INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT: FACULTY CARING SURVEY

Rubén Garza
   Texas State University

James P. Van Overschelde
   Texas State University

Abstract

This study focused on the development of an instrument to measure preservice teachers' perceptions of faculty behaviors that convey caring due to the unavailability of such measure and its significant link to student retention and success. A mixed method approach was used to develop a valid and reliable instrument. Qualitative data analysis, item discrimination coefficients, rank ordering of the items in terms of importance, internal consistency and reliability, and exploratory factor analysis provided evidence for a single subscale: Faculty Caring. Results identify preservice teachers' perceptions of the most important caring behaviors instructors demonstrate. Instructors' self-understanding of their caring encounters with students may provide a means for self-improvement in order to influence student success and a lens to promote positive interpersonal relationships with all students. Development of our instrument has the potential to facilitate informal or formal assessment of teacher educators' caring disposition at different higher education institutions nationally.

Keywords: caring, preservice teachers, teacher educators, teaching, instrument development

---

Caring is a topic significantly linked to student success (Garza & Huerta, 2014; Muñoz, Scoskie, & French, 2013; Walker & Gleaves, 2016) and a necessary aspect of preservice teachers' preparation (Hallam, 2009). While researchers (Ford & Ford,1989) have acknowledged that caring is a disposition instructors should convey towards their students, O'Brien (2010) affirmed, "we can and must attend solicitously to caring in our work with college students in order to maximize student learning" (p. 114). However, committee responsibilities, large classes, research, personal problems, or health and physically related issues, may interfere with our degree of caring and the importance of cultivating a welcoming environment. Although teacher educators are often faced with students who lack the necessary dispositions to be successful in the classroom (Wasicsko, n.d.)., "the act of caring and being cared for forms a loop which provides needed support to enhance student growth" (Collier, 2005, p. 358). Appropriate ways to care for others could be modeled by teacher educators (Liston & Zeichner, 1987), yet what makes caring a challenging notion is the difference of perspectives regarding this complex notion (Scarlett, Ponte, & Singh, 2009). For example, some educators might view caring as expecting students "to act or behave in certain ways if they are to be considered as thinking or acting appropriately in relation to the attempts and enactments of care" (Sinha & Thornburg, 2012, p. 28). On the other hand, students may perceive those actions as unimportant or inadequate and their response to expectations contradicts what is expected by the instructor. Given this interpretive dissonance, educators might want to reflect on their own communication and interaction with students to authentically assess the degree of caring that may influence student learning and success.

As Scarlett, Ponte, and Singh (2009) affirmed, "showing care comes in many forms, and some of these forms, may at first, appear to be the opposite of showing care" (p. 61). Therefore, what behavior should a teacher educator exhibit to be perceived as caring by students, especially when the instructor must meet the needs of unique individuals who share varied beliefs and experiences? Because of the limited research of aspiring teachers'

perceptions of caring, researchers have suggested the need to explore university students' conceptions of caring (Eisenbach, 2016; Ng et al., 2012). Specifically, Ng et al. (2012) recommended further examination of university students' perceptions of caring. In response to their call for more studies on conceptions of teacher caring, the purpose of our study was to develop an instrument to measure undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers' perceptions of instructor behaviors that demonstrated caring. Identifying teacher candidates' perceptions of caring behaviors is important for several reasons. First, positive perceptions of instructor caring have been linked to student retention and success (Crosling, Heagney, & Thomas, 2009). Next, if teacher educators want to prepare caring teachers (Ng et al., 2012), it is important for teacher candidates to also experience behaviors that reflect caring attributes. "By modeling 'care' on a consistent basis, students come to know in a real sense what the influence of caring really means" (Collier, 2005, p. 354). Finally, instructors' self-understanding of their caring encounters with students may provide a means for self-improvement in order to influence student success (Collier, 2005) and a lens to promote positive interpersonal relationships with all students. Development of our instrument could facilitate an informal or formal assessment of teacher educators' caring dispositions at different higher education institutions nationally.

Conceptual Framework

The Ethos of Caring

This study is guided by a framework on caring in higher education. Research has recognized caring as a hallmark of teaching and learning, and scholars have continued to express their conceptual views on this complex notion. While researchers agree that caring is key in establishing a relationship, their views differ (Blustein 1991; Mayeroff 1971; Noddings 2005; Pang 2005). Whereas Noddings and Pang view caring as a reciprocal act, Mayeroff and Blustein consider an individual's responsibility and professional role as influences on the extent of a caring act. According to Noddings (1984, 2005), caring is reciprocal and recognizes the necessity of gaining the trust of students as a critical aspect of the relationship. This trust, once established, supports educators' ability to develop meaningful, genuine caring relationships with students, especially when they take a genuine interest in getting to know their students beyond the academic setting (Pang, 2005). Additionally, Noddings asserts that an ethic of caring must include modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. For example, caring teachers interact positively with students, provide assistance with academic learning tasks, are available to provide assistance when needed, and show a personal interest in the student (Garza, 2009; Valverde, 2006). Being present for students also includes "practices that encourage acceptance, trust, inclusion, and openness," qualities conducive to the development of a caring relationship (O'Brien, 2010, p. 114).

Unlike Noddings (2005) who believed caring must be reciprocal in nature, Blustein (1991) recognized that a relationship consists of certain roles that may not include reciprocal behaviors. For example, a teacher-student relationship exists when the teacher is expected to care for students out of disposition and job responsibility, but the situation does not guarantee reciprocity. These relationships, determined by contextual circumstances and the reciprocity of the student, may vary in intensity. "Teachers must be able to communicate to their students that they do care about them in order for students to perceive them as caring" (Teven, 2007, p. 435). However, this may require the educator to focus on changing the self rather than trying to change how students, the cared for, respond in ways that reflect expected responses from being cared for (Sinha & Thornburg, 2012). As Garza and Huerta (2014, p.146) underpinned, "educators are charged with developing and aligning effective educational practices" with students' perceptions of caring to meet their immediate needs.

More recently, Hachey (2012) expressed that caring is a visible affective behavior complemented by positive interaction between two individuals. Similarly, Ng et al. (2012) extended this notion by defining caring as "the perception that faculty members are motivating, positive, friendly, attentive to students' needs and problems (personal, social, and intellectual), willing and able to provide advice and guidance, have [sic] good relationship with students, and demonstrate professional competence in teaching" (p. 94). Therefore, to care for people requires

an interest and action for their welfare, rather than just showing visible affection (Nieto, 2004). In other words, my espoused belief that I care for others is demonstrated through my genuine behavior and actions and not because I expect to get something in return.

Ways of Demonstrating Caring

Research has acknowledged caring as a critical disposition of effective teachers (Garza & Huerta, 2014; Katz, 2007; Lee & Ravizza, 2008; Liu & Meng, 2009) and the impact on student learning and retention. However, what also makes caring a challenging concept, is understanding how people are "differentially located in sociocultural worlds" (Gomez, Allen, & Clinton, 2004, p. 487) to respond appropriately and effectively. This differential location is likely to lead to different interpretations of what constitutes caring behaviors, but if trust is at the center of a caring relationship, the bond between student and teacher has the potential to influence teaching and learning (Kim & Schallert, 2011).

Although the link between adolescent students' success and caring has been well documented in the literature, further empirical work to understand university teacher-preparation students' perceptions of caring is needed. As de Guzman et al. (2008) emphasized, "maintaining personal interactions with students and creating a caring atmosphere is central to college teaching" (p. 498). Several empirical studies have examined university students' perspectives of caring and the instructor–student relationship in the classroom. For example, Teven and McCroskey (1997) found a strong positive correlation between perceived caring and instructor appraisal and Thweatt and McCroskey (1998) found that the more attentive instructors were to students, the more they were perceived as trustworthy and caring. In a follow-up study, Teven (2007) found that appropriate behavior and interactions that conveyed caring positively influenced students' perception of the instructor and subject matter. According to de Guzman et al. (2008), college teachers interacting frequently with students and fostering a caring environment is key to students' positive classroom experiences. Similarly, Grantham, Robinson, and Chapman (2015) reported that faculty who initiated personal and academic contact with students were perceived as caring. Komarraju, Musulkin, and Bhattacharya (2010) further reported, "students who perceive their faculty members as being approachable, respectful, and available for frequent interactions outside the classroom are more likely to report being confident of their academic skills and being motivated, both intrinsically and extrinsically" (p. 339).

In addition to the studies that investigated undergraduate students' perspectives about caring, others have focused on student teachers and university professors. For instance, Lee and Ravizza (2008) described four preservice physical education candidates' perceptions of caring and discussed the factors that contributed to their perceptual lens. Findings indicated that caring can be demonstrated through pedagogical and relational aspects: attending to instruction, engaging all students in the learning process, providing feedback, fostering a sense of community, building a student-teacher relationship, regarding students as individuals, and being objective when interacting with students. This means that caring teachers are committed to their craft and can influence students' behavior (Collier, 2005).

A significant body of research on caring has been illuminated through emotional (Chowdhry, 2014), relational (de Guzman et al., 2008; Kim & Schallert 2011; O'Keefe 2013), critical (Antrop-Gonzalez & De Jesus, 2006; Gonzalez & Ayala-Alcantar, 2008), culturally responsive (Gay, 2010), ethnic (Pizarro, 2005; Valverde, 2006), multicultural (Pang, 2005) and feminist (Noddings, 1984) lenses. Furthermore, research on caring has also examined behaviors and characteristics (Garza & Huerta, 2014; Gholami & Tirri, 2012; Teven & Gorham, 1998), facilitative instructional practices (Nieto, 2004), teaching the ethic of caring (Rabin, 2014), and moral practice (Gholami, 2011; Noddings, 2005). While caring perspectives of university students enrolled in general courses have been examined, research on preservice teachers' conceptions about caring is limited. Therefore, the current study examines preservice teachers' perceptions of instructor caring.

Methodological Considerations

We used a mixed methods approach, employing a sequential exploratory design (McMillan, 2012), because we wanted to create an instrument to measure preservice teachers' perceptions of instructor behaviors that convey caring. As Creswell (2003) points out, "this model is especially advantageous when a researcher is building a new instrument" (p. 216). In addition, mixed method "can help to explain, clarify, and extend results discovered through the use of only one research method" (Mertler, 2016, p. 257). Our quantitative data were used to inform the design of a valid caring measure as one way to examine caring and expand on the qualitative findings. Thus, we developed an instrument in two phases to identify behaviors preservice teachers perceived as caring. Purposeful sampling was used to collect qualitative data (Palinkas et al., 2015) while convenience sampling was used to collect quantitative data (McMillan, 2012).

Phase 1: Scale Development

The first phase of our scale development involved generating items to include in our instrument (DeVellis, 2003). Data for item development were obtained from student responses to an online open-ended survey. A purposeful sample of preservice graduate and undergraduate students who had not started student teaching received an email inviting them to respond to the survey approved by the university's institutional review board (IRB) and received no type of compensation for their participation. All students were enrolled in teacher preparation courses during the first summer session of an academic school year. The survey included the following open-ended statements about teacher caring: (a) Describe the different ways you show or would show your students that you care about them, (b) Describe the different ways your students might perceive you as uncaring, (c) Describe the different ways your professors seem caring toward you, and (d) Describe the different ways your professors seem uncaring toward you. These four questions guided aspiring teachers to think about what it means to care for and to be cared about, providing rich qualitative data to inform our instrument development.

Of the 1,604 possible respondents, 219 (31 males and 188 females) completed the survey. Demographics included African American (2%), Asian/Pacific Islander (5%), Hispanic/Latino (28%), Native American (1%), and White (70%).

The 219 responses to each of the four open-ended questions were analyzed using constant comparative analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to reduce concepts and to identify the properties and recurring themes that emerged. A trained research assistant analyzed the responses to the four questions and coded student comments during an initial reading and made notes as the data were interpreted. Positive and negative examples of student comments were coded to convey examples of caring and non-caring behavior. Next, using the notes generated by the research assistant, we independently analyzed the data for recurring patterns through constant comparative analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Comparing initial notes and new codes to generate an initial list of recurring statements allowed for a deeper analysis of the data. Independently, we analyzed positive and negative examples of caring behavior for emerging themes from the list of student comments. This process helped to ensure inter-coder agreement. To add credibility to our findings, we engaged in peer debriefing (McMillan, 2012) as we refined statements from the open-ended questions to reflect ways faculty members can demonstrate caring before finalizing a list of 26 items for a quantitative survey.

Pilot Test. The purpose of the pilot test (De Vellis, 2003) was to determine which of the 26 descriptive statements were most strongly perceived by preservice teachers as ways faculty may demonstrate caring. Beginning with a convenience sample of students enrolled in field-based teacher preparation classes during the spring 2014 semester, we randomly selected 119 students to participate in an online survey approved by the university's IRB. These preservice teachers were asked to rate the statements about caring using a 4-point Likert scale of Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, with no neutral response allowed. Responses were assigned values of 4, 3, 2, and 1, respectively.

Item Refinement. Using the pilot data, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the set of latent constructs underlying the responses and to isolate the items aligned with those constructs (Pazos, Micari, & Light, 2010). "Factor analysis is an essential tool in scale development" (De Vellis, 2003, p. 137). We used parallel analysis (PA) to identify the number of factors to retain. PA is an ideal methodology for selecting the number of factors because it takes into consideration sampling error by generating random datasets of similar structure and then computing eigenvalues for the real data and for the randomly generated data (Van Overschelde & Garza, 2018). Factors are retained only when the eigenvalue for the real data is greater than the eigenvalue at the 95th percentile for the randomly generated datasets. PA has been shown to be one of the most reliable and conservative methods for isolating key factors for dimension reduction (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004; Thompson & Daniel, 1996; Velicer, Eaton, & Fava, 2000). Using this methodology, the first three components were retained. A principal component analysis (PCA) with three fixed factors was then run with Promax rotation where missing values were excluded from the list. The three factors accounted for 79% of the total variance, with the individual variance percentages of 48.2%, 16.5%, and 14.2%, respectively. One item was removed at this stage because it did not load on any factor above 0.30 (Beaver et al., 2013). Each set of questions that loaded most strongly on a factor were then analyzed for internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The alpha value was noted and any question that lowered the alpha by more than 0.005 was removed (Van Overschelde & Garza, 2018), one question at a time, and the Cronbach's alpha rerun. The final alphas for the three factors were: 0.93, 0.94, and 0.89. This iterative process resulted in the removal of six additional questions. A total of 19 questions remained for use in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Scale Development

The purpose of this phase was to test the near-final scale with a sample of undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers. All preservice teachers enrolled in teacher preparation courses during the summer or fall semesters of 2017 received an email inviting them to participate in an online quantitative survey approved by the university's IRB. The same response scale and item recoding (e.g., 4 = Strongly Agree) was used as during Phase 1.

Sample. Of the 789 preservice teachers emailed, 172 (22%) responded to the survey request. The demographic characteristics of the sample were similar to the demographics of the teacher preparation population. For example, the sample was 31% Latino/a, 58% White, 84% Female, and 49% early childhood through Grades 6 (EC-6), whereas the population in our teacher preparation program is 36% Latino/a, 53% White, 76% Female, and 40% EC-6, respectively. Table 1 provides demographic characteristics of the preservice teachers who completed the survey during Phase 2.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Phase 2 Sample Participants (N = 172)

Characteristics	n	%
Ethnicity		
Black	9	5%
Hispanic/Latino/a	62	31%
Other	12	6%
White	114	58%
Gender		
Female	145	84%
Male	27	16%
Academic Levels		
Sophomore	12	7%
Junior	55	32%
Senior	81	47%
Graduate or Post-Baccalaureate	24	14%
Type of Certification		
Early Childhood – Grade 6	84	49%
Grades 4-8	15	9%
Secondary (e.g., Math, English)	47	27%
Special Education	14	8%
Other – All level (e.g., Art, Physical Education)	12	7%

Data Analysis and Results.

Table 2 shows the percentage of preservice teachers who strongly agreed the behavior reflected teacher caring in the classroom during Phase 2.

Table 2
Frequency Item Analysis of Perceived Caring Behaviors during Phase 2 (N = 172)

Item	Item #	n	Strongly Agree	%
Is willing to help me	14	164	155	95%
Is encouraging in class	22	164	152	93%
Is patient with me	9	170	152	89%
Ensures that I understand material in class	20	164	145	88%
Listens to me in class	6	170	150	88%
Is approachable	19	164	144	88%
Is enthusiastic about his/her teaching	11	164	143	87%
Is fair with me	17	164	139	85%
Is available during office hours	15	164	136	83%
Is open to questions in class	21	164	136	83%
Is prepared for class	13	164	135	82%
Provides constructive feedback on assignments	4	172	138	80%
Provides positive reinforcement	2	172	137	80%
Interacts personally with me in the classroom	3	172	132	77%
Is available for extra help when needed	16	164	125	76%
Respects my opinions	1	172	128	74%
Returns graded assignments in a timely manner	5	170	114	67%
Is flexible	18	164	101	62%

Item Refinement. Using the caring survey data from Phase 2, an EFA was again conducted to identify the set of latent constructs underlying the responses and to isolate the items aligned with those constructs. This second EFA was performed because six items had been removed during the EFA for the Pilot phase. We again used PA to identify the appropriate number of factors to retain and one factor was retained. A principal component analysis with one fixed factor was then run with Promax rotation where missing values were excluded from the list. One item was removed because it did not load on the factor above 0.30. The factor loadings are in Table 3. A principal component analysis with no factor restriction was run to determine the percentage of variance accounted for by this one factor; the variance was 79%. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling size adequacy was 0.76, indicating the sample size was sufficiently large.

The resulting 18 items were then analyzed for reliability using Cronbach's alpha. No item caused the alpha to decrease by more than 0.005. The final alpha was 0.85. Table 3 shows the factor loadings for each of the final items, with all loadings above 0.3.

Table 3
Pattern Matrix Factor Loadings of Perceived Caring Behaviors during Phase 2 (N = 172)

Item	Factor 1
Respects my opinions	0.485
Provides positive reinforcement	0.600
Interacts personally with me in the classroom	0.402
Provides constructive feedback on assignments	0.441
Returns graded assignments in a timely manner	0.452
Listens to me in class	0.508
Is patient with me	0.633
Is enthusiastic about his/her teaching	0.331
Is prepared for class	0.418
Is willing to help me	0.533
Is available during office hours	0.462
Is available for extra help when needed	0.540
Is fair with me	0.498
Is flexible	0.503
is approachable	0.523
Ensures that I understand material in class	0.711
Is open to questions in class	0.635
Is encouraging in class	0.580

Discussion

While previous research has discussed teacher caring from different perspectives, the purpose of our study was to develop an instrument to examine preservice teachers' perceptions of caring by university faculty – the Faculty Caring Survey (FCS – Appendix A). The development of the FCS involved several stages. The items used in the FCS were generated during Phase 1 by preservice teachers as examples of behaviors they believe showed that faculty members care for them and examples of behaviors they would use to show their students they were cared for by them. Therefore, the instrument has content validity (DeVellis, 2003).

After pilot and Phase 2 testing, we determined the FCS can be effectively summarized using a single factor that accounted for 79% of the variance. The single factor showed high internal consistency (0.85). The results of our study highlight the behaviors university preservice teachers perceive as ways a faculty member demonstrates caring.

Our study expands the discourse on student perceptions of teacher caring by including undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers' voices and identifying the critical nature of those conceptions. Our results, consistent with other studies, support the need for faculty to cultivate responsive relationships and an inclusive classroom environment, keys in helping students succeed at the university level (Cooper & Miness, 2014; Kim & Schallert, 2011; Komarraju et al., 2010; Teven & Gorham, 1998; Thayer & Bacon, 1996a). Results indicated that undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers perceived some behaviors as the most important aspects of a caring instructor. Two items, *Is willing to help me* and *Is in encouraging in class* were perceived by more than 90% of the participants as positive examples of caring. This indicates the need for faculty to validate student needs as a way to demonstrate caring (Ng et al., 2012). Thus, a caring instructor is someone who regards a student as an individual rather than another body in the classroom and is empathic when personal challenges emerge. Students perceive a caring instructor as an individual who provides scaffolding during instruction and conveys a genuine interest and enthusiasm during instruction.

Limitations

Our study is limited by a sample from one large public university with data gathered from predominantly White undergraduate female preservice teachers in one educator preparation program. Although the teaching field consists of largely White females (Ingersoll & May, 2011), including a more diverse ethnic distribution might provide additional behaviors that were not mentioned initially. In addition, the results are dependent on the preservice teachers' willingness to complete the online surveys. "Volunteer samples may respond differently than non-volunteers" because of their motivation to participate (McMillan, 2012, p. 110). Participants in other educator preparation programs and geographical areas might encounter a different set of student characteristics, circumstances, and preparation experiences that may influence their perceptions of caring by their instructors. Also, since our instrument was informed by preservice teachers, perhaps the list of items might have been more extensive if practicing teachers had been surveyed during the qualitative phase of the instrument development. Being a classroom teacher provides different experiences than learning about teaching and what it means to care for students. Although our findings add to the research on caring by illuminating preservice teachers' perceptions of teacher behaviors that convey caring, our interpretation of the findings are based on classroom experiences of undergraduate and graduate teacher candidates' learning to become teachers. Therefore, caution should be taken when generalizing the results from this study to teacher educators and undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers in other preparation programs. Because instructors and preservice teachers are not homogeneous, caution must be exercised not to generalize these findings as absolute ways that university instructors demonstrate care for students.

Conclusions and Implications

In spite of the limitations of this study, the results of our study expand on research examining students' perceptions of caring (Ng et al., 2012) and support the need to cultivate positive caring experiences for students. Instructor caring, in concert with other research (Crosling et al., 2009), has the potential to affect student retention and success. Our FCS merits consideration as an important topic for teacher educators to consider, especially when they teach a diverse population of students. Encouraging faculty members to examine their own notions of caring merits further research consideration. As Collier (2005) reported, student success may also be contingent on faculty understanding of how to adequately care for their students.

Our results may be used as a springboard for dialogue among university faculty to consider the dynamics of caring for diverse students and assessing their beliefs with that of students' perceptions. As Gomez et al. (2004, p. 487) suggested, "teacher education at-large also should take up care as an important topic – a topic which asks students to examine not only what their ideals of care are, but also could support them in examining how their ideals have developed from their own positions, often privileged ones related to class, race, sexual orientation ability, and language background."

Other teacher educators and practitioners such as, mentor teachers, administrators, district supervisors, and university supervisors may find merit in these results because they provide a description of what current aspiring

teachers perceive as ways to be cared about. The notion of preservice teachers' perceptions of caring behaviors also deserves further examination to determine whether these behaviors are unique to our setting or representative of other aspiring teacher candidates in different university settings. Whereas most of our participants were White, a more diverse sample could perceive different behaviors as more important aspects of caring. In addition, comparing perceptions of undergraduate and graduate students in education to non-education students might reveal some interesting results, especially because caring is highlighted in much of the education pedagogy.

According to McNamee, Mercurio, and Peloso (2007), "caring is a deliberate moral and intellectual stance rather than simply feeling" because it involves action and a complementary behavior (p. 278). Our FCS can be used as a formal or informal assessment of faculty's caring disposition in other educator preparation programs. For example, an instructor can involve his/her students in assessing the degree of caring via our instrument and use data to reflect on the results and perhaps become a more culturally responsive professional. As a result, fostering a sense of belonging and better relationships with students, motivating them to attend class more, and creating positive schooling experiences (Garza & Huerta, 2014) may be an outcome of thoughtfully integrating our results with one's practice. Being consciously aware of how students respond to faculty behavior and actions can be a way for educators to reflect on their own verbal and nonverbal interaction with students to authentically assess the quality and degree of caring. In doing so, "teacher educators may in turn create teachers who care more about the effects of their teaching practices on students" (Dunn & Rakes, 2010, p. 520). The challenge is to be able to respond to students in ways that they perceive as meaningful and appropriate rather than what is easier for us as faculty members.

References

Antrop-Gonzalez, R., & De Jesus, A. (2006). Toward a theory of critical care in urban small school reform: Examining structures and pedagogies of caring in two Latino community-based schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(4), 409-433.

Beaver, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K., Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L. (2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational research. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 18*(6), 1-13.

Blustein, J. (1991). *Caring and commitment: Taking the personal point of view*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chowdhry, S. (2014). The caring performance and the 'blooming student': Exploring the emotional labour of further education lecturers in Scotland. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, *66*(4), 554-571.

Collier, M. (2005). An ethic of caring: The fuel for high teacher efficacy. *The Urban Review*, *37*(4), 351-359.

Cooper, K. S., & Miness, A. (2014). The co-creation of caring student-teacher relationships: Does teacher understanding matter? *The High School Journal, 97*(4), 264-290.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crosling, G., Heagney, M., & Thomas, L. (2009). Improving student retention in higher education: Improving teaching and learning. *Australian Universities' Review, 51*(2), 9-18.

de Guzman, A. B., Uy, M. M., Siy, E. Y., Torres, R. K. C., Tancioco, J. B. F., & Hernandez, J. R. (2008). 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. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *9*(4), 487-502.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dunn, K. E., & Rakes, G. C. (2010). Producing caring qualified teachers: An exploration of the influence of preservice teacher concerns on learner-centeredness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(3), 516-521.

Eisenbach, B. B. (2016). A conversation of care: Unpacking and engaging preservice teacher ideologies. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*. *89*(6), 223-227.

Ford, J., & Ford, S. S. (1989). A caring attitude and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *9*(2), 43-48.

Garza, R. (2009). Latino and white high school students' perceptions of caring behaviors: Are we culturally responsive to our students? *Urban Education*, *44*(3), 297-321.

Garza, R., & Huerta, M. E. S. (2014). Latino high school students' perceptions of caring: Keys to success. *Journal of Latinos in Education*, *13*(2), 134-151.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gholami, K. (2011). Moral care and caring pedagogy: Two dimensions of teachers' praxis. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *19*(1), 133-151.

Gholami, K. & Tirri, K. (2012). Caring teaching as a moral practice: An exploratory study on perceived dimensions of caring teaching. *Education Research International, 2012*(954274),1-8.

Gomez, M. L., Allen, A., & Clinton, K. (2004). Cultural models of care in teaching: A case study of one preservice secondary teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(5), 473-488.

Gonzalez, R., & Ayala-Alcantar, C. U. (2008). Critical caring: Dispelling Latino stereotypes among preservice teachers. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(2), 129-143.

Grantham, A., Robinson, E. E., & Chapman, D. (2015). ¨That truly meant a lot to me": A qualitative examination of meaningful faculty-student interactions. *College Teaching*, *63*(3), 125-132.

Hachey, A. C. (2012). Care from a cognitive perspective. *Knowledge Quest*, *40*(4), 39-44.

Hallam, M. K. (2009). Why teacher dispositions are a crucial aspect of student success. *The Language Educator*. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/files/TLE_Jan09_Article.pdf

Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(2), 191-205.

Ingersoll, R., & May, H. (2011). *Recruitment, retention and the minority teacher shortage*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium of Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/recruitment-retention-and-minority-teacher-shortage

Katz, M. S. (2007). Competing conceptions of caring and teaching ethics to prospective teachers. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, *2007*, 128-135.

Kim, M., & Schallert, D. L. (2011). Building caring relationships between a teacher and students in a teacher preparation program word-by-word, moment-by-moment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(7), 1059-1067.

Komarraju, M., Musulkin, S., & Bhattacharya, G. (2010). Role of student-faculty interactions in developing college students' academic self-concept, motivation, and achievement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(3), 332-342.

Lee, O., & Ravizza, D. (2008). Physical education preservice teachers' conception of caring. *Education*, *128*(3), 460-742,

Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1987). Reflective teacher education and moral deliberation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(6), 2-8.

Liu, S., & Meng, L. (2009). Perceptions of teachers, students and parents of the characteristics of good teachers: A cross-cultural comparison of China and the United States. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(4), 313-328.

Mayeroff, M. (1971). *On caring*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

McMillan, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

McNamee, A., Mercurio, M., & Peloso, J. M. (2007). Who cares about caring in early childhood teacher education programs? *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 28*(3), 277-288.

Mertler, C. A. (2016). *Introduction to educational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Muñoz, M. A., Scoskie, J. R., & French, D. L. (2013). Investigating the "black box" of effective teaching: The relationship between teachers' perception and student achievement in a large urban district. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *25*(3), 205-230.

Ng, P., Su, X. S., Chan, V., Leung, H., Cheung, W., & Tsun, A. (2012). The reliability and validity of a campus caring instrument developed for undergraduate students in Hong Kong. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 46*(2), 80-100.

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed). New York, NY: Allyn and Bacon.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge of care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

O'Brien, L. M. (2010). Points of departure. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 109-115.

O'Keefe, P. (2013). A sense of belonging: Improving student retention. *College Student Journal*, *47*(4), 605-613.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services, 42*(5), 533-544.

Pang, V. O. (2005). *Multicultural education: A caring-centered reflective approach*. NewYork, NY: McGraw Hill.

Pazos, P., Micari, M., & Light, G. (2010). Developing an instrument to characterize peer-led groups in collaborative learning environments: Assessing problem-solving approach and group interaction. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(2), 191-208.

Pizarro, M. (2005). *Chicanas and Chicanos in schools*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Rabin, C. (2014). Don't throw the rocks!: Cultivating care with a pedagogy called rocks-in-the-basket. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *28*(2), 145-161.

Scarlett, W. G., Ponte, C. I., & Singh, J. P. (2009). *Approaches to behavior and classroom management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sinha, S., & Thornburg, D. (2012). The caring teacher-student relationship in public education. *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice*, *25*(1), 23-30.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Teven, J. J. (2007). Teacher caring and classroom behavior: Relationships with student affect and perceptions of teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication Quarterly*, *55*(4), 433-450.

Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education*, *46*(1), 1-9.

Teven, J. J., & Gorham, J. (1998). A qualitative analysis of low-inference student perceptions of teacher caring and non-caring behaviors within the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, *15*(3), 288-298.

Thayer-Bacon, B. J., & Bacon, C. S. (1996a). Caring professors. *The Journal of Education*, *45*(4), 255-269.

Thompson, B., & Daniel, L. G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56,* 197-208.

Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, *47*, 348-358.

Valverde, L. A. (2006). *Creating new schools for Mexican Latinos*. MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Van Overschelde, J. P., & Garza, R. (2018). Understanding the under-representation of Hispanic students in teacher preparation. *Journal of Latinos and Education*.

Velicer, W. F., Eaton, C. A., & Fava, J. L. (2000). Construct explication through factor or component analysis: A review and evaluation of alternative procedures for determining the number of factors or components. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy* (pp. 41-71). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Walker, C., & Gleaves, A. (2016). Constructing the caring higher education teacher: A theoretical framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *54*, 65-76.

Wasicsko, M. M. (n.d). *The national network for the study of educator dispositions*. College of Education, Eastern Kentucky University.

Appendix A
Faculty Caring Survey

Research has illuminated the importance of caring in the classroom, but it is unclear if teachers perceive caring in the same way that students do. Therefore, we would like to know the degree to which the following teacher behaviors are ways caring might be demonstrated in the classroom. Please volunteer to complete this anonymous survey.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree that the behaviors described below represent caring.

A	B	C	D
Strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree

1. Respects my opinions.
2. Provides positive reinforcement.
3. Interacts personally with me in the classroom.
4. Provides constructive feedback on assignments.
5. Returns graded assignments in a timely manner.
6. Listens to me in class
7. Is patient with me.
8. Is enthusiastic about his/her teaching.
9. Is prepared for class.
10. Is willing to help me
11. Is available during office hours.
12. Is available for extra help when needed.
13. Is fair with me.
14. Is flexible.
15. Is approachable
16. Ensures that I understand material in class.
17. Is open to questions in class.
18. Is encouraging in class.