education sciences

MDPI

Article

Finnish Teachers' Perspectives on Caring and Meaningful School Development Work

Maarit Hosio [1], Lauri Heikonen [2,3,*], Arto Kallioniemi [2] and Raisa Ahtiainen [2,4]

[1] Independent Researcher, 01300 Vantaa, Finland; maarit.hosio@vantaa.fi
[2] Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Helsinki, 00014 Helsinki, Finland; arto.j.kallioniemi@helsinki.fi (A.K.); raisa.ahtiainen@helsinki.fi (R.A.)
[3] Department of Education, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Jyväskylä, 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland
[4] School of Educational Sciences, Tallinn University, 10120 Tallinn, Estonia
* Correspondence: lauri.heikonen@helsinki.fi

Abstract: A variety of new policy requirements set for learning and teaching affect the work in schools. The local context in which a school is located forms the grounds for school-level policy adjustments and development work. Caring is a common pedagogical concept and depending on the context its interpretation and meaning varies. Teachers can express their caring attitude in their interactions with students and other teachers. We investigated teachers' perceptions of school development and elements that encourage and motivate teachers to engage in school development work. We also studied caring as one feature in the descriptions related to the work cultures of the schools. The data were teacher group interviews (N = 10) in five different Finnish comprehensive schools located in five different municipalities. In total, 44 teachers participated in the study. We used conventional content analysis allowing a data-driven descriptive approach to the material. The data were thematized and classified into categories concerning the aspects of development work. The categories were further examined to analyze caring. The analysis resulted in finding categories concerning meaningful school development and prerequisites to development that reflected and were aimed at the caring elements in the work culture.

Keywords: school development; school improvement; caring; work culture

check for updates

Citation: Hosio, M.; Heikonen, L.; Kallioniemi, A.; Ahtiainen, R. Finnish Teachers' Perspectives on Caring and Meaningful School Development Work. *Educ. Sci.* **2023**, *13*, 880. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090880

Academic Editor: Eila Jeronen

Received: 5 August 2023
Revised: 28 August 2023
Accepted: 28 August 2023
Published: 30 August 2023

Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The need to ensure and plan education that meets both the present needs and those of the future are driving forces for many education systems globally. The idea of schools that provide children with an environment in which they can develop their skills and knowledge as well as their emotional and social capabilities form a backdrop for many policies around education and schooling [1] (p. 34). A variety of societal expectations and changes in society add to the requirements set for learning and teaching, not to mention sudden global or local changes that force educators and policymakers to rethink their practices (e.g., the recent COVID-19 pandemic; [1–3]).

Whether the point of departure for school development is the use of new technologies in learning and instruction, meeting the learning needs of diverse student groups, or some other topical matter, the interaction between the adults and children of the school plays a role in the whole. Further, one should not undervalue the aspects of caring and child-centered approaches to learning and instruction when aiming to improve practices in the classroom or the school community. In this whole, caring can be seen as student-centeredness, collaboration, and equality-promoting values providing an ethical basis for development work in schools [4,5]. It is also well known that the actions of leaders influence the interaction in schools [6].

Earlier research around caring has been focusing on the interaction between a teacher and a student [7], or teacher collaboration [4,8], but caring in school development has been less studied. Therefore, it is crucial to get more information about the way teachers perceive the meaningfulness of school development alongside the aspects of caring they express about it. This article addresses two research questions to investigate the meaningfulness of development work in schools (RQ1) and the caring attitude in descriptions of school cultures and development (RQ2), thus combining caring elements to the discussion of school cultures and the aims and actions of meaningful school development.

2. Study Framework

2.1. School Development

Efforts to implement education policies and develop practices related to learning, teaching, and work cultures in schools form a wide range of activities from large-scale reforms [9] to locally initiated programs. The process of improving and transforming the ways schools function includes shorter- and longer-term goals; yet at the same time, educators ought to be aware of unanticipated new opportunities that may appear while they work with the current goals and development efforts [1] (p. 119). By referring to research by Braun et al. [10] on context, we acknowledge the meaning of the school-specific factors (e.g., staffing, intake, history, budgets, local education administration) that influence and shape the enactment of education policies.

School development work entails teachers' learning [11]. This does not only mean learning through participating in formal learning activities organized to support the attainment of the objectives set for school development, such as professional development organized to support reform, but also learning from the activities they undertake during working and teaching itself such as collaborating, reading, and experimenting [12]. Whereas teachers often engage in learning activities focusing on the enhancement of their teaching practices, the school as the learning environment may determine whether they act on it individually or with colleagues [13]. The concept of collaboration appears often in literature and policy discourse around school development and the teaching profession [14–16]. In a school context, teacher collaboration can be viewed in several ways [16] depending on the goal and context. For example, co-teaching (e.g., team teaching) is related to teachers' work at the classroom level and can cover a variety of practices outside the actual instructional practice (e.g., planning, assessment; [17]). Successful co-teaching requires teachers' commitment to shared values and priorities [17,18]. Moreover, collaborative practices and team structures aimed at enhancing shared work-related goals seem to create fruitful grounds for teacher learning and school development as well as having the potential to change the work culture [19]. This mode of collaboration includes the aspects of organizational, personal, and interpersonal capacities [13]. Organizational capacity can be understood as supportive resources, such as structures, and systems (e.g., availability of time, information, materials), personal capacity as teachers' active and reflective construction of knowledge, and interpersonal capacity as behavioral elements such as shared practices, beliefs, and responsibilities between teachers as well as reflective dialogues and opportunities for consultation [13].

Teachers' adjustability and capability to collaborate and take part in school development work reflect teachers' former experiences and beliefs [20]. Further, the history of a school lays the grounds for the way collaboration and development work are perceived [10,21]. Therefore, principals, as the leaders of their schools, play an important role in these processes. Leadership based on sharing and distributing responsibilities and encouraging teacher involvement in the development and planning of school-level practices (i.e., instruction, common rules) can be essential in initiating teacher collaboration [13,22,23]. Through their actions, principals can model the desired practices (e.g., collaboration, and learning; [24]), and support teachers in keeping their focus on the goals set for the development work, enabling communication during the process by creating spaces for teachers' learning and development of new pedagogies [25,26].

2.2. A Caring Work Culture

Work cultures in schools are built around values, habits, beliefs, and assumed ways of doing things in a school community in which teachers tend to work with similar constraints and demands related to their pedagogical practice. The culture covers collectively shared solutions that are generated through the history and earlier experiences of the school [4]. A caring culture also refers to a culture that expresses a caring approach in collaboration between the teachers and in teacher-student interaction as well as in the actions of the principal [6].

A caring ethos in a school influences the school's atmosphere and can be seen in an open and trusting interaction and willingness to work together. The school's atmosphere reflects the experience of school life by school personnel, students, and parents, and includes academic, social, ethical, and emotional viewpoints. That is, it covers curricula, teaching and learning processes, and physical and emotional safety (e.g., order and discipline), as well as teachers' professional development. It further concerns the quality of interactions between school personnel and students, including a sense of connectedness to the school [8].

A caring pedagogical work culture can be considered from two aspects: content and form [4] (pp. 165–166). Content refers to assumptions, values, beliefs, and ways of working that are shared within a school community or a certain group of teachers. Form refers to patterns of relationships and associations between members of the community, and it becomes visible in the ways these relations are articulated. Thus, work cultures and teachers' relationships with their colleagues form a central context for teachers' experiences of meaningful school development [4].

Caring in a school environment is a common pedagogical concept and depending on the context its interpretation and meaning varies. With the concept of caring, we refer to open and trusting interaction and willingness to work together; thus, it is about fostering a good and innovative atmosphere. Speaking about caring in schools, we refer to teachers' attitudes to students, rules and instructions given to the students, disciplinary practices, studying practices, school atmosphere, and planning and conducting teaching, thus finding caring as an ethical approach to teachers' work (see [5,7]). Teachers' ethical thinking is based on common values, the teacher's values, beliefs, rules, or instructions, also including being capable of solving ethical dilemmas [27]. According to Carr [28], several ethical levels in the teaching profession cannot be ignored, such as respecting one's integrity and teaching the contents of the subjects properly. A desire to act in a fair and supportive way and show respect towards another person are also values that are commonly shared by teachers [29,30]. Responsibility, in terms of aiming to advance what is best for students, is also seen as a core value of teachers' ethical and caring profession [31]. Based on a previous study [7], the basis for caring relationships is in communication situations, attentive encountering situations, and trust-building relationships. A caring aspect of teaching means using diverse teaching and allowing the students to study in a safe and supportive classroom environment as well as taking care of students' learning by planning the lessons, taking into account the level and the skills of the students, helping them when they are studying, and allowing relevant conversations [7].

Teachers' ethical attitude also affects the actions of a school and school culture (see [27,30,32–34]). The ethical aspects of schoolwork are formed around common values of equality, tolerance, and care of the students, which are the values that principals/school leaders usually share [35]. These aspects guide the everyday practices of teachers, school leaders, and students, and therefore should be openly discussed within the school community [32,36]. The school leaders (i.e., principals) have a central role in leading the development, adoption, and realization of the ethical aspects in their schools, and through that, they affect the atmosphere and teachers' attitudes (see [6,37,38]) by building a shared vision and fostering the acceptance of group goals, giving support to teachers and modeling appropriate values [39]. Leading a school in a caring and goal-directed approach focuses on pedagogical discussions and interaction between the teachers and is aimed at developing a capacity for caring in the school community [24].

2.3. School Development and Leadership in the Finnish Context

In Finland, the guidelines for developing school cultures are specified in the National Core Curriculum [40] which is considered obligatory, yet leaving school-level actors (principals, teachers) with great autonomy in planning and conducting teaching [41,42]. There are no school inspectors, and the work is based on the ideas of teacher autonomy and trust in the system [43]. The curriculum draws the overall framework for schools' pedagogical work and describes the nature of a school culture. According to the curriculum, a school should aim towards: "[a school culture that] promotes learning, interaction, participation, well-being and a sustainable way of living" [40] (p. 24). Finnish comprehensive schools are thus seen as learning communities that ought to ensure the well-being and safety of every student [40]. Caring by connecting and being concerned for the well-being of others aims to maintain good relationships and enjoy good contact with colleagues and students, revealing the nature of Finnish teachers' ethical sensitivity [44]. A high proportion of teachers (an average of 81%) across OECD countries have reported working in a school culture characterized by collaboration-based practices [15]. Finland is among those countries which during the past ten years have experienced a significant increase in teacher collaboration, especially in the form of team teaching [15].

The context in which a school is located opens a space for school-level policy adjustments and development work to reach the aims set for education, which also describes well the way the Finnish education system functions [45,46]. Consequently, locally emerging critical problems benefit from solutions developed in these contexts [1] (p. 185). Moreover, the fit between existing capabilities and common needs noted in a school and the goals set for development work, capacity demands, and values form prerequisites for the success or failure of the process [1] (p. 8). All these factors form the grounds for school development work that is focused on our study.

Earlier research in Finland implies that principals have found the aspects of developing a learning community to be challenging [47]. Moreover, principals have reported difficulties in reaching their aim to engage every teacher in sharing the responsibilities and decision-making at the school level [2,45,48]. Yet Hanhimäki and Risku [49] (p. 96) define ethical leadership as a cornerstone for educational leadership in Finland that can "carry and support individuals and communities during both good and bad days". Although they find the ideas of educational leaders reflective and value-based, they argue that educational leadership and teacher education should be further developed to respond to the challenges in the future.

3. Aim of the Study

The study aims to investigate teachers' perceptions of school development and the elements that encourage and motivate teachers in the development of their schools. Furthermore, the focus is also on exploring caring as one feature in the descriptions related to the work cultures of the schools.

The research questions are the following:

What are Finnish teachers' conceptions regarding the development of the school and its work culture?

How is caring present in teachers' conceptions of the work culture and its development?

4. Data and Method

4.1. Participants

Forty-four teachers, of whom 28 identified themselves as female and 16 as male, participated in semi-structured focus group interviews in 2019. The interviewees represented all career stages starting from a few years of work experience to 10–20-year careers as teachers. The participants came from five schools located in five different municipalities in Southern Finland. We conducted two focus group interviews in each of the five schools (i.e., 10 focus group interviews in total). The focus groups were formed of 3–5 participants. The schools represented two types of comprehensive schools: schools with grades 1–9 (N = 3) and

schools with grades 7–9 (N = 2). Most teachers worked in schools of 350–500 students, and one larger school (>800 students) was also represented in this study. In each school, we interviewed two types of teacher groups: one formed of teachers who were involved in leadership group work in their school, and the other one composed of teachers outside the leadership group. At the time of the interviews, all five schools were involved in a 1.5-year development work focusing on leadership structures. Consequently, most of the research participants met up regularly, and therefore, background information that could connect information about specific schools, ages, or gender of the teachers has been left out [46,48].

4.2. Data Collection

The data were extracted from a larger study in which we collected survey data from all school personnel and had two rounds of interviews with teachers and principals in 2017–2019. The ten teacher focus group interviews reported here were carried out in April–May 2019. Two teacher groups from five schools participated in the interviews; that is, we interviewed teachers who were leadership group members and teachers who were non-members of the leadership group in each school. Most of the groups had three or four participants. The interview data comprised 272 min in total, and a typical focus group covered 23–33 min.

The interviews were guided by a thematic interview schema built around four focus areas: (1) Teacher's role outside the classroom (e.g., Along with instruction and its preparation, what is included in your work in the school?), (2) Teachers and responsibility for school development (e.g., Is it necessary for individual teachers to take responsibility for school development work?), (3) School leadership and teacher participation in development work (e.g., How could teachers be encouraged to participate in school development by the school leadership?), and (4) Teacher leadership (How do you understand the concept of teacher leadership?). All interviews were recorded and transcribed for later analysis. The interviews were in the Finnish language and the quotes presented in this article were translated from the original transcriptions by the authors.

4.3. Data Analysis

While planning the analysis process, we referred to the consolidated criteria from Tong et al. [50] for reporting qualitative research. Our work with the data was based on qualitative content analysis, especially conventional content analysis that allows a data-driven descriptive approach to a phenomenon [51]. That is, there were no predetermined theory-based categories, but the categories were formed through an interplay between the data and the researchers' pre-understanding regarding earlier research in the field [51,52]. The data analysis was composed of three main phases. First, we immersed ourselves in the data to reach an understanding of the material [51]. Second, the analysis continued by reading the data word by word to find classification units (coding scheme) to capture teachers' conceptions regarding the development of the school and its work culture. During the third phase, the classification units were thematized and sorted into categories. Finally, we focused on the categories and examined caring practices and perceptions that were included in teachers' perceptions about school development [51,53]. One researcher had the main responsibility for the analysis, and the others were involved in cross-checking the coding scheme, reflection on the accuracy of category labeling, and formulation of the findings [50].

4.4. Ethical Considerations

The data were pseudonymized. All information regarding the participants' identity (e.g., school names, teacher names) was replaced with artificial identifiers. The data were stored in the [name of the university] network. Only the researchers involved in the project had access to the data. The [name of the university] has research ethics regulations that are binding on all employees of the institution. This type of research does not require an ethics committee review in Finland [54]. All the teachers interviewed were provided

with information about their rights (e.g., withdrawal), the aim of the study, data collection methods, and the storage and use of the data. Participation was voluntary.

5. Results

5.1. Overview of the Results

Our study included two research questions, of which the first focused on teachers' conceptions regarding the development of school and work culture (RQ1). In the analysis process, we identified two main categories related to this question, *meaningful school development* and *prerequisites for school development* (Table 1). The main categories were divided into five subcategories. Meaningful school development entailed *professional learning* and *impact on the school community*. Prerequisites for school development included *vision/strategy*, *leadership*, and *structure*.

Table 1. Teachers' conceptions of work culture and its development.

Category	Description	Data Example
Meaningful school development		
Professional learning	-Collaboration	*"Different student groups require different kinds of leadership and guidance"* (Teacher 3, School 1).
	-Implementing new ideas in teaching	
	-Considering the needs and the situation of students or groups	
	-Applying equal and flexible evaluation practices	
	-Meeting the goals given in the curriculum	
Impact on the school community	-Developing teaching practices	*"It would help a lot if we had clear and joint practices. . .that the students are also aware of. That would increase a feeling of safety"* (Teacher 2, school 4).
	-Developing student integration practices	
	-Promoting student equality	
Prerequisites for school development		
Vision/strategy	-Mutual discussions between the leader/leadership group and the teachers	*"To be able to take part in the discussion of values and such things, the vision and the strategy are also important. . ."* (Teacher 4, School 5).
	-Accepting and sharing ideas in respectful working atmosphere	
Leadership	-Instructions given by the leader or leadership team	*"The leader or the leadership group should filter the tasks given to schools from the municipal administrative level"* (Teacher 1, School 4).
	-Instructions from the municipality or the National Board of Education	
	-Prioritizing and fair delegation of tasks	
	-Noticing teachers' work and efforts, positive feedback	
Structure	-Time and space	*"I think [development] must be a task of a group of teachers, so it won't be the responsibility of one single teacher."* (Teacher 1, School 4)
	-Teacher teams	
	-Salary	

The second research question considered how caring is present in teachers' conceptions of the work culture and its development (RQ2). After the description of the main categories related to school development, there is a characterization of how caring was present in the descriptions belonging to each category. The organization of the results is based on the

emphasis and coverage of the categories related to the development of schools starting from the most frequent subcategory.

5.2. Meaningful School Development

The main category 'meaningful school development' (Table 1) consisted of two subcategories, of which *professional learning* was based on school development in terms of developing teachers' own competence and teaching practices, while *impact on the school community* covered the teaching community and the school in a broader sense. In both subcategories, caring was widely present throughout the data.

5.2.1. Professional Learning

The *professional learning* subcategory was the largest of the subcategories of meaningful school development. It depicted the elements teachers linked to the meaningfulness of school development in their work. Teachers saw school development as a purposeful part of everyday work, particularly when it was connected to their classroom work and teaching. Consequently, teachers interpreted that development work at its best enhanced their teaching competence, and they further stated how it could increase their motivation, sense of meaningfulness, and well-being at work. Teachers also pointed out that no one else but themselves could improve the classroom part of school development. One teacher (Teacher 2, School 1) summarized the idea as follows: "*Only I can develop my work, and therefore, it is rewarding to be engaged in the [development] work*".

Regarding the importance of the close connection between school development and classroom-level work, teachers not only perceived expanding their own competence and teaching strategies as meaningful but also saw their importance from the perspective of students' learning. Some teachers mentioned how it is important to provide a model of cooperation for students and try out some new pedagogical ideas in practice with them. Teachers believed that the way adults collaborate influences how the students learn to work together and feel safe to try novel ways.

Moreover, the *professional learning* subcategory covered teachers' descriptions of their sense of purpose to enable multifaceted learning opportunities for students. They described how they applied versatile teaching methods and implemented new pedagogical ideas to help students achieve both their personal learning goals and the objectives set in the curriculum. Further, teachers reflected on the development of shared practices around more flexible evaluation methods regarding the use of due dates or fixed time slots for students to do their assignments as such methods would benefit the schooling of students who need to be motivated and supported in their studying. About these themes, teachers referred to the diverse student population of their school and contemplated how the school should be able to meet all in the best way as "*different student groups require different kinds of leadership and guidance*" (Teacher 3, school 1).

5.2.2. Impact on the School Community

Under the *impact on the school community* subcategory, teachers stated that at its best, school development can provide an opportunity to influence the work culture of the school by establishing new ways of working with colleagues. Teachers described the creation of shared teaching practices with close colleagues or a group of them. For the teachers we interviewed, shared practices meant joint planning and/or teaching lessons with a colleague, and planning and working closely with a subject-based theme with other teachers focusing on the same subject.

Further, the development work opens a space for investigating means to strengthen students' equal rights and opportunities to attend through implementing ways to increase the inclusion of all students in mainstream settings. By that, teachers meant specific situations or lessons (e.g., physical exercise, arts) that were organized in a way that allowed students with special education needs (SEN) to study with students in mainstream classes. Students with SEN were most often provided with instruction in small groups.

5.2.3. Caring in Meaningful School Development

As considered from a caring point of view, the descriptions in the *professional learning* subcategory revealed teachers' caring attitude reflecting the need for more opportunities for joint conversations about common practices and principles concerning pedagogy, teaching, and values. It also depicted student-centeredness in planning teaching, which is also a caring element among teachers' aim for multi-faceted teaching methods that would take the ability and motivation of every group into account to enable a learning environment that meets students' needs. All these elements stress the teachers' supportive, respectful, caring attitude toward the students. Moreover, teachers also mentioned classroom practices with caring elements that covered their aim to act supportively and to create a safe and positive learning environment. The classroom atmosphere was considered crucial, and teachers wanted to have a supportive and positive attitude in their teaching yet stay in charge at the same time, as one teacher described, "*We have a fairly positive education culture and it seems to give better opportunities to set limits when needed*" (Teacher 1, school 4).

In the category of *impact on the school community*, many teachers mentioned the importance of sharing ideas, working in teams or pairs, and enjoyment of an open and respectful working atmosphere, which are traits of a caring teaching culture. Some teachers had even been planning and co-teaching. Shared and collaborative teaching practices (i.e., fostering of open and trusting interaction) reveal the idea of the willingness of mutual pedagogical understanding regarding the descriptions of the co-teaching situations targeting to meet the needs of the whole group, which requires student-centered and shared values reflecting teachers' caring attitude.

Furthermore, teachers' recognition of equality in education and evaluation depicts teachers' sense of fairness. Teachers tried to find ways to organize evaluations and tests in a fair yet supportive way, finding it important to enable equal opportunities for students to show their skills and knowledge. Equality in education was also related to teachers' tendency to seek ways to organize teaching situations that would enable every student's participation, and the theme of equality was especially stressed by teachers implementing the integration of special education groups and mainstream settings. These teachers wished for more opportunities to mix groups and even different age groups in the future and stated that these processes can be supported by building up timetables that allow collaboration between groups. By doing all this, the teachers applied their own beliefs and values, which can be seen as caring elements in a school community.

In addition, a need to have a mutual understanding of disciplinary manners can be interpreted as an ethical need to act in a fair and just way that is recognized as caring and equal. Some teachers expressed their concerns related to the lack of shared understanding of disciplinary manners and time for pedagogical discussions because they may lead to ethical dilemmas if a single teacher must make decisions without support from the school community. "*It would help a lot if we had clear and joint practices. . .that the students are also aware of. That would increase a feeling of safety*" (Teacher 2, school 4). Teachers also seemed to rely on the national curriculum, yet some of the teachers mentioned the high demands of the present curriculum or the National Board of Education. Teachers' approach to work signals a basis on the sense of responsibility, being thus caring by its nature. Despite the thorough planning of versatile teaching methods, some teachers mentioned facing challenges with balancing between the idea of a student's self-regulation and teacher guidance. Teachers expressed their suspicions about needing to implement all objectives of the curriculum. Consequently, balancing between the regulative demands and meeting the needs of a student can be seen in these cases even as an ethical dilemma.

5.3. Prerequisites for School Development

Prerequisites for school development formed the second main category related to teachers' conceptions of work culture and its development. This main category is divided into three subcategories, *vision/strategy*, *leadership*, and *structure.*

5.3.1. Vision/Strategy

The *vision/strategy* subcategory enlightens teachers' descriptions of their work with leaders and other teachers in their school. Teachers mentioned the importance of joint discussions within the school community. Most of the teachers welcomed new ideas with pleasure. However, they stressed that the atmosphere for sharing and discussing had to be safe and respectful. Teachers also pointed out that they preferred attitudes that were positive and future-orientated. Complaining about the present situation was often perceived to make the situation worse, thus diminishing teachers' willingness to implement any of the new ideas. Furthermore, some teachers reflected on the time perspective, and the meaning and importance of values about development: "*To be able to take part in the discussion of values and such things, the vision and the timetable are also important (in the development work)*" (Teacher 4, school 5). In addition, some teachers wanted to draw attention to challenges related to teacher collaboration and the development of work culture by pointing out how challenges can emerge from the lack of motivation due to too many duties or unclear development objectives. Sometimes teachers had experienced disagreements within the teaching community regarding the given objectives, and they hoped for mutual discussion with other teachers and the leader to clarify the aims.

5.3.2. Leadership

The *leadership* subcategory covered teachers' thoughts about and hopes for leaders' work in their schools. Many teachers mentioned that they wished to receive a framework with more pedagogical guidelines related to school development from the school leader(s). Further, the leaders ought to clarify expectations set for the teachers in the process. Some teachers argued that leaders should engage themselves more closely in the school development to ensure that the work proceeded. "*We are so excited and make decisions in the meetings, but still, the follow-up is missing. . .*" (Teacher 1, School 4).

Teachers who were members of leadership groups stressed more often the need for a shared vision than the teachers not involved in leadership group work, who, in turn, called for more information about goals or instructions. By doing so, both teacher groups recognized the shared vision and goal as prerequisites of development work. The teachers in both groups identified themselves as teachers rather than leaders, although the leadership group teachers saw that they were closer to messengers between the larger teacher group and the school leadership (leadership group or principal) than being leaders themselves. In general, all teachers comparably perceived development work and there were not many differences between the teachers based on their position about the leadership group. Yet, some teachers would have wanted to have more freedom in their work with school development, whereas some other teachers in another school explained how they had been encouraged to try new ways of teaching and felt that their school's work culture was a safe place for testing, as no one gets criticized afterward, even if they fail.

Teachers considered that starting a development project every year with a new aim often led to difficulties in finishing the earlier and ongoing projects properly. Sometimes a development project had been launched with great enthusiasm, but the work had never been accomplished or the results remained unnoticed. Related to that, teachers pondered how tasks should be prioritized in a situation in which a school had too many projects, and they reflected that the challenge of many simultaneous development projects could be solved by concentrating only on the more important objectives at a time. One of the teachers argued that "*the leader or the leadership group should filter the tasks given to schools from the municipal administrative level*" (Teacher 1, School 4). Teachers further stated that school development projects should influence and be connected to their everyday work because otherwise they are not perceived as important or motivating: "*If one shares the values and goals of a project, one wants to be committed and reach towards them*" (Teacher 3, School 5).

The biggest problem that was brought up under the *leadership* subcategory was the unevenness in the distribution of responsibilities or tasks. Fair delegation of tasks was perceived as a necessity in collaboration, as many of the teachers argued that every teacher

should take part in development work and responsibilities should be distributed fairly. This was a task that was seen as the responsibility of the leadership group and the school leader, and teachers hoped that those in leadership positions would pay more attention to it. However, some teachers wondered if development work should be voluntary to increase motivation. They felt that if one can develop something important for one's work, the motivation would be better. That also would enhance the results and sustainability of school development if compared with a development project perceived as externally given and therefore, not as meaningful to one's work. In addition, a few teachers pointed out that more feedback about the work should be provided, and that everyone's work and effort should be noticed more openly. This argument points to the direction of leadership groups and school leaders. Many teachers also argued that a positive and encouraging attitude would increase the motivation to develop the school as the efforts of teachers' development work have sometimes been found to be unnotified. "*Motivation and positive feedback from leaders, that they see the effort that was put in the work, and they should credit the great job that has been done here*" (Teacher 1, School 1).

5.3.3. Structure

The *structure* subcategory covered teachers' thoughts about the team structures of their schools. The work in teacher teams or with the whole teaching community and the leader(s) was seen as crucial as it provided opportunities for sharing knowledge and practices regarding planning lessons, subject-specific themes, or co-teaching. They noted that teacher teams were functional in introducing new ideas and sharing tasks. "*I think [development] must be a task of a group of teachers, so it won't be the responsibility of one single teacher.*" (Teacher 1, School 4).

Development work was found to be especially meaningful in the subject-based teams. This subcategory also touched on the questions of time, space, and salary. Teachers saw that if they must organize their teaching to meet the demands posed either by the school leader or the municipality or take part in school development projects with limited time resources, this could lead to an ethical dilemma. "*Every teacher has too much work to do right now, and everyone is having additional responsibilities. . .one can barely manage all of it.*" (Teacher 1, School 2). In the teacher discussions, lack of time or the distance between classrooms were often seen as factors that made collaboration challenging since such conditions made it difficult to meet up with colleagues. Teachers further argued that they should be heard in the development work and their ideas for organizing classrooms in the school building might help to solve some practical dilemmas. In addition, a few teachers mentioned that development work should be noticed in the paycheck.

5.3.4. Caring for Prerequisites for School Development

Caring was recognized in the *vision/strategy* subcategory, in need of mutual discussions between the teachers and school leaders targeting the sharing of the vision and goals. The teachers seemed also to have expectations related to a caring working atmosphere, and they hoped to get guidance from the leaders in the process of establishing or developing it. Many of the teachers, including the members of leadership groups, felt that it would be important to understand more about the visions that leaders were having. Instead of just getting orders from above, teachers found instructions and guidance given by the leader or leadership group to be valuable and that this signaled caring from the school leadership's side. It would thus better serve teachers' engagement with and understanding of the schools' joint value base. Some teachers explained that since the planning for extra events (e.g., student involvement development projects) seemed compulsory and meant less time for planning the lessons, it is crucial to be clear about mutual goals towards which the teachers are supposed to be heading. That was linked to teachers' discussions about the joint goal in teachers' work, namely educating children forming the very core of teachers' caring attitude, and the need for mutual discussions around that. The *structure* subcategory

is also linked to these prerequisites since collaboration needs time and space. Teamwork was perceived to be the most effective way to organize the work.

In the *leadership* subcategory, caring was also widely present, especially in descriptions that considered structures that help to conduct mutual discussions and a need for open interaction and connecting to others. Teachers' viewpoints of mutual discussions within the school community brought up the need to hear the ideas of and get guidance from the leadership group to get an overview of the development project at hand. "*The leadership group has the vision, and they can manage the project*" (Teacher 1, School 1).

When considering a sense of fairness as a part of teachers' caring, collaborative attitude, we can also identify a set of requirements targeted at the work of leaders or leadership groups. For the teachers who stressed that everyone should participate in the development work in an equal manner, fairness is fair task delegation within the teaching community. Tasks and events planned and carried out with other teachers were not perceived as stressful as the ones that had been the responsibility of only a few. Some teachers argued that this school development is at its best when they work in teams and not in the big meetings targeted at the whole teaching community. "*One takes more responsibility in teams than one would take in a big meeting*" (Teacher 1, School 2). In addition, fairness in work culture also meant being noticed positively and getting positive feedback from the leaders. Also, the discussion about teachers facing the demands set in the national curriculum can be seen as a trait of the ethical, caring, and goal-targeted part of the teaching profession. Working towards a shared and fostered vision is a part of a caring atmosphere in a community.

6. Discussion

The results of this study show the importance and perceived meaningfulness of development work and the complexity of teachers' work when ethical matters are discussed. The Finnish comprehensive school system sees development work as an important part of teachers' work [40]. Teachers' desire to learn and develop the areas that affect teaching has been noticed in other studies, as well as the enhancing effect of financing, time, and space (see [13,34]).

Teacher collaboration is beneficial not only to students and teachers (see [34]), but also to the whole school as it can change the school culture into a more innovative one and flatten power structures in the school [16]. A cooperative, trusting, fair, and supportive atmosphere among the teachers can be seen as a part of a caring school (see [31,37,55,56]). This was the case in this study as well, as the results of this study showed teachers' willingness to cooperate and develop teaching to meet students' needs. These elements have also been outlined in several previous studies (see [7,27,30,32–34]). The aim to share values and practices in the working community as well as the aim to use diverse teaching, act supportively, and in doing so, apply one's own beliefs or values, were the more common caring elements in this study (see [29,30]). Teachers came up with the need for fair delegation of tasks and the need for time and space for developing collaboration and co-teaching practices. Teachers' expectations of getting instructions, in which the leading team had an essential role, also came up in a study by Ahtiainen and Simola [2]. Teachers' commitment to shared values and regulation have been seen as prerequisites in previous studies as well [16,18]. On the other hand, principles have been also considered the reasons for the lack of commitment to the mutual goals of some teachers, questioning whether the expectations differ from the leaders to the teachers or the aims have not been thoroughly discussed and leaving the experience of participation superficial [2].

The subcategories called *shared goals and interaction* and *student-centeredness* revealed the main findings in the area of caring elements in work culture: teaching students in the best possible way and developing a cooperative working atmosphere. These elements are also found in the descriptions of professional learning communities [13]. School leaders /principals can affect teachers' engagement and working practices by encouraging them to challenge their assumptions and beliefs, facilitating the opportunities to work together building a vision, and setting directions [34,39].

The elements that revealed ethical dilemmas in this study concerned teaching, e.g., planning the lessons in a way that meets the student's needs in the best way. These issues were also found as caring elements in students' opinions [7]. Balancing between the targets set in the national curriculum [40] and the needs of a group of students was sometimes difficult. Another ethical dilemma was interpreted in the descriptions of collaboration, which was found to be important, but the teachers felt that they did not have enough time or opportunities to plan it properly. Lack of time is one of the hindering structural characteristics of collaboration [16]. Giving time and space for teachers' collaboration during working hours can also diminish the risk of free-riding teacher colleagues [18], which was one of the teachers' arguments in this study as well. Ethical dilemmas presented in this article do not concern only teachers, as principals have also found it challenging to develop school culture to meet the demands of the curriculum, which promotes inclusive education and the use of information and communication technology in schools [47].

Some of the teachers argued that the expectations of the municipality have been stressful, although a respectful and open working atmosphere can strengthen the staff to meet the pressure of demands [56]. According to teachers in this study, the problems seemed to be less difficult if teachers were able to work in subject groups or teacher teams (see also [18]). According to Lahtero et al. [23], distributed leadership can be understood as delegation of predetermined tasks and as interaction between principals and teachers and their situations that take place in the official and unofficial structures of school environments. In this study, the teachers' arguments about getting more information about the goals of school development, fair task delegation, and feedback are the kind of interaction that is meant in distributed leadership. According to Lahtero [57], promoting teachers' motivation to develop work needs indirect leadership through building a structure for teams to meet and have mutual discussions (time and space) and supporting interaction and knowledge of the staff. In his study, principals also believed that distributed leadership would engage teachers and increase their motivation for school development because distributed leadership provides a feeling that one can have an influence on one's work [57]. The elements mentioned above were also found as prerequisites to development work in this study.

All in all, the results examined from both the aspects of school development work and teachers' work as implementing caring values were connected. The meaningfulness of school development and its prerequisites were those elements and necessities that reflected and were aimed at the caring elements in the work culture, such as open and trusting interaction and willingness to work together thus fostering a good and innovative atmosphere. In conclusion, this study contributes to the knowledge about teachers' perceptions of the development of the school and how caring is present in teachers' conceptions of the work culture. Finally, as one of the teachers puts it: "*It is also a fairly important target to maintain good things, that one can't rely on the present situation in which interaction and the leading structure is in a good stage*" (Teacher 1, school 2), which confirms that the school development work will be continued.

7. Limitations and Future Research

This study presents the perceptions of Finnish teachers working in five schools, which sets limitations for generalizing the results. However, with 44 participants including teachers who were part of their school's leadership group and teachers who weren't, the study provided a good first insight into how caring becomes apparent in teachers' perceptions of meaningful school development. Further, the nature of the data is teacher self-reports that give limited information about their actual practices in the school. It is possible that the teachers participating in the study had positive attitudes toward school development to start with, and that may have led to a rather positive picture of teachers' perceptions. Therefore, there is a need for the theme to be investigated more thoroughly and in other contexts in the future.

As the results presented in this article are from Finland, international and comparative studies are needed. Finnish teacher education is at a high level and teachers are academically educated at universities. From this viewpoint, it would be very fruitful to conduct an international study on ethical aspects and perceptions of school development to explore and compare teachers' awareness and perceptions concerning ethical dimensions in developmental work in different countries.

In Finland, where we have almost no private sector in education, schools are led by a very collaborative approach to distributed leadership. It will be highly interesting to do comparative research in this area to see how results differ in different school systems.

In this research, teachers addressed a few aspects of ethical dilemmas, although teaching is considered an ethical profession. Ethical themes that are seen as core values in caring teaching need therefore to be observed further in Finland.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.H., L.H. and R.A.; methodology, M.H., L.H. and R.A.; formal analysis, M.H.; investigation, R.A.; resources, R.A. and A.K.; data curation, R.A.; writing—original draft preparation, M.H., L.H. and R.A.; writing—review & editing, M.H., L.H., A.K. and R.A.; visualization, M.H. and L.H.; supervision, A.K. and R.A.; project administration, R.A.; funding acquisition, not applicable. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: Open access funding provided by the University of Helsinki.

Institutional Review Board Statement: According to the Research Ethics Committee in the Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of Helsinki, ethical review is required if participation in the research deviates from the principle of informed consent, the research involves intervening in the physical integrity of research participants, the focus of the research is on minors under the age of 15 without separate consent from a parent or carer or without informing a parent or carer, research that exposes participants to exceptionally strong stimuli, research that involves a risk of causing mental harm that exceeds the limits of normal daily life to the research participants or their family members or others closest to them. This study did not have any of the aforementioned characteristics. Therefore, ethical review and approval were waived for this study.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Hatch, T. *The Education We Need for a Future We Can't Predict*; Corwin: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2021.
2. Ahtiainen, R.; Heikonen, L. The Leadership Group as a Means for Teacher Participation and Leadership Distribution. In *Leadership in Educational Contexts in Finland: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*; Ahtiainen, R., Hanhimäki, E., Leinonen, J., Risku, M., Smeds-Nylund, A.-S., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, in press.
3. Drysdale, L.; Gurr, D. Leadership in uncertain times. *Int. Stud. Educ. Adm.* **2015**, *45*, 131–158.
4. Hargreaves, A. *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age*; Cassell: London, UK, 2001.
5. Tirri, K. Etiikan "uusi tulo" opettajuuteen ja opettajankoulutukseen. In *Ihmistä Kasvattamassa: Koulutus-Arvot-Uudet Avaukset*; Kallioniemi, A., Toom, A., Ubani, M., Linnansaari, H., Kumpulainen, K., Eds.; Suomen Kasvatustieteellinen Seura: Helsinki, Finland, 2008; Volume 40, pp. 215–230.
6. Louis, K.; Murphy, J.; Smylie, M. Caring leadership in schools: Findings from exploratory analyses. In *Educational Administration Quarterly*; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2016; pp. 1–39.
7. Hosio, M. *Välittävä Kasvatus ja Opetus Peruskoulun Yhdeksäsluokkalaisten Kokemana, [Personal Caring and Caring Teaching in Basic Education Experienced by 9th Grade Students]*; Turun Yliopisto, Turku University: Turku, Finland, 2021.
8. Thapa, A.; Cohen, J.; Guffey, S.; Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. A review of school climate research. *Rev. Educ. Res.* **2013**, *83*, 357–385. [CrossRef]
9. Fullan, M. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, 5th ed.; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2015.
10. Braun, A.; Ball, S.J.; Maguire, M.; Hoskins, K. Taking context seriously: Towards explaining policy enactments in the secondary school. *Discourse Stud. Cult. Politics Educ.* **2011**, *32*, 585–596. [CrossRef]
11. Lieberman, A.; Mace, D.H.P. Teacher learning: The key to educational reform. *J. Teach. Educ.* **2008**, *59*, 226–234. [CrossRef]

12. Hoekstra, A.; Korthagen, F.; Brekelmans, M.; Beijaard, D.; Imants, J. Experienced teachers' informal workplace learning and perceptions of workplace conditions. *J. Workplace Learn.* **2009**, *21*, 276–298. [CrossRef]
13. Vanblaere, B.; Devos, G. Relating school leadership to perceived professional learning community characteristics: A multilevel analysis. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2016**, *57*, 26–38. [CrossRef]
14. Hargreaves, A.; O'Connor, M.T. *Collaborative Professionalism. When Teaching Together Means Learning for All*; Corwin: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2018.
15. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals*; OECD Publishing: Washington, DC, USA, 2020. [CrossRef]
16. Vangrieken, K.; Dochy, F.; Raes, E.; Knydt, E. Teacher Collaboration, A Systematic Review. *Educ. Res. Rev.* **2015**, *15*, 17–40. [CrossRef]
17. Fluijt, D.; Bakker, C.; Struyf, E. Team-reflection: The missing link in co-teaching teams. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2016**, *31*, 187–201. [CrossRef]
18. Härkki, T.; Vartiainen, H.; Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, P.; Hakkarainen, K. Co-Teaching in non-linear projects: A contextualized model of co-teaching to support educational change. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2021**, *97*, 1031883. [CrossRef]
19. Turner, J.C.; Christensen, A.; Kackar-Cam, H.Z.; Fulmer, S.M.; Trucano, M. The Development of Professional Learning Communities and Their Teacher Leaders: An Activity Systems Analysis. *J. Learn. Sci.* **2018**, *27*, 49–88. [CrossRef]
20. Biesta, P.; Priestley, M.; Robinson, S. The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teach. Teach. Theory Pract.* **2015**, *21*, 624–640. [CrossRef]
21. Hargreaves, A.; Fink, D. *Sustainable Leadership*; Jossey-Bass: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2006.
22. Harris, A. Distributed leadership: Implications for the role of the principal. *J. Manag. Dev.* **2012**, *31*, 7–17. [CrossRef]
23. Lahtero, T.; Ahtiainen, R.; Lång, N. Finnish principals: Leadership training and views on distributed leadership. *Educ. Res. Rev.* **2019**, *14*, 340–348. [CrossRef]
24. Dinham, S. *Leading Learning and Teaching*; ACER Press: Camberwell, Australia, 2016.
25. Daniëls, E.; Hondeghem, A.; Dochy, F. A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educ. Res. Rev.* **2019**, *27*, 110–125. [CrossRef]
26. Vennebo, K.; Ottesen, E. The emergence of innovative work in school development. *J. Educ. Chang.* **2015**, *16*, 197–216. [CrossRef]
27. Husu, J. Real-world pedagogical ethics: Mission impossible? *Teach. Dev.* **2003**, *7*, 311–326.
28. Carr, D. Personal and interpersonal relationships in education and teaching: A virtual ethical perspective. *Br. J. Educ. Stud.* **2005**, *53*, 255–271. [CrossRef]
29. Hallinan, M. Teacher influences on students' attachment to school. *Sociol. Educ.* **2008**, *81*, 271–283. [CrossRef]
30. Schussler, D.; Collins, A. An empirical exploration of the who, what, and how of school care. In *Teachers College Record*; Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, NY, USA, 2006; Volume 108.
31. Noddings, N. *Philosophy of Education*, 3rd ed.; Westview Press: Boulder, CO, USA, 2012.
32. Noddings, N. *The Challenge to Care in Schools, an Alternative Approach to Education*; Teachers College Press: New York, NY, USA, 2005.
33. Noddings, N. Identifying and responding to needs in education. *Camb. J. Educ.* **2005**, *35*, 147–159. [CrossRef]
34. Sleegers, P.; Thoonen, E.; Oort, F.; Peetsma, T. Changing classroom practices: The role of school-wide capacity for sustainable improvement. *J. Educ. Adm.* **2014**, *52*, 617–652. [CrossRef]
35. Hanhimäki, E.; Tirri, K. The Moral Role and Characteristics of Finnish Urban School Principals. *J. Res. Character Educ.* **2008**, *6*, 53–65.
36. Hamre, B.K.; Pianta, R.C.; Allen, J.P. Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*; Christenson, S.L., Reschly, A.L., Wylie, C., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012; pp. 365–386.
37. Kuusilehto-Awale, L. Responsible leadership with an ethic of care and caring. In Proceedings of the 20th ENIRDELM Conference, Reykjavik, Iceland, 16–18 September 2011.
38. Ryu, J.; Walls, J.; Louis, K.S. Caring leadership: The role of principals in producing caring school cultures. *Leadersh. Policy Sch.* **2020**, *21*, 585–602. [CrossRef]
39. Leithwood, K.; Harris, A.; Hopkins, A. Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *Sch. Leadersh. Manag.* **2008**, *28*, 21–42. [CrossRef]
40. Finnish National Agency for Education. *National Core Curriculum of Basic Education*; Finnish National Agency for Education: Helsinki, Finland, 2014.
41. Lavonen, J. Curriculum and teacher education reforms in Finland that support the development of competencies for the twenty-first century. In *Audacious Education Purposes: How Governments Transform the Goals of Education Systems*; Reimers, F.M., Ed.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2020; pp. 65–80.
42. Reinius, H.; Kaukinen, I.; Korhonen, T.; Juuti, K.; Hakkarainen, K. Teachers as transformative agents in changing school culture. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2022**, *120*, 103888. [CrossRef]
43. Wallenius, T.; Juvonen, S.; Hansen, P.; Varjo, J. Schools, accountability and transparency—Approaching the Nordic school evaluation practices through discursive institutionalism. *Nord. J. Stud. Educ. Policy* **2018**, *4*, 133–143. [CrossRef]
44. Ronkainen, R.; Kuusisto, E.; Eisenschmidt, E.; Tirri, K. Ethical sensitivity of Finnish and Estonian teachers. *J. Moral Educ.* **2021**, *52*, 172–188. [CrossRef]

45. Ahtiainen, R.; Heikonen, L.; Hotulainen, R. Johtoryhmä opettajayhteisöä osallistavana johtamisjärjestelmänä. In *Kasvatus-ja Koulutusalan Johtaminen*; Holappa, A.-S., Hyyryläinen, A., Kola-Torvinen, P., Korva, S., Smeds-Nylund, A.-S., Eds.; PS-Kustannus: Jyväskylä, Finland, 2021; pp. 173–190.
46. Simola, M.; Ahtiainen, R. Contradictions and opportunities in contexts of everyday leadership in education. In *Leadership in Educational Contexts in Finland: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*; Ahtiainen, R., Hanhimäki, E., Leinonen, J., Risku, M., Smeds-Nylund, A.-S., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, in press.
47. Tirri, K.; Eisenschmidt, E.; Poom-Valickis, K.; Kuusisto, E. Current Challenges in School Leadership in Estonia and Finland: A Multiple-Case Study among Exemplary Principals. *Hindawi Educ. Res. Int.* **2021**, *2021*, 8855927. [CrossRef]
48. Eisenschmidt, E.; Ahtiainen, R.; Kondratjev, B.S.; Sillavee, R. A Study of Finnish and Estonian Principals' Perceptions of Strategies that foster Teacher Involvement in School Development. *Int. J. Leadersh. Educ.* **2021**, 1–24. [CrossRef]
49. Hanhimäki, E.; Risku, M. The Cultural and Social Foundations of Ethical Educational Leadership in Finland. In *The Cultural and Social Foundations of Educational Leadership*; An International Comparison; Normand, R., Moos, L., Liu, M., Tulowitzki, P., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2021.
50. Tong, A.; Sainsbury, P.; Craig, J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int. J. Qual. Health Care* **2007**, *19*, 349–357. [CrossRef]
51. Hsieh, H.-F.; Shannon, S. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qual. Health Res.* **2005**, *15*, 1277–1288. [CrossRef]
52. Potter, W.J.; Levine-Donnerstein, D. Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *J. Appl. Commun. Res.* **1999**, *27*, 258–284. [CrossRef]
53. Cohen, L.; Manion, L.; Morrison, K. *Research Methods in Education*; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2018.
54. The Ethical Principles of Research with Human Participants and Ethical Review in the Human Sciences in Finland. In *Finnish National Board on Research Integrity [TENK] Guidelines*; TENK: Helsinki, Finland, 2019.
55. Caldwell, P.F.; Sholtis, S.A. *Developing an Ethic of Care in the Classroom*; Kappa Delta Pi Record: Indianapolis, IN, USA, 2008; Volume 44, pp. 85–89.
56. Hargreaves, A. The emotional politics of teaching and teacher development: With implications for educational leadership. *Int. J. Leadersh. Educ.* **1998**, *1*, 315–336. [CrossRef]
57. Lahtero, T.; Ahtiainen, R.; Fonsén, E.; Kallioniemi, A. Rehtoreiden ja opettajien käsityksiä perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman toteutumista edistävistä tekijöistä laajan pedagogisen johtamisen viitekehyksessä. *Hallinnon Tutk.* **2021**, *40*, 326–338. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.