

To cite this article: Kamal Mo'ed (2025). POWER, DISCIPLINE, AND THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO EDUCATION ACCORDING TO MICHEL FOUCAULT'S: A NEW REVIEW, International Journal of Education and Social Science Research (IJESSR) 8 (5): 168-179 Article No. 1142, Sub Id 1775

POWER, DISCIPLINE, AND THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO EDUCATION ACCORDING TO MICHEL FOUCAULT'S: A NEW REVIEW

Kamal Mo'ed

Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher Education
Education Department
Open University, Ra'anana
History and Philosophy Department

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2025.8512>

ABSTRACT

Michel Foucault's critical theories have profoundly influenced almost every field offering a lens through which to analyze the relationships between power, knowledge, and institutional practices. This article explores Foucault's key ideas on education, focusing on his concepts of discipline, power/knowledge, and governmentality. Additionally, it shed a light on Foucault's lesser-known insights on education, such as his views on the role of space, body, and ethics of self-formation. My main argument in this article is that there are major implications of Foucault's work for contemporary educational theory and practice, highlighting its relevance for understanding issues of inequality, resistance, and the politics of knowledge production. Educational institutions, according to Foucault, function as sites of normalization and control, shaping individuals into docile bodies through mechanisms such as surveillance, examination, and curriculum.

KEYWORDS: Foucault, Education, philosophy of education, Knowledge and Power

INTRODUCTION

Michel Foucault (1926–1984) was a French philosopher, historian, and social theorist whose work has had a profound impact on a wide range of disciplines, including philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, history, and political theory. Foucault's work is characterized by its critical analysis of power, knowledge, and discourse, and his exploration of the relationships between these concepts in shaping human society. This survey provides an overview of Foucault's key ideas, their influence, and the critical reception of his work, supported by references to scholarly literature.

Before we begin analyzing Foucault's views and positions on education, it is very important and helpful to briefly present the central concepts in his thought in order to situate his views on education in the broader context of his work. Foucault's extensive work was based on four central concepts that he conceived and which had a great influence on other thinkers from all over the world in the fields of society, politics, economics, education and culture. The four concepts in brief are: *Archaeology of*

Knowledge: Foucault's archaeological method, outlined in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), examines the historical conditions under which certain statements become accepted as knowledge. He argues that knowledge is not a neutral reflection of reality but is shaped by discursive practices that vary across historical periods (Foucault, M. 1969). *Genealogy and Power:* In works like *Discipline and Punish* (1975) and *The History of Sexuality* (1976), Foucault introduces the concept of genealogy, which traces the historical development of power relations. He argues that power is not merely repressive but productive, shaping individuals and societies through institutions like prisons, schools, and hospitals (Foucault, M. 1975).

Discourse and Power/Knowledge: Foucault's concept of discourse refers to the ways in which language and practices produce knowledge and power. He argues that discourses are not neutral but are tied to power structures that determine what can be said, by whom, and in what context (Foucault, M. 1980). *Bio politics and Governmentality:* In his later work, Foucault explores bio politics, the regulation of populations through mechanisms like health, reproduction, and security, and governmentality, the art of governing through institutions and practices (Foucault, M. 2008). Foucault's thought had a great influence and had many implications and applications on the world of thought, which left an imprint on the works of many socialist thinkers in the 20th century.

This is not the place to expand on those implications, so I will limit myself to presenting only four of them: *Critical Theory and Post structuralism:* Foucault is often associated with post structuralism and critical theory. His work has influenced thinkers like Judith Butler, Gilles Deleuze, and Edward Said, who have applied his ideas to gender studies, postcolonial theory, and cultural studies (Butler, J. 1990., & Said, E. 1978). *Sociology and Anthropology:* Foucault's analysis of power and institutions has been widely adopted in sociology and anthropology to study systems of control, surveillance, and normalization (Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. 2003). *Education and Pedagogy:* Foucault's ideas have been used to critique educational systems as sites of power and discipline, where knowledge is produced and regulated. (Ball, S. J. 2013).

Criminology and Legal Studies: *Discipline and Punish* has been particularly influential in criminology, offering a critical perspective on the prison system and the broader mechanisms of social control (Garland, D. 1990). However, despite Foucault's special and wide influence and despite his many admirers, he had many critics who harshly criticized him, mainly in the following areas: **Lack of Normative Framework:** Critics argue that Foucault's work lacks a clear normative framework, making it difficult to derive ethical or political guidelines from his analysis (Habermas, J. (1987). **Overemphasis on Power:** Some scholars contend that Foucault's focus on power relations overlooks the role of agency and resistance in social change. (Fraser, N. 1989). **Historical Accuracy:** Foucault's historical analyses have been criticized for their selective use of evidence and lack of empirical rigor (Megill, A. 1987).

Yet, Michel Foucault's work remains a cornerstone of contemporary social theory, offering powerful tools for analyzing the intersections of power, knowledge, and discourse. While his ideas have been

subject to criticism, their influence across disciplines underscores their enduring relevance. Future research could further explore the applications of Foucault's concepts in emerging fields such as digital surveillance, environmental studies, and global governance.

Discussions on the Nature of Education

Education has long been a central theme in philosophy, with debates about its nature, purpose, and role in society dating back to ancient times. Philosophers have examined the nature of education from various perspectives—ethical, social, political, and epistemological—each bringing different insights into how education functions, what it aims to achieve, and what methods should be employed to accomplish its objectives. The nature of education touches on fundamental questions about human existence, the transmission of knowledge, the cultivation of virtue, and the formation of social and political identities. As such, discussions about education are deeply intertwined with broader questions about human nature, society, and morality.

At the heart of these discussions lies a question about what education is: is it simply the transmission of knowledge, or is it a more complex process involving the formation of character, socialization, and personal development? Moreover, what is the ultimate aim of education? Is it to prepare individuals for their roles in society, to help them attain personal flourishing, or to critically engage with the world in ways that challenge existing norms? These questions have been central to educational theory and continue to fuel debates today. Before we address and expand on Foucault's views on education, it is important and useful to explore key philosophical debates about the nature of education, drawing from both classical and contemporary thinkers. It will outline several dominant perspectives: education as the transmission of knowledge, education as moral and intellectual development, education as socialization, and education as liberation. By exploring these perspectives, we can better understand how differing philosophical views on the nature of education influence educational practices and policy.

Education as the Transmission of Knowledge

One of the oldest and most prevalent views of education is that it is primarily concerned with the transmission of knowledge. In the Western tradition, this view is strongly associated with Plato (428-348 BC), who in his work *The Republic*, argued that education serves to guide individuals toward understanding universal truths, such as the Forms, which transcend the physical world. For Plato, education was a process of intellectual development, leading to wisdom and enlightenment. This view suggests that education is essentially a means of imparting knowledge from one generation to the next and shaping individuals to fit societal roles by equipping them with the necessary intellectual tools to perform these roles effectively (Plato, *The Republic*).

In contrast to Plato, John Locke's conception of education in *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) focuses more on the formative role of experience. Locke believed that individuals are born as blank slates (*tabula rasa*), and education helps shape individuals' understanding of the world through

experience. For Locke, the main aim of education was not only to transmit knowledge but also to cultivate a practical understanding of the world, preparing children to navigate the challenges they would encounter in society. This emphasis on experience-based learning marked a shift from the more idealized theories of education (Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*).

Education as Moral and Intellectual Development

Another prominent view of the nature of education focuses on its role in developing both the intellectual and moral capacities of individuals. Aristotle (384-322 BC), in his *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*, argued that education should aim to cultivate virtue, preparing individuals to live good, flourishing lives. Education, for Aristotle, was not just about the acquisition of knowledge but also about the formation of character. It was through education that individuals learned to act in accordance with reason and to fulfill their role as responsible citizens in the polis (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*). This view posits that education's true aim is the moral and intellectual development of the individual, forming citizens who contribute to the common good. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), in *Emile* (1762) further extended the idea of education as the development of virtue, but with a more radical approach. Rousseau contended that traditional education systems corrupted the natural goodness of children, and he called for an educational model that allowed children to develop freely and naturally, without the constraints of societal norms. His theory of education focused on the importance of the child's autonomy and the cultivation of inner virtue (Rousseau, *Emile*). While Rousseau's ideas were revolutionary, they have been critiqued for being overly idealistic and not sufficiently addressing the complexities of educating in a modern, complex society.

Education as Socialization: A key aspect of the philosophical discussion about the nature of education is its role in socializing individuals into the values and norms of society. Plato's educational model in *The Republic* is an example of this approach, as he argued that education serves to maintain the social order by preparing individuals for the roles they are naturally suited to. In this context, education serves not only to cultivate intellectual and moral virtues but also to teach individuals their place in the social hierarchy. Similarly, for Aristotle, education was a means of producing citizens who would contribute to the stability and well-being of the state (Plato, *The Republic*; Aristotle, *Politics*).

John Dewey, a leading figure in progressive education, emphasized the social aspect of education in his work *Democracy and Education* (1916). Dewey argued that education should not be a passive transmission of knowledge but an interactive, social process where individuals learn through experience and engagement with others. For Dewey, education was about preparing individuals to actively participate in democratic society, equipping them with the skills needed for collaboration, critical thinking, and problem-solving (Dewey, *Democracy and Education*). Dewey's view of education as socialization focuses on its potential to nurture democratic values and social responsibility, moving beyond the mere transmission of knowledge.

Education as Liberation: A more radical approach to the nature of education is found in the work of Paulo Freire, particularly in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Freire's philosophy of education emphasized the transformative potential of education as a tool for liberation. He criticized traditional education models, which he described as "banking" systems in which teachers deposit knowledge into passive students. In contrast, Freire advocated for a dialogical model of education that encourages active participation, critical reflection, and the questioning of societal structures. For Freire, education was a means of empowering marginalized individuals and communities to challenge oppressive systems and create a more just society. His view of education as liberation emphasizes the need for education to be both a means of personal development and a tool for social change (Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*).

As we have seen above, the philosophical discussions about the nature of education are vast and multifaceted, with different thinkers emphasizing various roles that education can play in shaping individuals and society. From the transmission of knowledge and moral development to socialization and liberation, education is understood in many ways depending on the values and goals that guide each philosophical tradition. By examining these different perspectives, we gain a deeper understanding of how education functions not only as a method of imparting knowledge but also as a process that can influence personal, social, and political development. The continuing debates about the nature of education remain essential for shaping contemporary educational theory and practice, as they raise crucial questions about the aims and methods of education in a changing world.

Foucault's Key Concepts and Their Relevance to Education

To a significant extent, education was influenced by Foucault's thought and the concepts he coined, such as discipline and power. Foucault strongly opposed existing, official government education, believing that it was an education whose purpose was to raise generations of submissive and docile people. Foucault extensively explored the relationship between power, knowledge, and the body in his works (Deacon, R. 2005). One of his most influential concepts was the idea of "discipline" and its role in producing "docile bodies". Foucault's exploration of discipline and docile bodies remains a cornerstone of critical theory, offering a framework for understanding how power operates in modern societies. This concept, '*discipline and docile bodies*', is central to his analysis of modern institutions and their mechanisms of control. Foucault's notion of discipline is elaborated in his seminal work, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975). He argues that discipline is a form of power that operates through subtle and pervasive mechanisms to regulate individual behavior and produce "docile bodies." Docile bodies are those that are obedient, efficient, and easily controlled, yet capable of being productive and useful within societal structures (Deacon, R. 2005).

The key Features of Discipline according to Foucault was *Surveillance and the Panopticon*. Foucault actually draws on Jeremy Bentham's design of the Panopticon, a prison structure where inmates are constantly visible to a central observer. This creates a sense of perpetual surveillance, leading individuals to internalize control and regulate their own behavior. Foucault writes, "He who is

subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself" (Foucault, 1975, p. 202). Foucault thought that there are three vital mechanisms for discipline. *Normalization* was the first one. Discipline works by establishing norms and standards of behavior. Institutions such as schools, hospitals, and factories enforce these norms, categorizing individuals as "normal" or "deviant." This process of normalization ensures conformity and eliminates behaviors deemed undesirable. Another mechanism of Discipline was *Hierarchical Observation*. Foucault emphasizes the role of hierarchical structures in maintaining discipline. Supervisors, teachers, and managers observe and evaluate individuals, ensuring compliance with institutional rules. The third mechanism of Discipline was *Examination*: The examination is a key tool of disciplinary power. It combines surveillance and normalization by documenting and assessing individuals' behavior, performance, and abilities. Foucault describes the examination as "a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish" (Foucault, 1975, p. 184).

Foucault argues that disciplinary techniques transform the human body into a "docile body," one that is both productive and submissive. This transformation is achieved through meticulous control of time, space, and movement. For example: In schools, students are trained to sit still, follow schedules, and adhere to rules. In factories, workers are conditioned to perform repetitive tasks efficiently. In the military, soldiers are drilled to obey commands without question. Foucault writes, "A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved" (Foucault, 1975, p. 136). The docile body is not merely passive; it is also capable of being molded and optimized for specific tasks, making it a valuable asset in modern capitalist societies.

Implications of Disciplinary Power on Education:

Foucault's analysis reveals that disciplinary power is not limited to prisons or other overtly coercive institutions. It permeates all aspects of modern life, shaping individuals' behavior and identities. This form of power is subtle and often invisible, making it more effective than overt forms of repression. Education and school students are negatively affected by the power of obedience and discipline as we will see in the following analysis. Foucault's concept of power/knowledge and its implications for the curriculum have been widely discussed in educational theory. Foucault's work challenges traditional notions of power as something held by institutions or individuals and instead presents power as a pervasive, productive force that operates through the production and regulation of knowledge. This perspective has profound implications for understanding the curriculum as a site where power and knowledge intersect to shape educational practices and outcomes. Foucault's notion of power/knowledge (*pouvoir/savoir*) is central to his critique of how power operates in modern societies. He argues that power and knowledge are not separate entities but are deeply interconnected. Power produces knowledge, and knowledge, in turn, reinforces power. As Foucault states: "Power and knowledge directly imply one another... there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (Foucault, 1977, p. 27). This means that what is considered "knowledge" is not neutral

or objective but is shaped by the power structures within society. Knowledge is produced within specific historical, social, and institutional contexts, and it serves to legitimize certain truths while marginalizing others. For example, the dominance of scientific and technical knowledge in modern curricula reflects the values of a society that prioritizes economic productivity and technological advancement.

The Curriculum as a Mechanism of Power

Foucault's analysis of power/knowledge has significant implications for understanding the curriculum. The curriculum is not simply a neutral collection of facts and skills to be transmitted to students; rather, it is a mechanism through which power operates. The selection of content, the organization of subjects, and the methods of teaching and assessment are all shaped by power relations. *Selection of Knowledge:* The curriculum reflects the interests of those in power. Certain forms of knowledge are privileged, while others are excluded or marginalized. For example, the emphasis on STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) subjects in many educational systems reflects the priorities of a globalized, capitalist economy. Conversely, subjects like the arts, humanities, and indigenous knowledge systems are often undervalued or excluded (Apple, 2004). *Normalization and Discipline:* Foucault's concept of disciplinary power is particularly relevant to the curriculum. Disciplinary power operates through techniques of surveillance, normalization, and control. In schools, this is evident in practices such as standardized testing, grading, and tracking, which classify and categorize students according to norms established by those in power. These practices not only regulate students' behavior but also shape their identities and futures (Foucault, 1977). *Hidden Curriculum:* Beyond the formal curriculum, Foucault's work highlights the importance of the 'hidden curriculum'—the implicit messages and values conveyed through school structures and practices. For example, the organization of classrooms, the authority of teachers, and the emphasis on punctuality and obedience all serve to socialize students into accepting the existing power structures (Giroux, 1981).

Resistance and the Possibility of Change: While Foucault's analysis emphasizes the ways in which power operates through the curriculum, it also opens up possibilities for resistance and change. Foucault argues that power is not monolithic or deterministic; it is always accompanied by the potential for resistance. As he states: "Where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, 1978, p. 95). In the context of education, this means that the curriculum is not a static or fixed entity but a contested space where different interests and values can be negotiated. Educators and students can challenge dominant power/knowledge relations by questioning the assumptions and values that underpin the curriculum. This might involve: Incorporating marginalized perspectives and forms of knowledge, encouraging critical thinking and questioning of dominant narratives, Creating more inclusive and democratic educational practices (Giroux, 1988). Foucault's concept of power/knowledge provides a critical lens for understanding the curriculum as a site where power relations are enacted and contested. The curriculum is not neutral but is shaped by the interests of those in power, and it serves to regulate and normalize students according to societal norms. However, Foucault's work also highlights the potential for resistance and transformation. By questioning the assumptions and values that underpin the

curriculum, educators can work towards creating more equitable and empowering educational practices.

Power/Knowledge and the Curriculum: Foucault's concept of power/knowledge highlights the inseparable relationship between power and the production of knowledge. In education, the curriculum is not a neutral body of knowledge but a tool of power that determines what is considered legitimate and valuable. By controlling the curriculum, educational institutions reproduce dominant ideologies and social hierarchies. Example: The exclusion of marginalized perspectives from the curriculum reinforces existing power structures, while the inclusion of certain knowledge forms legitimizes particular worldviews. (Foucault, M. (1980). *Governmentality and the Role of Education:* Foucault's later work on governmentality examines how modern states govern populations through institutions like schools. Education is a key site for the regulation of individuals, as it shapes citizens who are both self-disciplined and aligned with state objectives. Example: The emphasis on standardized testing and accountability in contemporary education reflects a neoliberal form of governmentality that prioritizes efficiency and productivity. (Foucault, M. 2008).

The Role of Space and Architecture: Foucault's analysis of space and architecture in *Discipline and Punish* has significant implications for education. He argues that the design of educational spaces, such as classrooms and lecture halls, facilitates surveillance and control. The Panopticon, a circular prison design, serves as a metaphor for how educational spaces are organized to maximize visibility and discipline. Example: Open-plan classrooms and the use of technology for monitoring student behavior reflect the panoptic principles of constant visibility and self-regulation. (Foucault, M. 1975). *The Body and Embodied Learning:* Foucault's work on the body, particularly in *Discipline and Punish*, emphasizes how educational practices shape and regulate students' physical behaviors. From seating arrangements to physical education, the body is a site of discipline and normalization. Example: The enforcement of strict dress codes and posture requirements in schools reflects the regulation of the body as a means of instilling discipline. (Shilling, C. 1993). *Ethics and Self-Formation:* In his later work on ethics, Foucault shifts his focus from external mechanisms of power to the ways individuals engage in self-formation and self-governance. This perspective has implications for education, particularly in terms of fostering critical self-reflection and ethical responsibility. Example: Pedagogical approaches that encourage students to question societal norms and reflect on their own values align with Foucault's notion of ethics as a practice of freedom. (Foucault, M. 1997).

Applications of Foucault's Ideas in Educational Theory

Critique of Standardization and Testing: Foucault's analysis of discipline and surveillance has been used to critique the increasing standardization and testing in education. Scholars argue that these practices reduce education to a technical process, undermining creativity and critical thinking (Ball, S. J. 2013). *Inequality and the Politics of Knowledge:* Foucault's work has inspired critical studies of how educational systems reproduce social inequalities. For example, the privileging of certain forms of knowledge (e.g., Western, male-dominated perspectives) marginalizes alternative ways of knowing. (Apple, M. W. 2004). *Resistance and Agency:* While Foucault is often criticized for overemphasizing

power and control, his work also opens up possibilities for resistance. Students and educators can challenge disciplinary practices by questioning dominant discourses and creating alternative spaces for learning. (Giroux, H. A. 1988). *Critical Pedagogy and Empowerment*: Foucault's ideas have been integrated into critical pedagogy, which seeks to empower students by encouraging them to question power structures and engage in transformative action. (Freire, P. 1970). *Technology and Digital Surveillance*: Foucault's concepts of surveillance and discipline have been applied to the study of technology in education. The use of digital tools for monitoring student behavior and performance raises questions about privacy and control. (Selwyn, N. 2015).

The Main Role of Teachers and Schools According to Foucault

Foucault argued that schools, like other institutions (e.g., prisons, hospitals), are sites where power is exercised to regulate and normalize individuals. In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975), Foucault introduces the concept of "disciplinary power," which operates through surveillance, hierarchical observation, and normalization. Schools, in this context, function as systems that monitor and control students' behavior, ensuring conformity to societal norms (Deacon R. 2006). According to Foucault, Teachers act as agents of this disciplinary power. They enforce rules, evaluate performance, and categorize students based on their adherence to norms. Foucault describes this as a form of "micro-power" that operates at the individual level, shaping students' identities and behaviors (Deacon R. 2006). Foucault's concept of the "panopticon" (a prison design where inmates are constantly visible to a central observer) is metaphorically applied to schools. Teachers and administrators make Surveillance, observe students, creating a sense of perpetual visibility that encourages self-regulation. (Foucault, M. 1975). *Normalization and the Production of Docile Bodies*: Foucault contends that schools play a central role in normalizing individuals by imposing standardized criteria for behavior, knowledge, and achievement. This process of normalization ensures that students internalize societal expectations and become "docile bodies"—individuals who are manageable, productive, and compliant.

Curriculum and Assessment: The standardized curriculum and assessment methods in schools serve as tools for normalization. Students are ranked, classified, and compared, creating hierarchies of ability and worth. Teachers facilitate this process by delivering the curriculum, administering tests, and reinforcing the values and norms of the dominant culture. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969) and other works, Foucault explores the relationship between knowledge and power. He argued that schools are not neutral spaces for knowledge transmission but are deeply implicated in the production and dissemination of dominant discourses. So Teachers in fact are gatekeepers of knowledge, determining what is taught and how it is taught. This control over knowledge reinforces existing power structures and marginalizes alternative perspectives. (Foucault, M. 1977). Beyond the formal curriculum, there is what Foucault call a *Hidden Curriculum*. It means that schools transmit implicit messages about authority, obedience, and social roles, further entrenching power relations (Foucault, M. 1969). While Foucault emphasizes the controlling functions of schools, he also acknowledges the potential for resistance. Students and teachers can challenge dominant discourses and disrupt

normalized practices, creating spaces for alternative ways of thinking and being. Here, Teachers can act as critical educators, encouraging students to question power structures and develop a critical consciousness. Students, too, can resist normalization.

Criticisms of Foucault's Perspective on Education

Despite the great importance of the radical and renewal thought proposed by Foucault in the field of education, schools, and the nature of their role, it met with severe opposition and criticism, perhaps due to the strangeness and boldness of what he proposed and its distance from the conventional educational thought that viewed the school as a vital and necessary institution to preserve society and achieve its goals, and that the purpose of education is primarily to adapt the individual to his society so that he becomes its servant. Foucault's strong opposition to this logic exposed him to this amount of criticism, which can be focused on the following central axes:

Lack of Agency: Critics argue that Foucault's focus on disciplinary power leaves little room for individual agency and resistance. Some scholars contend that students and educators are not merely passive subjects but active participants in shaping educational practices. (McLaren, P. 1999).

Overemphasis on Control: Foucault's portrayal of education as a tool of control has been criticized for being overly pessimistic. Critics argue that education can also be a site of empowerment and liberation, particularly when it fosters critical thinking and social justice. (Freire, P. 1970).

Neglect of Structural Inequalities: Some scholars argue that Foucault's focus on micro-level power relations overlooks broader structural inequalities, such as those based on race, class, and gender. (Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. 1990).

Ambiguity in Practical Application: Foucault's abstract theories can be difficult to translate into practical educational strategies, leading to criticisms that his work is more diagnostic than prescriptive. (Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. 1998).

CONCLUSION

This article provides a comprehensive overview of Foucault's contributions to educational theory, offering insights into the complex interplay of power, knowledge, and discipline in education, while also addressing critiques and extending the discussion to contemporary issues. Michel Foucault's thoughts and legacy on education provide a powerful framework for understanding the ways in which power operates within educational institutions. By revealing the mechanisms of discipline, the politics of knowledge, and the role of governmentality, Foucault challenges us to rethink the purpose and practice of education. by rejecting imposed identities and asserting their own agency. (Ball, S. J. 2013).

As a matter of fact, Foucault's analysis reveals that schools and teachers play a dual role: they are instruments of social control and normalization, yet they also hold the potential for resistance and transformation. By understanding the mechanisms of power and discipline in educational settings, educators can critically reflect on their practices and work toward more equitable and empowering approaches to teaching and learning.

While Foucault's work has been subject to criticism, its enduring relevance lies in its ability to inspire critical reflection and transformative action in education. Future research could further explore the intersections of Foucault's ideas with relevant issues of Humanity modern life such as Hi-technology, globalization, equity and social justice in education.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Routledge. New York.
- Aristotle. (1992). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W. D. Ross. The MIT Press.
- Aristotle. (2000). *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Courier Corporation.
- Ball, S. J. (2013). *Foucault, Power, and Education*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. Sage Publications.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- Deacon R (2006). *From Confinement to Attachment: Foucault on the Rise of the School*. *The European Legacy*. 11 (2): 121-138.
- Deacon R (2005a). *Moral Orthopedics: A Foucauldian Account of Schooling as Discipline*. *Telos*, 130:84-102.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum.

Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. University of Chicago Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling*. Temple University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Bergin & Garvey.

Gore, J. M. (1998). *Disciplining Bodies: On the Continuity of Power Relations in Pedagogy*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(3), 229-238.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. MIT Press.

Locke, J. (1693). *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Awnsham Churchill.

McLaren, P. (1999). *Schooling as a Ritual Performance: Toward a Political Economy of Educational Symbols and Gestures*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Megill, A. (1987). *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida*. University of California Press.

Plato. (2004). *The Republic*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Dover Publications.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (1998). *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education*. Teachers College Press.

Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2003). *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984*. New Press.

Rousseau, J.-J. (1762). *Emile, or On Education*. Translated by Barbara Foxley. Everyman's Library.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Selwyn, N. (2015). *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. Bloomsbury.

Shilling, C. (1993). *The Body and Social Theory*. Sage.