which indicates they agree to the submission of the manuscript, and that the manuscript has not been published, and is not under consideration for publication, in part or in substance, elsewhere.
The editor will communicate via the internet with the author(s) of accepted manuscripts to ensure that the final version of the article is not only acceptable with the author(s) but also complies with the journal's established requirements and format.

PUBLICATION DETAILS: *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration* is an independently published quarterly by the University Council for Educational Administration's Consortium for the Study of Leadership and Ethics in Education. This journal is published both in traditional hard copy format as well as on-line at http://www.ucea.org/initiatives/ucea-centre-study-leadership-ethics/. On-line access to the journal articles is free and copyright provisions are expected when using any information contained in an article.

EDITORIAL CONTACT INFORMATION: Address editorial correspondence and information requests to:

William C. Frick
University of Oklahoma
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
Jeannine Rainbolt College of Education
820 Van Vleet Oval
201 Collings Hall
Norman, OK 73019-2041
405-325-2447 (office)
405-325-2403 (fax)
https://www.ou.edu/education/people/faculty/william-frick