

From Teaching from the Heart to Teaching with a Heart: Segmenting Filipino College Students' Views of their Teachers' Caring Behavior and their Orientations as Cared-for Individuals

Allan B. de Guzman
Ramon Kristoffer C. Torres

Millard M. Uy
Joseph Bryan F. Tancioco

Elmore Y. Siy
Jomar R. Hernandez

University of Santo Tomas
Philippines

Caring, as a universal human phenomenon, should permeate elementary, secondary and tertiary level instruction. The practice of teaching, especially at the tertiary level, is not only substantial and procedural but relational as well. To teach with a heart is the essence that makes teaching a form of caring. When teaching is viewed as a form of caring, teachers become relational geniuses in their own right. This study is an attempt to segment Filipino college students' views (n=1000) of their teachers' caring behavior and their orientations as cared-for individuals. The identified clusters of teacher roles that indicate caring behavior imply that acts of teaching become acts of caring depending on how the teachers, the *efficient cause* of education, perform their ordinary tasks in the context of *extraordinariness*. Such extraordinariness spells out a big difference in the way teachers practice the so-called *single loop caring or caring visibility* and *double-loop caring or caring presence*. The former refers to teaching from the heart while the latter pertains to teaching with a heart. Interestingly, the extent to which teachers' caring behavior is felt and experienced by the students positively shapes their orientations as cared-for individuals.

Key words: teaching as caring, caring presence, caring visibility, Filipino, teaching with a heart, extraordinariness

Introduction

Teaching is a noble work still in progress. At

Allan B. de Guzman, Senior Researcher, Center for Educational Research and Development of the Royal and Pontifical University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines; Millard M. Uy, Elmore Y. Siy, Ramon Kristoffer C. Torres, Joseph Bryan F. Tancioco, and Jomar R. Hernandez, alumni of the College of Education and junior researchers, Center for Educational Research and Development, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Allan B. de Guzman, UST Center for Educational Research and Development Room 201 Thomas Aquinas Research Complex, España, Manila, Philippines. E-mail: abdeguzman@mnl.ust.edu.ph or doc_allan@yahoo.com

whichever level of education, it does not simply involve transmission of knowledge and information but more importantly a long-term and passionate commitment to human transformation. Such commitment which speaks of the true joys of teaching rooted on a kind of transcendence from mere transmission to transformation (de Guzman & Fernandez, 2005) makes teaching not only a profession but a powerful act of human service. In a highly globalized and technology-driven environment, the place of teaching cannot be underestimated nor should its power be overlooked. The power of teaching to transform individuals and society at large depends, in great measure, on the interplay of the triad of competence, commitment and compassion among its efficient causes—the teachers. However, in the words of Rosiek (2003), “it is distressing

that we find ourselves in a moment when public discourse about education is so exclusively focused on measurable cognitive outcomes of teaching” (p. 399). Besides having sound pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) and awareness of societal trends, problems, and issues, Darling-Hammond (2006) avers that teachers also need to understand the person, the spirit, of every child and find a way to nurture that spirit. By and large, teaching and learning as human experiences are not only mental and physical affairs. Human experiences, according to Rosiek (2003), are emotional affairs. This thinking challenges teachers as key players of education to teach not only from the heart but more importantly to teach with a heart. To teach with a heart is the essence that makes teaching a form of caring. When teaching is viewed as a form of caring, teachers become relational geniuses in their own right (de Guzman & Fernandez, 2005). Today, teaching and learning are now acknowledged as social and relational processes (Cochran-Smith, 2003). Hence, teaching as caring should permeate elementary, secondary and tertiary level instruction.

The child-centered, humanistic, and autonomous character of education (Hess, 2001 cited in Cochran-Smith, 2003) makes caring as one of the reasons that drives an individual to join the teaching profession. Caring is believed to be a major and important wide aspect in the reality of teaching (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2005). Similarly, Frank (2001) succinctly describes that caring is an integral part of the social psychological systems that operate between instructors and learners. Notably, Kane, Sandretto, and Heath (2004) averred that “what is at the heart of establishing interpersonal relationships with students is the person of the teacher” (p. 299). Previous studies representing various disciplines have given a wide spectrum of interpretation of what a caring behavior is. Teven and McCroskey (1996), for their part, averred that the classroom is constantly under the scrutiny of students who can interpret verbal and non-verbal actions such as facial expressions, body movements that provide valuable information about the teacher and his emotional state. Teachers who treat their students as whole individuals (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2005; Ferreira, 2000) and are interested in their personal situations are regarded as caring individuals (Vogt, 2002). Teachers who listen to situations involving the children such as their problems, worries, and

feelings (Thayer-Bacon, Arnold, & Stoots, 1998) are approachable and encourage discussions (Vogt, 2002; Thayer-Bacon et al, 1998; Neal, 1999); establish trust (Vogt, 2002; Thayer-Bacon et al., 1998); are empathic (Teven & McCroskey, 1996; Thayer-Bacon et al, 1998); give and receive respect (Vogt, 2002) and respond to students' needs coupled with understanding (Teven & McCroskey, 1996; Neal, 1999) are social behaviors and attributes considered as caring factors. In curriculum-based activities, students who consider teachers as caring are those who explain work and check for understanding (Ferreira, 2000); are flexible (Thayer-Bacon et al., 1998); provide a safe environment vital to learning (Frank, 2001); and maintain good classroom management (Ferreira, 2000).

However, Alder (2002), for her part, surprisingly noted that little attention is given in the research as to what it means to care and how caring relationships are created and maintained with the students. While the construct of caring is explicitly observed and documented in elementary and secondary levels, its fertile implications are still yet to be seen and understood in the context of the technical and fast-paced aspects of college teaching. Tertiary level teaching does not exist in a vacuum nor does it operate in total isolation. While teaching at this level often involves lecturing to large number of students, building relevant interpersonal relationships with students should not be overlooked (Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2004). Such reciprocal relationship between the teacher and the students renders tertiary teaching a dynamic relational enterprise.

Cognizant of the fact that caring is a universal human phenomenon, this paper argues that the practice of teaching, especially in tertiary level, is not only substantial and procedural but relational as well. Such relationality appeals more to the emotions which, according to Rosiek (2003), have a prominent presence in the learning process. The ability of the teacher to respond to students' emotional need is made possible through the acts of caring. Though caring may elicit various meanings and interpretations depending on the context of the profession, it is being perceived as a normal and natural expression of one's humanity as a complete person (King, 1998 cited in Hansen & Mulholland, 2005). College teachers do not only communicate the truth in their teaching but their being persons capable of caring. Teachers deal with students as whole human beings and need to respond to them as emotional, moral, social, and

cultural as well as cognitive beings (Rosiek, 2003). In college teaching, the ability to promote a caring atmosphere defines professors' effectiveness which, in turn, facilitates students' learning (Kim, Damewood, & Hodge, 2000). The act of caring is not just a descriptor applied to the carer (Hansen & Mulholland, 2005), but the interaction between *carer* and those *cared* for in which the views of the cared for must be considered (Noddings, 2001). There is mutuality in the relationship (Neal, 1999), relationships are caring if both "carer" and "cared-for" contribute appropriately. The carer attends non-selectively for the cared-for, which is the recipient and contributes by responding in some positive way to the efforts of the carer (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2005). Caring is not mere concern for others or just an action but is defined by the relationship in which the action was embedded (Ferreira, 2000).

The Present Study

The caring relationship between the teacher and the learner has a direct impact on both parties but more directly on students. Moreover, Thayer-Bacon and associates (1998) averred that caring teachers have a significant impact on their students' lives, including those of different cultural backgrounds and different genders. If a teacher engages in behaviors that communicate a positive attitude toward the student, it is more likely that the student will exert more effort to know what he is attempting to teach. Indeed, the teaching-caring relationship encourages growth of the ideal selves of the teacher and the students.

Driven by Teven and McCroskey's (1996) assumption that as a result of teacher-student relationships, the behavioral patterns of teachers affect the behavioral patterns of students, this study purports to address the following research objectives (i) segment college teachers' acts of caring and their corresponding effects on students' personal and academic behaviors; (ii) identify students' sources of caring support; and (iii) ascertain significant differences in student respondents' perceptions of their teachers' caring behavior and their reactions to these behaviors when grouped according to their demographic profile.

Method

Subjects

A total of 1000 junior undergraduate students representing hard and soft disciplines from a comprehensive university in the capital of the Philippines were asked to participate in this study. They were chosen on the assumption that their three years in college had given them enough exposure to and understanding of their teachers' caring behavior. The senior students were not considered for this purpose since at the time of the study, a majority of them were in their practicum or on-the-job training (OJT) outside the university. Said university is the oldest in the country and has the largest student population (an average of 30,000 every school term). The respondents represented the following disciplines: Education, Commerce, Psychology, Tourism, Hotel and Restaurant Management (*soft sciences*), Pharmacy, Medical Technology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Nutrition and Food Technology (*hard sciences*). Of the sample population there is a preponderance of females (61.8%) with a modal age of 19 (67.4%) and a grade-point average of 2.0 or 87-88% (30.1%) in their final rating. The respondents were mostly the eldest child in the family (43.1%), living with their parents (76.5%) and not committed to a relationship (57.6%). A large number of the respondents are regular (89.7%) non-working (94.6%) students who preferred watching movies (24%), going to the mall (20.1%), and staying at home (20.1%) as their most preferred hobbies. As to their favorite courses, 418 (41%) students chose Science, followed by Math (25%) and Language (18%). They were more comfortable with their single teachers (54%) and preferred female teachers (69%) over males (15.0%).

Data Measure and Data Collection Procedure

To gather data and the information needed in the study, a two-part researcher-developed instrument was fielded. The first part, the *robotfoto* (a preliminary identity sketch), was distributed to the target group of respondents for purposes of establishing their baseline characteristics. Variables or identifiers included respondents' age, gender, grade point average for the last semester, co-curricular engagement activities, ordinal position in the family, residence area, field of the study, academic status, civil status, parents' whereabouts, preferred hobby, favorite course, preferred

gender and civil status of the teacher, with whom they consulted about their family problems, with whom they shared their academic achievements, with whom they shared their failures, and with whom they shared their secrets. The said identifiers were primarily sought by the researchers for the purpose of respondent profiling or characterization. However, an attempt was made in the analytical phase of this investigation to ascertain if these variables impact the way caring behavior is observed. As Berliner (2002) succinctly puts it “any teaching behavior interacts with a number of student characteristics such as IQ, socio-economic status, motivation to learn, and a host of other factors” (p. 19).

The second part of the instrument called the Caring Behavior Inventory (CBI) was originally developed by the researchers based on literature review and interview with students in the university. This instrument was divided into two parts. The first set of questions was labeled “*A teacher is caring when he or she...*” and the second set, “*When my teacher is caring I...*” The junior college respondents were asked to rate the questions as to the extent of their agreement, following the given scale: 4= Strongly agree, 3= Agree, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly Disagree. The data-gathering tool was pilot-tested on a non-participant group for purposes of reliability testing. Results of the Cronbach alpha test yielded a reliability index of 92.2%.

The researchers personally administered the *robotfoto* and the 63-item survey instrument to the different colleges with the permission of the dean of each college and the assistance of the faculty members in charge of each class.

Data Analysis

Through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0, data gathered were treated in-depth through Mean, Standard Deviation, Factor Analysis, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Friedman test.

Factor analysis using principal component analysis with varimax rotation was applied to determine the underlying dimensions of the teachers’ caring behavior and the students’ reaction to these caring behaviors. Prior to factor analysis, Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy was applied to test the fitness of the data. The KMO values were found to be .877 (caring

behavior) and .936 (reactions) which were lower than .001. These values indicate that the number of samples is adequate for factor analysis to proceed.

To validate the internal reliability of each of the statements in the identified factors, an internal reliability testing using Cronbach Alpha was conducted. All factors with a reliability coefficient above .60 were considered acceptable for purposes of this investigation. Relatively high reliability coefficients ranging from .66 to .77 (caring behavior) and .66 to .86 (reactions) were indicated by all factors. Items with factor loadings and communalities less than .40 were discarded and this resulted in a 31-item instrument for the first part that measured seven dimensions of teaching caring behaviors. All items in the second part of the questionnaire were acceptable which resulted in five (5) dimensions of student reactions to teachers’ caring behavior being yielded. This was labeled in the order of decreasing explained variance.

The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to establish significant differences in the respondents’ mean perceptions of their teachers’ caring behavior and their reactions as cared-for individuals. The Friedman Test, a non-parametric one-sample repeated measure, was used to establish significant difference in the ranks made by the respondents on sources of their caring crutches.

Results

The 31 statements in the Caring Behavior Inventory (CBI) characterized college teachers’ acts of caring into seven groups (see Table 1). The first group (*The Teacher as Key*) views the teacher as a vital element in the learning process. He/she assumes the responsibility of facilitator, and opens up or discovers the potential within the class. The second group of items (*The Teacher as Compass*) describes the teacher as somebody who opens the line of communication to both students and the parents for purposes of behavioral modification or attitudinal redirection. The third group of items (*The Teacher as TV*) highlights the role of the teacher in captivating students’ interest and enthusiasm for learning through meaningful, lasting and enjoyable learning experiences. Interestingly, the fourth group of items (*The Teacher as Alarm Clock*) points to the role of the teacher in redirecting students’

Table 1
Results of Factor Analysis on Teachers' Caring Behavior

Caring Behavior Factors and Terms	Factor Loading	Eigen value	Variance (%)	Reliability Coefficient
<i>Factor 1 – The Teacher as Key</i>		2.28	9.58	77.7
Makes use of class time productively	.677			
Shares personal experiences in class discussions	.540			
Observes class policies	.540			
Is available for consultation	.538			
Injects values in class whenever possible	.532			
Repeats my ideas and my innate individuality	.530			
Prepares interesting classroom activities	.449			
Employs humor in class	.435			
<i>Factor 2- The Teacher as Compass</i>		2.48	9.17	75.0
Checks my notebook	.684			
Visits me when I am sick	.673			
Tells my parents if I have any deficiencies	.614			
Follows up my class progress	.573			
Looks for me every time I'm not around	.566			
Gives me good advice regarding my problems	.540			
Encourages me to participate in school activities	.491			
<i>Factor 3- The Teacher as T.V.</i>		1.79	8.60	68.8
Cracks jokes in class	.764			
Dismisses the class earlier	.682			
Always wears a smile in class	.632			
Always ready for a chat	.584			
<i>Factor 4- The Teacher as Alarm Clock</i>		1.91	7.00	68.6
Gives a lot of assignments	.778			
Gives surprise quizzes	.769			
Embarrasses me in front of the class	.649			
Is strict	.544			
<i>Factor 5- The Teacher as Slum book</i>		1.11	5.83	68.4
Finds time to entertain my questions	.613			
Commends my good performance	.546			
Praises me when this is due	.477			
Knows my name	.457			
<i>Factor 6- The Teacher as Mirror</i>		1.26	5.63	68.4
Comes to class on time	.824			
Comes to class prepared	.760			
<i>Factor 7- The Teacher as Pencil Eraser</i>		1.10	5.40	66.9
Criticizes my work	.810			
Comments on my negative actions	.666			
Total Variance Explained			51.21	

Note. Kaiser-Meyer Olkin value (KMO) = .877

Table 2

Results of Factor Analysis on Students' Reactions to their Teachers' Caring Behavior

Motivation Factors and Terms	Factor Loading	Eigen value	Variance (%)	Reliability Coefficient
Factor 1- Achievement Orientation		2.74	13.27	86.8
Complete my duties	.736			
Am serious in my undertakings	.729			
Am encouraged to excel in class	.659			
Pass my projects on time	.637			
Am motivated to study at home	.610			
Give my best in doing my projects and assignments.	.537			
Participate in classroom discussion	.408			
Factor 2- Task Orientation		3.00	13.01	85.5
Come to class on time	.766			
Do my homework	.740			
Take down notes	.719			
Listen attentively to my teachers	.661			
Cooperate with my classmates in classroom activities	.617			
Gain confidence	.595			
Study in advance	.422			
Factor 3- Change Orientation		2.08	11.43	78.2
Participate in extra-curricular activities	.671			
Communicate with my parents and other family members	.651			
Deviate from my bad habits	.591			
Behave properly in/outside the class/school	.573			
Become more sociable	.530			
Avoid cheating	.500			
Factor 4- Goal Orientation		1.41	8.03	67.1
Discover my strengths and weaknesses	.660			
Become goal-oriented	.606			
Gain self-control	.469			
Talk to her casually	.464			
Feel safe and secure inside the classroom	.420			
Factor 5- Rule Breaking Orientation		1.25	6.20	66.5
Abuse his/her kindness	.802			
Seeks attention from the class	.776			
Total Variance Explained			51.94	

Note. Kaiser-Meyer Olkin value (KMO) = .936

Table 3
Adolescents' "Caring Crutches"

	Academic	Personal	Family	Excel	Fail	Secrets	Total Ave.	Rank
Friends	3.19	3.28	3.19	3.91	3.17	3.36	3.35	1
Parents	2.68	2.71	2.75	3.18	2.82	2.16	2.72	2
Teachers	2.08	1.76	1.79	1.77	1.80	1.74	1.82	4
Partner	1.98	2.20	2.23	2.10	2.18	2.26	2.16	3

Table 4a
Significant Differences in Respondents' Perceptions of their Teachers' Caring Behavior when Grouped according to their Demographic Profile

Profile	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> -ratio	<i>P</i> -value
Gender				0.040	0.841
Male	688	3.11	0.31		
Female		3.11	0.28		
GPA				0.901	0.515
1.00-1.25	3	3.14	0.21		
1.26-1.50	14	3.17	0.06		
1.51-1.75	73	3.13	0.03		
1.76-2.00	130	3.15	0.02		
2.00-2.25	301	3.12	0.02		
2.26-2.50	206	3.10	0.02		
2.51-2.75	199	3.08	0.02		
2.76-3.00	56	3.11	0.04		
5.00	16	3.00	0.07		
Ordinal Position				0.732	0.481
Eldest	431	3.10	0.30		
Middle	327	3.13	0.29		
Youngest	241	3.11	0.27		
Live with Parents				0.191	0.662
Yes	765	3.11	0.29		
No	235	3.12	0.30		
Field of Study				8.628**	0.003
Hard Science	500	3.09	0.29		
Soft Science	500	3.14	0.29		
Currently in a relationship				7.529**	0.006
Yes	576	3.13	0.29		
No	424	3.08	0.29		

Note. * $p < .01$ ** $p < .05$

Table 4b

Significant Differences in Respondents' Reactions to their Teachers' Caring Behavior when Grouped according to their Demographic Profile

Profile	N	Mean	SD	F-ratio	P-value
Gender				0.204	0.652
Male	312	3.25	0.40		
Female	688	3.26	0.36		
GPA				2.130*	0.031
1.00-1.25	3	3.74	0.24		
1.26-1.50	14	3.30	0.29		
1.51-1.75	73	3.33	0.38		
1.76-2.00	130	3.30	0.33		
2.00-2.25	301	3.25	0.38		
2.26-2.50	206	3.26	0.34		
2.51-2.75	199	3.23	0.39		
2.76-3.00	56	3.25	0.41		
5.00	16	3.03	0.39		
Ordinal Position				0.269	0.764
Eldest	431	3.25	0.39		
Middle	327	3.27	0.36		
Youngest	241	3.26	0.36		
Live with Parents				1.476	0.225
Yes	765	3.25	0.37		
No	235	3.29	0.37		
Field of Study				0.073	0.787
Hard Science	500	3.26	0.38		
Soft Science	500	3.26	0.37		
Currently in a relationship				0.155	0.694
Yes	576	3.26	0.37		
No	424	3.26	0.37		

Note. * $p < .01$ ** $p < .05$

unproductive behaviors through sound discipline. The fifth group of items (*The Teacher as Slumbook*) regards the teacher's ability to recognize individuality of each student through personalized approach to both success and failures. The sixth group of items (*The Teacher as Mirror*) describes the role of the teacher in instilling good values to his students through role modeling. The last group of items (*The Teacher as Pencil Eraser*) recognizes the role of the

teacher as a critical friend or devil's advocate with a view to correcting errors or mistakes committed by the student.

In regard to students' reactions to the caring behavior of their teachers, the results of factor analysis yielded five interesting group of factors (Table 2). Factor 1 (*Achievement Orientation*) consists of items that refers to the tendency of students to perform at their level best as shown by their heightened interest in their studies. Factor 2 (*Task*

Orientation) describes the students' ability to carry out tasks and duties following the set standards of performance and behavior. Factor 3 (*Change Orientation*) pertains to students' desire to experience growth and acceptance by digressing from their faulty habits and practices. Factor 4 (*Goal Orientation*) refers to students' tendency to assume responsibility and achieve desired ends through self-regulation. Factor 5 (Rule-Breaking Orientation) refers to the tendency of the students to abuse the positive actions the teacher manifests and the positive environment he/she is trying to establish.

Table 3 presents the crutches or individuals with whom the respondents confer their problems. Among the four sources of support, ranked first were the group of friends (3.35), followed by the respondents' parents (2.68), partners (2.16), and teachers (1.82).

As shown in Table 4a, significant differences were noted in the way students view their teachers' caring behavior when grouped according to their field of study (F -ratio = 8.628, $p < .01$), with students from the soft sciences perceiving their teachers as more caring than those from the hard sciences ($WM=3.14$ versus 3.09). In regard to their romantic relationships, it is interesting to note that those students who are currently in relationships (F -ratio = 7.529, $p < .01$) rated their teachers somewhat higher ($WM = 3.13$ versus 3.08) than those who are not into relationship.

In regard to students' reaction to their teachers' caring behavior (Table 4b), significant differences were observed when clustered according to their grade point average (F -ratio = 2.130, $p < .05$), with students obtaining higher grade point averages (GPA) perceiving their teachers as more caring ($WMs = 3.30-3.74$).

Discussion

On Teachers Caring Behavior

While caring is integral to teaching excellence, segmentation attempts done in this study yielded interesting insights and implications on the need to promote and nurture pedagogy of caring in university teaching. This pedagogy of caring, once made explicit and practiced in the context of tertiary level teaching, may enable teachers to know what exactly university students are looking for in a teacher.

Interestingly, the identified acts of teaching (e.g., makes use of class time productively, shares personal experiences in class discussions, and observes class policies, among others) in this study, although part of the day-to-day tasks and expectations of a teacher, were interpreted by student respondents as forms of caring behavior. This is parallel to what Noddings termed as *rule-bound caring* in university teaching, which may extend to concrete behaviors such as giving feedback as frequently and comprehensively as possible (Kreber, Klampfleitner, McCune, Bayne, & Knottenbelt, 2007).

Although the acts of caring examined in this paper are similar to the extant literature on teaching excellence, it is interesting to note that any act of caring begins with the carer's recognition of the needs of the cared-for. The beauty of the caring act lies in the ability of the carer to do something ordinary in an extraordinary way. This makes the teacher an extraordinary carer. The act of caring in teaching calls for a kind of transcendence in one's teaching practice. Transcendence in teaching entails not only the acquisition of abilities through advanced training but more so with a kind of attitudinal disposition rooted in understanding to learn and an openness to possibilities. Such transcendence spells out a big difference between *caring visibility* or *single-loop caring* and *caring presence* or *double-loop caring*. Teachers who simply perform tasks for and with their students efficiently may be described as acting within the realm of *caring visibility* while the ability to perform the assigned tasks over and above set standards coupled with a strong desire to see meaningful and lasting changes in the thinking and behavior of the cared-for defines *caring presence*. Caring presence best operates in an environment of quality, excellence, meaning-making and responsiveness. Unless the acts of teaching truly respond to the felt needs, problems and interests of the cared-for, no caring presence can be made evident. Caring presence makes a teacher effective and engaging. Caring teachers strive to engage pupils in meaningful learning within an environment in which students are respected and considered in general (Donnel, 2007). As such, the teacher recognizes that he teaches persons, not classes (Tomkovick, 2004). When caring becomes the language of facilitation, student learning becomes more meaningful, lasting and productive. Caring in facilitating is a vital aid in crafting meaningful learning experiences (Tomkovick, 2004). The teacher as a key, as

shown in this study, implies the need for an academically focused teaching which requires the provision of clear instruction, opportunities for practice and feedback and structuring time for real engagement in tasks (Brophy & Good, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1998; Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996, cited in Horsch, Chen, & Wagner, 2002). Teachers, as facilitators of learning, should be committed to the students and their learning, and have an extensive knowledge of the subjects they teach and how to teach these to their students (Witcher & Onwuegbuzie, 1999). As Kreber (2002) would put it, excellent teachers are those who know how to motivate their students, how to convey concepts, and how to help students overcome difficulties in their learning.

On one hand, the teacher's role as a compass is not only to guide, listen, give advice, offer encouragement, be available, be approachable, give importance, be concerned and be trustworthy (Thayer-Bacon et al, 1998), but also to teach the students how to solve their own problems by adopting problem solving methodologies (Skelton, 2004). In this context, caring becomes the language of empowerment. Such empowering acts that make a teacher an excellent one entails the teacher's commitment to the student as a whole person (Vallance, 2000). This commitment recognizes the need for their own personal growth and awareness of their own journey. The identified role of the teacher as a television, on the other hand, recognizes the need to make learning fun and enjoyable. This is where the elements of entertainment and humor come into play for the purposes of catching the attention and interest of the students and in creating informal interaction and relationships within the classroom (Ferreira, 2000). The teachers' use of humor signifies an expansive understanding of themselves, of the teaching process, and of student psychology (de la Rosa, 2005). Teaching rooted in caring promotes an atmosphere of joy in learning. The joys of teaching emanate from joys of learning. Consequently, the joy of learning leads to a passion for solving problems (Chonko, 2007).

The teacher as an alarm clock is firm yet gentle. He creates an atmosphere that disciplines the total person in every student. Teaching as caring is also a form of control. Such control enables the learner to prioritize his activities and feels a kind of specialness in the classroom. This thinking runs parallel with the study of Noblit in 1993.

Teaching with control creates a business-like atmosphere where products are evaluated against the stated goals and objectives. It further ensures a kind of teaching where quality is not sacrificed with mere acts of kindness but kindness with control. When control is judiciously observed in teaching, teachers' sense of efficacy is better promoted (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) which in turn, bring about improved motivation to learn (Frank, 2001) and sense of responsibility, effort, improvement, participation and cooperation (McMillan, Myran, & Workman, 2002). As a slum book, teachers should be interested in their students at the personal level (Ferreira, 2000). Bliss (2006) noted that as teachers connect with the students at a deeper level, learning becomes richer. An excellent teacher establishes a personal commitment to his or her students, thereby expressing a sense of wonder or curiosity (Vallance, 2000). The personal attachment made by the teacher to the students by listening and communicating has an effect on classroom management (Cothran, Kulinna, & Garrahy, 2003).

A teacher's classroom behavior is constantly under scrutiny by students. As a result, students learn much from teachers' nonverbal behavior as well as verbal behavior (Teven & McCroskey, 1996). Students tend to imitate or absorb the teacher's behaviors since the students look up to their teacher. Correcting behavior problems and employing constructive criticism on the negative behavior of students are the teachers' role as a pencil eraser. As Thayer-Bacon, Arnold and Stoots (1998) proposed, care does not require people to agree with one other. Conversely, care means people are possibly open to hearing others' voices. A teacher does not always have to conform to students' desires just to show that he/she cares (Weinstein, 1998). The teacher should instead, serve as a critical friend or a mentor (Skelton, 2004).

On Students' Reactions to their Teachers Caring Behavior

The results of the factor analysis yielded five different orientations of students relative to their reactions to teachers' caring behavior which consist of achievement, task, change, goal, and rule-breaking orientations. *Achievement orientation* reflects students' willingness to pursue and excel in their academic affairs. In a study by Alder (2002), it was found that teachers who pressured students to complete assignments and study were caring

teachers. Similarly, teacher effectiveness is measured by the gain in learning by the students (Cochran-Smith, 2001). Caring behaviors such as acceptance, encouragement and approval from teachers tend to enhance the self-esteem and self-evaluation of the students (Sava, 2002). These behaviors are at the same time regarded as academic-enabling behaviors (McMillan, Myran, & Workman, 2002). *Task orientation* describes the initiative of the students in performing their duties at their level best. The role of the teacher in developing this kind of student initiative should be overlooked. Learning how to learn, according to Chonko (2007) is a means by which students can contribute to creation and resolution of learning disequilibria. Cranton and Carusetta (2004), in their study using grounded theory approach, found that the relationship between teacher and student includes helping students to learn. *Change Orientation* involves deflecting their misdemeanors and orienting themselves to become better students and individuals. If education involves leading, guiding, and facilitating the growth and development of an individual toward the fullness of humanity (Fernando, 2003) then, true acts of caring should be geared toward transforming the way an individual thinks, feels and behaves. Teaching that is rooted in caring views individual students as active agents in their own learning and is geared toward transformative learning which is thought to precipitate deep and lasting personal change, shaping the learner and creating a shift in perspective (Donnel, 2007). *Goal orientation* involves the awareness and awakening of the full potentials and individuality of a student with the help of the teacher and the school. Such initiative on the part of the student best operates in the context of teaching-learning partnership or what the Japanese collectively call as *kyosei* which demands a dedication to service and stewardship and the advancement of mutual interests over self-interests (Chonko, 2007). Unless the teacher recognizes students as their teaching partners and unless the students see their teachers as their learning partners, the ability to learn how to learn as one of the indices of teaching as caring cannot be fully realized. The key motivation of the goals of students should develop new interests and strengthen old ones (Fernando, 2003) and as persons capable of growth in talent and in character (Morrison, 1985; Goldstein & Lake, 2000). By way of implication, teachers should not practice dictatorship inside the classroom, but allow students to journey and

arrive at their own realizations (Fernando, 2003). The *rule-breaking orientation* of students should be regarded by teachers as creative opportunities to channel students' energy by exercising tough love. This kind of love appeals more to the students' sense of being and becoming and their sense of responsibility. A love that is tough operates in a relationship of fairness, which, according to Faranda and Clarke III (2004), involves the ability of the teacher to demonstrate just, equitable, and impartial treatment with a view to motivating student learning.

On Caring Crutches

While adolescence is the time of discovery, it is also the time when peer groups and friends become more important (Dekovic & Meeus, 1997). During this period, parent-child agreement is said to be critical to the child's decision-making capability (Scabini, 2000). The inept discipline practice such as strictness and high-level control among parents, tend to widen the gap with their children, thus, causing the latter to spend more time in peer relationships (Dekovic & Meeus, 1997). Though adolescents still rely on their parents for support, warmth, affection and assistance in case of need, parents characterized by too much authoritarianism and coercion would most likely make the child less autonomous, less confident about his competence and more susceptible to peer pressure (Scabini, 2000).

Adolescence is the stage when attraction to the opposite sex starts. Adolescents tend to commit themselves to boy-girl relationships. Young people need affection and respectful physical contact with others. They need to be comforted when they are upset, listened to with sympathy, taken seriously and given opportunities to share feelings (Cowie, 1999). Respondents might have ranked their partners as the third best crutch because they are comfortable in sharing their problems and secrets relative to the trust and love present in the relationship.

However, teachers are the least preferred crutch for students. A previous study conducted by Cutforth (1995) highlighted the three features of an effective teacher, namely: The teacher as a disciplinarian, the teacher as a carer and the teacher as a friend. In Cutforth's study, the reputation of "Mrs. Tracer" as a caring teacher and a friend contrasts strongly with the distance that is created between

her and her students when she performs her role as a disciplinarian, and one wonders whether this makes it possible for her to care. This study proposes that being a disciplinarian results in distance in teacher-student relationship and discourages the openness of students to be more open to the teacher. Cowie (1999), for his part, posited that teachers act more as “gatekeepers” and offer fewer opportunities to students to participate in decision-making. Thus, teachers do not give students the chance to decide on their own and to act on their choices, thus, enabling them to act on their problems and develop decision-making capability.

On Significant Differences

Notably, identifiers such as nature of students’ field of study and romantic relationships shape their perception on teachers’ caring behavior. Excellence in teaching, as equated with the caring behavior of teachers, is being experienced by the soft sciences students. The essence of teaching is grounded on the triad of scholarship, expertise and excellence. Scholarship, as an attribute of teachership, pertains to the extent to which prospective teachers have acquired the necessary degree and certification to qualify for a teaching position. Teaching expertise, as an attribute, is developed as a result of sustained professional practice. Excellence in teaching, as an elusive construct in education, refers to the degree to which teachers are able to maintain a sound, balance and harmonious relationship with students. Such a relationship goes beyond mere transmission of knowledge but more so is concerned with transforming students’ worldviews and life experiences through humane education. Excellence in teaching, though founded in hi-teach and high-tech practices, is indeed well appreciated in a hi-touch mode of human relationship. This human relationship is similar to the *psychologized* understanding of excellence developed by Skelton in 2005 which places a premium on the teacher-student relationship and learning effectiveness. Telli, den Brok and Cakiroglu (2007), for their part, averred that “teacher-student interpersonal behavior is a crucial element in the teaching-learning process. Today, more than ever, an excellent teacher is one who cares, shows empathy, and is well-rounded as he acts as a role model to students, parents and other professionals (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 1994). In effect, teachers’

caring behaviors may result to higher student achievement (Garrot, 2002; Cooper, 2004); improved students’ academic engagement (Thayer-Bacon et al, 1998, Brekelmans, Slegers, Fraser, 2000) cooperative skills and involvement (Goldstein, 1998); and better personal, social, and moral development (Cooper, 2004). Indeed, student behavior is interacting with teacher characteristics, such as teacher’s training in the subject taught, conceptions of learning, beliefs about assessment, and even the teacher’s personal happiness with life (Berliner, 2002). In this study, teacher’s caring behavior impacts upon students’ learning performance.

It is interesting to note that students’ perception of their teachers’ caring behavior is shaped by their romantic relationship. Such perceptions can be attributed to Bowlby’s Attachment Theory which holds that the propensity to make strong emotional bonds to particular individuals is a basic component of human nature. A person’s adult romantic attachment style is deeply influenced by his or her attachment history. Additionally, this theory suggests that a person learns to regulate his or her future behavior according to the signals from significant others. These signals are contributory to the formation of a schema of attachment which the person can confidently apply in other types of human relationships (Apostolidou, 2006). In the context of this study, the student’s romantic partner becomes instrumental in the formation of a strong schema of caring which is personally experienced by the students in their teacher’s behavior. However, the extent to which students experience teachers’ caring behavior depends, in great measures, on the way teachers distance themselves from their students particularly in college teaching. Though there are teachers who keep personal distance from their students, some manage to maximize the said distance by being formal, while others minimize this by treating their students as co-equals (Lowman, 1995).

Conclusion

Maintaining personal interactions with students and creating a caring atmosphere is central to college teaching. Today, more than ever, the ability of the teacher, to see his or her students not as material to work on but as individuals to work with, lies in his caring behavior. Such caring behavior may be witnessed and experienced by students in

varying forms and gradations, depending on the context where the teacher and the students operate as authentic partners in the teaching-learning process.

Interestingly, the various persona of the teacher, as a caring agent in and outside the classroom, is vividly evident and described by the results of this study. Expressed metaphorically, the collective responses of Filipino college students involved in this study were one in declaring that teachers' caring behavior is best measured by their ability to facilitate learning (key), direct students' learning progress (compass), help students see and feel the human aspects of teaching and learning (TV), monitor students' activities (clock), show interest in students' diverse backgrounds (slumbook), serve as students' role model in both standards of performance and behavior (mirror), and fulfill the role of a critical friend (pencil eraser).

The power of caring is indeed a pedagogical phenomenon. Though the ontology of caring may seem ordinary, its epistemology renders the caring act as an extraordinary process. As a unique phenomenon, it situates the teacher in two caring modes, namely: single-loop caring or caring visibility and double-loop-learning or caring presence. The former refers to teaching from the heart while the latter pertains to teaching with a heart. The extent to which teachers' caring behavior are felt and experienced by the students shape their orientations positively as cared-for individuals. As shown by the results of this study, teachers' caring behavior pushes students to do well and excel in class activities, meet teachers' expectations; effect positive changes through proper channels, experience self-discovery and appreciation and at times, test the limits of boundaries set in class.

While teachers' caring behavior have a profound influence on students' behavioral manifestations in class, it is surprising to note that as adolescents, Filipino college students, regard their friends and parents as their primary caring crutches in matters that relate to their academic, personal, family concerns and struggles. The way care is perceived and interpreted is also conditioned by the receivers' age, grade point average, field of study, academic status and romantic relationship.

The caring phenomenon in teaching remains as an abstract and yet human experience that only those who are truly cared-for can account for. Though the results of this study yield a more or less conclusive set of data, such a

teaching phenomenon invites further probing by considering the lived experiences of students who are in direct contact with the source of the said caring behavior. It is therefore suggested that future studies expand the results of this investigation by capitalizing on the power of qualitative research methods. The underlying cultural dimension of the caring phenomenon invites the need for a more aggregate cross-cultural comparison.

References

- Alder, N. (2002). Interpretations of the meaning of care: Creating caring relationships in urban middle school classrooms. *Urban Education, 37*(2), 241-266.
- Apostolidou, Z. (2006). Are childhood experiences with parents linked to feelings in romantic relationships during adulthood? *The New School Psychology Bulletin, 4*(1), 63-85.
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher, 31*(8), 18-20.
- Brekelmans, M., Slegers, P., & Fraser, B. (2000). Teaching for active learning. In R. J. Simons, J. van der Linden & T. Duffy (Eds.), *New learning* (pp. 227-242). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Bliss, C. (2006). Integrating meaning and purpose: The student-centered college classroom. *Journal of College and Character, 7*(1), 1-5.
- Chonko, L. B. (2007). A philosophy of teaching and more. *Journal of Marketing Education, 29*(2), 111-121.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Sometimes it's not about the money: Teaching and heart. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(5), 371-375.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 527-546.
- Cooper, G. (2004). Empathy, interpretation caring: Teachers' roles in unstrained environment. *Pastoral Care, 22*(3), 12-21.
- Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., & Garrahy, D. A. (2003). "This is kind of giving a secret away..." Students' perspectives on effective class management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(4), 435-444.
- Cowie, H. (1999). Peers helping peers: Interventions, initiatives and insights. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*(4),

- 433-436.
- Cranton, P., & Carisetta, E. (2004). Perspectives on authenticity in teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 5-22.
- Cutforth, N. J. (1995). Reconciling the moral and technical dimensions of teaching: Moving beyond notions of good and bad pedagogy. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Francisco, California. April 18-22, 1995. Retrieved December 22, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/14/0f/38.pdf ERIC Number ED384598.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300-314.
- de Guzman, A. B. & Fernandez, E. A. (2005). Understanding Filipino preservice and inservice teachers' motivations to teach: A convergence of transcendental views. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 18(4), 433-441.
- dela Rosa, P. SM. (2005). Toward a more reflective teaching practice: revisiting excellence in teaching. *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, 6(2), 170-176.
- Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. (1997). Peer relations in adolescence: Effects of parenting and adolescents' self-concept. *Journal of Adolescence*, 20(2), 163-176.
- Donnel, K. (2007). Developing a transformative urban teaching practice. *Urban Education*, 42(3), 223-249.
- Faranda, W. T., & Clarke III, I. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing educators. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(3), 271-281.
- Fernando, I. G. (2003). Teacher rules to live by. *Educator's Journal*, 23, 7.
- Ferreira, M. M. (2000). Caring teachers: Adolescents perspectives. *Research – Reports* (143). Retrieved December 16, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/3c/19.pdf. ERIC Number ED441682.
- Frank, L. S. (2001). The caring classroom. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Experiential Education*. Charleston, WV, November 1-4, 2000. Retrieved December 16, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1a/4b/bf.pdf ERIC Number ED467540.
- Garrot, C. L. (2004). The relationship between nonverbal immediacy, caring and L2 student learning (Spanish) (143). *Reports-research*. Virginia USA. Retrieved December 16, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1a/50/35.pdf ERIC Number ED467736.
- Goldstein, L. (1998). Taking caring seriously: The ethic of care in classroom life. *Paper presented at the 1998 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting*. San Diego, California. Retrieved December 16, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/15/7f/48.pdf ERIC Number ED419801.
- Goldstein, L., & Lake V. E. (2000). "Love, love and more love for children" Exploring preservice teachers' understandings of caring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 861-872.
- Hansen, P., & Mulholland, J. A. (2005). Caring and elementary teaching: The concerns of male beginning teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(2), 119-131.
- Horsch, P., Chen, J., & Wagner, S. L. (2002). The responsive classroom approach: A caring, respectful school environment as a context for development. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(3), 365-383.
- Isenbarger, L., & Zembylas, M. (2005). The emotional labor of the caring in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 130-134.
- Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2004). An investigation into excellent tertiary teaching: emphasizing reflective practice. *Higher Education*, 47(1), 283-310.
- Kim, C., Damewood, E., & Hodge, N. (2000). Professor attitude: Its effect on teaching evaluations. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(4), 458-473.
- Kreber, C., Klmpfleitner, M., McCune, V., Bayne, S., & Knottenbelt, M. (2007). What do you mean by "authentic"? A comparative review of the literature on conceptions of authenticity in teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 58(1), 22-43.
- Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*. Jossey Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- McMillan, J. H., Myran, S., & Workman, D. (2002). Elementary teachers classroom assessment and grading

- practice. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95(4), 203-213.
- Morrison, H. B. (1985). Caring teacher-pupil relationship: Feminist or phenomenological? *Viewpoints. Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.* Retrieved February 16, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/14/54/e0.pdf ERIC Number ED390860.
- Neal, K. W. (1999). Developing and sustaining teacher communities: Caring as central in teachers' negotiation of reading instruction and curriculum implementation. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association*, Point Clear, AL, November 17-19, 1999. Retrieved January 29, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/15/fa/6c.pdf ERIC Number ED436527.
- Noblit, G. W. (1993). Power and caring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 23-38.
- Noddings, N. (2001). The caring teacher. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th, pp. 99-105). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Rosiek, J. (2003). Emotional scaffolding: An exploration of the teacher knowledge at the intersection of student emotion and the subject matter. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5), 399-412.
- Sadovnik, A. R., Cookson, P. W., & Semel, S. F. (1999). *Exploring education: An introduction to the foundations of education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Scabini, E. (2000). Parent child relationships in Italian families: Connectedness and autonomy in the transition to adulthood. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 16(1), 23-30.
- Skelton, A. (2004). Understanding teaching excellence in higher education: A critical evaluation of the national teaching fellowship scheme. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 451-468.
- Skelton, A. (2005). *Understanding teaching excellence in higher education. Towards a critical approach*. London: Routledge.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Education Review*, 70(3), 370-404.
- Teven, J. J., & Macroskey, J. C. (1996). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association*, San Diego, California, November 23-26, 1996. Retrieved December 16, 2005 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/92/f8.pdf ERIC Number ED407690.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. J., Arnold, S., & Stoots, J. (1998). Identification of caring professor in teacher education programs. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Diego, California. April 13-17, 1998. Retrieved December 16, 2005 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/15/6d/62.pdf ERIC Number ED418970.
- Telli, S., den Brok, P., & Cakiroglu, J. (2007). Students' perceptions of science teachers' interpersonal behaviour in secondary schools: Development of a Turkish version of the questionnaire on teacher interaction. *Learning Environments Research*, 10(2), 115-129.
- Tomkovic, C. (2004). Ten anchor points for teaching principles of marketing. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(2), 1019-115.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A.W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.
- Vallance, R. (2000). Excellent teachers: Exploring self-constructs. Role and personal challenges. *Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE)*, Conference, Sydney 4-7, December, 2000. Retrieved February 20, 2006, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/val00341.htm>.
- Vogt, F. (2002). A caring teacher: Explorations into primary school teachers' professional identity and ethic of care. *Gender and Education*, 14(3), 251-264.
- Witcher, A., & Onwuegbuzie. (1999). Characteristics of effective teachers: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (MSERA)*, Point Clear, Alabama, November 18, 1999. Retrieved December 18, 2007, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000

019b/80/16/d8/20.pdf ERIC Number ED450079.

Weinstein, C. S. (1998). "I want to be nice, but I have to be mean," Exploring prospective teachers' conceptions of caring and order. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(2), 153-163.

Received March 29, 2006

Revision received March 10, 2008

Accepted July 23, 2008