Organizational trust of faculty members and its relationship to team-building capacity and teaching effectiveness

Beverly M. Addun, PhD

Associate Professor, Cagayan State University

ABSTRACT: This study was an investigation of the organizational trust of faculty members of a university in the Philippines and its relationship to their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. It uses a quantitative design utilizing the descriptive-correlational method. The respondents of this study were dominantly female, in their middle adulthood and master's degree holders. Their average length of service in the university is almost two decades. The study concludes that the university under study has a promising instructional staff imbued with high level of organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. Altogether, they exhibit positive attitude such as high morale, effective task performance and a clear relevance to the university as they work interdependently, are committed to common goals, and produce very good instructional performance. The study has proven that a major factor that influences the team building capacity of the faculty members is their organizational trust. This shows that there is indeed a positive or direct relationship between organizational trust and team building capacity. However, the study disproves some studies claiming the direct relationship between organizational trust and teaching effectiveness. Interestingly, the only demographic variable that influences organizational trust of teachers is their length of service. But with respect to teaching effectiveness, the study concludes that sex, age, and educational attainment of teachers are factors that influence teachers' level of teaching effectiveness. Essentially, male, young and those with lower educational attainment are teachers who have higher teaching effectiveness. Finally, the study has demonstrated that team building capacity is not influenced or has no positive relations with the teachers' sex, age, educational attainment, academic rank and length of service.

Keywords: Organizational trust, Team Building Capacity, teaching effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive environment, one of the foremost conditions required for organizations to be able to sustain their presence and ensure their productivity is their ability to provide an environment of trust that allows employees to actively participate in accomplishing its vision, mission, goals and objectives. Such is the reason why organizational trust plays a very critical role in the growth and development of any institution. Due to its high potential to provide organizational productivity, its presence and continuous nourishment in any organization is, without a doubt, very indispensable. When

trust is established in the organization, positive employee behaviors are ensured manifested through cooperative behavior, organizational commitment, favorable identification with the organization, and reduction of dysfunctional conflict.

A lack of trust, on the other hand, generates antisocial work behavior that is harmful to co-workers teamwork and is financially counterproductive for the organization. In his research, Zand (2012) has shown that in groups where the level of trust is high, individuals' skills for elucidating and clarifying objectives and problems were higher, and that they were able to generate distinctly higher number of alternatives compared to groups with low levels of trust. Suspicion dominates in an environment lacking trust, which in turn leads to individuals evading each other. Those working in organizations with low levels of trust are subject to stress, and they feel the need to continuously look out for themselves and to justify the validity of the decisions they make. In this context, it is considered that in organizations with a low level of trust, it becomes difficult for employees to use initiative and to make effective decisions by evaluating alternatives in a sound fashion.

The presence of organizational trust has manifold influence in the employees' behavior. One behavior that can be harnessed with the presence of organizational trust is the development of teamwork. Development of teamwork behavior is in part, a result of high organizational trust. Teamwork is a symbiotic process which leads to a much better result that is greater than the integration of individual performances. Effective teams are the ones that produce high quality results and succeed in spite of many difficulties and differences.

As compared in the past decades, organizations are increasingly relying on team-based work structures to accomplish organizational goals, as teams have been argued to potentially overcome complex problems more effectively than individuals working alone. Effective teams have come to be considered as a central element in the functioning of organizations. This has been facilitated, at least partly, by a series of studies reporting the positive relations between team-based working and the quality of products and services offered by an organization. Teams provide diversity in knowledge, attitudes, skills and experience, whose integration makes it possible to offer rapid, flexible and innovative responses to problems and challenges, promoting performance and improving the satisfaction of those making up the team. This is the result of what has been called *the wisdom of crowds*: increased capacity for achieving various types of performance made possible by the interaction of team members (Salas, Rosen, Burke & Goodwin, 2009). Thus, the success of organizations and the overall production of knowledge depend to a large extent on the effectiveness of teams.

Another employee behavior that can be affected by organizational trust is the employees' performance. In the case of teaching, performance is reflected in the teachers' teaching effectiveness. High teaching effectiveness is also in part, a result of high organizational trust. The perception of trust by teachers will result in better teaching effectiveness because committed teachers align themselves with the goals and values of the organization, want the best for the organization, and tend to show the best of organizational citizenship behavior. That is, inner desire of faculty members to perform tasks beyond what the organization expects.

Given the foregoing importance of organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness, there is however, scant studies determining the nexus or link of these variables. According to Dirks and Ferrin's (2012) research endeavors should be directed to subordinates' trust in organization because of the paucity of research devoted to subordinates' trust in organization and its effect on subordinates' intentions and behaviors such as teamwork and job performance.

Considering the constantly changing environment in today's educational landscape, investigating the effect of teachers' trust in organization and its impact on their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness is also required. Hence, this study on finding the relationship between organizational trust of faculty members of Cagayan State University with their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness has been conceptualized. By determining the relationship of these variables, the researcher shall be able to prove whether or not organizational trust of teachers have great influence on their organizational intentions and behaviors particularly along their teamwork ability and teaching effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

This study made used of quantitative design. Specifically, it utilized the descriptive-correlational method. The descriptive part of the study revolved around the determination of the faculty members' level of organizational trust and team building capacity as well as their teaching effectiveness in the different campuses of Cagayan State University. The correlational part is reflected in the investigation of the relationship between organizational trust of the respondents and their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness as well as the relationship between the profile variables and the respondents' organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness.

The study was conducted in the eight campuses of Cagayan State University in the whole province of Cagayan. The respondents of the study were the faculty members and different college deans in the forty two (42) colleges in the whole university. Complete enumeration was done for the college deans and faculty members. Only the regular faculty members were considered in the study with at least five years in the service. The reason for pegging five years of service is in consideration of the fact that it takes years to develop organizational trust and team building capacity.

Three standardized instruments were used in this study. To measure organizational trust, the Organizational Trust Scale (OTS) was utilized. The OTS has been developed by Katie Delahaye Paine in 2006. The scale has six dimensions – organizational integrity (items 1-4); organizational dependability (items 5-8); organizational control mutuality (items 9-12); organizational satisfaction (items 13-16); organizational commitment (items 17-20); and organizational communal relations (items 21-24).

On the other hand, team building capacity was measured using the Team Building Capacity Questionnaire (TBCQ) crafted by Stonecoast Group in 2009. The three areas of team building capacity that were determined in this instrument are

knowledge of procedures and policies (items 1-6); contribution to team effectiveness and discussions (items 7-13); and working out team conflict (items 14-20).

Finally, teaching effectiveness was measured using the NBC 461 Evaluation for Teachers. This is the prescribed evaluation instrument to all State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines. This instrument measures four dimensions of teaching effectiveness namely, commitment (items 1-5); knowledge of subject matter (items 6-10); teaching for independent learning (items 11-15); and management of learning (16-20). All the instruments use 5-point Likert-type scale.

To enable the researcher to tally, tabulate, compute, analyze and interpret the data gathered, the following statistical treatments were used: Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the profile, level of organizational trust, team building capacity as well as the teaching effectiveness of the faculty members. These include frequency count, percentage and mean. To determine the significant difference in the organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness of the faculty members when grouped according to campus assignment, One-way ANOVA was used. However, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to investigate the relationship between organizational trust of the respondents and their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness as well as the relationship between the profile variables and the respondents' organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. Finally, the hypotheses in the study were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the profile of the 218 faculty respondents. It shows that there are 119 or 54.6 percent females and 99 or 45.6 percent males. Such reveals that majority of the respondents are female. With respect to age, their mean age is 44.61 which means that they are middle adulthood stage. However, a closer look of their age reveals that 38 or 17.4 percent are aged 46-50, 33 or 15.2 have ages ranging from 56-60 and 32 or 14.7 percent are aged 41-44. The youngest respondents constitute 3 or 1.4 percent whose ages fall between 21-25 years.

In terms of educational attainment, majority of the faculty respondents are master's degree holders constituting 126 or 57.8 percent. This is followed by doctorate degree holders constituting 89 or 40.8 percent and 3 or 1.4 percent are bachelors degree graduate. As to academic rank, most of the respondents are holders of Assistant Professor positions (95 or 43.5 percent), followed by Associate Professors 69 or 31.7 percent and 40 or 18.3 percent instructors. Only 14 or 6.4 percent of the respondents are holders of professorial positions.

Finally, it terms of length of service, the average length of service of the respondents is 18 years. The bulk of the respondents constituting 60 or 27.5 percent have rendered 6-10 years followed by 47 or 21.5 percent having rendered 11-15 years. This is followed by 34 or 15.8 percent respondents rendering services from 26-30 years and 28 or 12.8 percent having served the university between 31-35 years. Only 13 or 6 percent have rendered 1-5 years and 2 or 1 percent have served the university for 41-45 years.

Table 1. Profile of the Faculty Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Sex		
Male	99	45.4
Female	119	54.6
Age		
21 – 25	3	1.4
26 – 30	23	10.5
31 – 35	31	14.3
36 – 40	23	10.6
41 – 45	32	14.7
46 – 50	38	17.4
51 – 55	25	11.6
56 – 60	33	15.2
61 – 65	10	4.6
	Mean = 44.61	SD = 10.51
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's degree	3	1.4
Master's Degree	126	57.8
Doctorate Degree	89	40.8
Academic Rank		
Instructor	40	18.3
Assistant Professor	95	43.6
Associate Professor	69	31.7
Professor	14	6.4
Length of Service		
1 – 5	13	6
6 – 10	60	27.5
11 – 15	47	21.5
16 – 20	16	7.4
21 – 25	15	7
26 – 30	34	15.8
31 – 35	28	12.8
36 – 40	18	8.2
41 – 45	2	1
	Mean = 18.33	SD = 11.19

One of the key variables in this investigation is the determination of the organization trust of the faculty members using the Organizational Trust Scale (OTS). In this study, organization trust means the employees' or group's confidence that the organization is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2009). In this study, organizational trust was measured using the Organizational Trust Scale (OTS) developed by Katie Delahaye Paine in 2006.

The scale has six dimensions – organizational integrity; organizational dependability; organizational control mutuality; organizational satisfaction; organizational commitment; and organizational communal relations

Table 2 shows that the weighted mean of the different dimensions are as follows: *organizational integrity* (3.76-high), *organizational dependability* (3.69-high), *organizational control mutuality* (3.62-high), *organizational satisfaction* (3.59-high), *organizational commitment* (3.76-high) and *organizational communal relations* (3.73-high). The overall weighted mean of all the six dimensions is **3.69** which means that the organizational trust of the respondents is **High**.

The high organizational trust of the faculty members of Cagayan State University indicates that they are confident to their university because it is perceived to be dependable, benevolent, competent, honest, and open. Katie Delahaye Paine (2003) opined that dependability and honesty/openness of the officials is reflected in the ability of school administrators to do what they say and act consistently and dependably. It also evidenced in the competence of officials to share accurate information that is sincerely and appropriately communicated to the employees for proper action.

The benevolence of the university can be reflected from the high monetary incentives that it grants to its employees such as Collective Negotiations Agreement (CNA), sports allowance, and the like which is usually given every December. It must be emphasized that CSU is an envy of numerous agencies during December because of the grant of high incentives which started in 2006.

In addition, the university is also perceived to be reliable because the faculty members can depend on it in time of emergency. Practices on the grant of monetization in matters when faculty members need money for operation and other immediate family needs can bear witness to the dependability of the university for its employees. Approval of requests regarding this matter is not made difficult and budgetary appropriation is requested to the Department of Budget and Management.

Table 2. Organizational trust of the faculty members as perceived by themselves and their College Deans

Indicators	Deans	Faculty	
	Weigh- ted Mean	Weigh- ted Mean	Average
Organizational Integrity	**3.84** **(High)**	**3.68** **(High)**	**3.76** **(High)**
Organizational dependability	**3.70** **(High)**	**3.67** **(High)**	**3.69** **(High)**
Organizational Control Mutuality	**3.57** **(High)**	**3.67** **(High)**	**3.62** **(High)**
Organizational Satisfaction	**3.58** **(High)**	**3.60** **(High)**	**3.59** **(High)**
Organizational commitment	*3.80* **(High)**	*3.72* **(High)**	*3.76* **(High)**
Organizational communal relations	*3.73* (High)	*3.74* (High)	*3.73* (High)
Overall Category Mean	**3.70** (High)	**3.68** (High)	**3.69** **(High)**

Significantly, the faculty members see the university to have openness and honesty. Openness is seen in the transparency of transactions in the university operations. One proof of the management's transparency for its operations is

the transparency seal, in which case, all transactions that pass-through Bids and Awards Committee are posted in the CSU website. The Citizens Charter is also another vehicle for transparency whereby all transactions are determined in terms of its flow chart. Time frame and responsible persons are determined by the clients and therefore they know who are held liable for transactions that are not delivered well and on time. The presence of complaint's desk per campus is also one proof of transparency. Internal and external clients can make complaints should services are not given appropriately. All complaints must be given attention and solution by responsible officials because this is evaluated by the Civil Service Commission.

A closer look at Table 2 reveals that among the dimensions of organizational trust, organizational integrity obtained the highest weighted mean (3.76-High). According to Rogers and Riddles (2006) organizational integrity means adhering to a code of ethics or a set of values, and it is a vital aspect of every personal and professional endeavor. It means matching our actions with our beliefs across a variety of situations. Integrity, as a measure of coherence and consistency, is key to building and sustaining trust. We trust those who are honest and consistent in their actions, who fully disclose important information, who are willing to deal with tough issues, and who are open about their objectives and motives

The high weighted mean of the teachers along organizational integrity connotes that *CSU as an organization has behavior that is guided by sound principles* (3.79-high). Sound principles means that the university is practicing sensible and acceptable management and governance. This can be reflected in treating its employees fairly and justly. Faculty members of CSU believe that their top managers, middle level supervisors as well as their colleagues handle their work issues fairly and justly. Their work problems and issues are handled based on the governing policies, rules and guidelines of the university. This finding of the study affirms numerous studies like that of Bidault and Jarillo (2007) showing that employee's organizational trust is directly correlated to the quality of the relationship between a manager and his/her employee. They opined that employees become distrusting to organization and frequently look for another job when this relationship does not exist.

Moreover, the high organizational integrity of the university may also mean that *CSU organization makes an important decision, faculty members know that it will be for their best interest and welfare* (3.76-high). They perceive that the university allows its faculty and personnel associations both at the university and campus level to make negotiations for the interest and welfare of their members. In making negotiations with management, CSU officials listen to their "voices" and make decisions that are favorable to the management and employees as well. In short, it can be said that in making major decisions, *CSU is also perceived not to mislead its employees* (3.72-high).

According to social exchange theory Blau (2006) and Whitener et al. (2009), among others, information, advice, social support and recognition are important means in trust building, which is created by repeated interactions and reciprocity. As this is the case, all of these elements are seen in the university thus, the faculty members are able to nourish high trust to CSU.

The communal relations as a dimension of organizational trust having obtained the second highest weighted mean reveals that the *faculty members consider their organization to be very helpful to their own growth* (3.87-high); *they also believe that their university helps them without expecting anything in return* (3.70-high); *they feel that CSU does not take advantage of their vulnerability and their university is very concerned about their welfare* (3.69-high).

The belief of the faculty members that CSU is helpful in their growth means that the university plays a critical role in their personal and professional development. This fact is reflected in the seminars, trainings and conferences that teachers

are allowed to attend and participate. Their personal development is also enhanced with some religious, socio-cultural and sports activities that they are able to enjoy as they stay in the university. Meanwhile, the belief of the teachers that the university extends help to them without expecting anything in return makes them feel that CSU does not pressure or exact much outputs from them. They feel that they can work at their pace without so many demands and stressful deadlines from management. In short, they just feel that the pressure on them is just enough unlike some organization wherein teachers are treated like "robots" with management demanding so much from them as they could.

Finally, the organizational dependability as a dimension of organization trust having a weighted mean of 3.69 (high) manifests that the *faculty members are very willing to let their university make decisions for them and they feel that their organization does not take advantage of them* (3.75-high). Such indicator suggests the teachers' confidence that indeed their university has great concern on them. They concern for the employees is reflected in the feelings of caring, empathy, tolerance and safety. Additionally, the teachers also believe on the sincere and sustained efforts of the management to understand and contribute to high levels of productivity in their relationships.

Finally, the high organizational dependability of the teachers manifests that *CSU can be relied on to keep its promises* (3.63-high); *and they think that their university takes their opinions into account when making critical decisions* (3.62-high). These statements suggest that the university is democratic in its process because critical decisions are discussed. The presence of planning and performance review per college and per campus can be a good evidence for this. With the current implementation of the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS), planning becomes bottom to top and vice versa. In here, critical decisions are planned and shared by the faculty members and the management most especially with respect to the number of outputs and the directions of the college and campus.

Level of Organizational Trust of Faculty Members as Assessed by the Deans and Faculty Members Themselves

Table 3 reveals the level of organizational trust of the faculty as perceived by the faculty themselves and their deans. This is based on the frequency and percentage of respondents who have been rated with their organizational trust ranging from very low to very high organizational trust. Of the 218 faculty respondents, 104 or 47.70% have been rated to have **high** organizational trust having scores between 73-96 points.

Meanwhile, 73 or 35.50% obtained **very high** organizational trust having scores ranging from 97-124. There were also 38 or 17.40% whose organizational trust rating is **moderate** as their scores are between 49-72 and 3 or 1.40% have been rated to have **low** organizational trust having obtained scores between 24-48 points.

Table 3. Level of organizational trust of the faculty as perceived by the faculty themselves and their dean

Level of Organizational Trust	Frequency	Percentage
Low (24 – 48)	3	1.4
Moderate (49 – 72)	38	17.4
High (73 – 96)	104	47.7
Very High (97 – 124)	73	33.5
Total	**218**	**100**

The high organizational trust of the faculty members indicates that they have high commitment to their university believing that their relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote. In short, they feel and believe that CSU is an organization of integrity marked by fairness and justice. It is an organization that will do what it says it will do and it is an institution that acts consistently and dependably.

Moreover, the high organizational trust of the faculty members make them think that their officials and colleagues provide benefits for each other because they are concerned for each other's welfare and interest. Their relationship operates under mutuality in which they agree on who has rightful power to influence one another. Altogether, these suggest that there is a high level of satisfaction on the part of the faculty members because they have favorable attitude toward their university because positive expectations about the relationship are reinforced.

According to Baier (2004), organizational trust is likened to both glue and a lubricant. As glue, it binds leaders and employees together. Thus, trust is essential to maintaining cohesive relationships and fostering effective cooperation. To be productive and to accomplish shared goals, organizations need cohesive and cooperative relationships (Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 2006). As a lubricant, organizational trust greases the machinery of an organization. It facilitates communication and greater efficiency is created when people can have confidence in other people's words and deeds (Arrow, 2008). Without trust, conflict and heat are generated which bog down the work of the organization. Leaders need follower's trust to foster communication and facilitate effectiveness.

Team Building Capacity of Faculty Members as Assessed by the Deans and the Faculty Members Themselves

Another very significant variable that is investigated in this study is the team building capacity of the faculty members. Team building capacity refers to the ability of the faculty members to contribute to a productive and motivating team environment with both their colleagues and college dean. In this study, team building capacity was measured using the Team Building Capacity Questionnaire (TBCQ) crafted by Stonecoast Group in 2009. The three areas of team building capacity that were determined in this instrument are knowledge of procedures and policies; contribution to team effectiveness and discussions; and working out team conflict.

Table 4 presents the level of team building capacity of the faculty members. Results show that the ratings of the deans and the faculty members to themselves in the three dimensions have a general weighted mean of **3.80** with an adjectival value of **High**. This finding shows that the faculty members have high ability to contribute to a productive and motivating team environment in their colleges, campuses and university at large. Congruently, CSU as an organization has also a high team environment enabling its faculty members to help contribute in the accomplishment of the university vision, mission, goals and objectives.

The productivity and good team climate of the faculty can be attested by the accreditation status that all degree programs of the university have achieved. It must be noted that all programs of the university in all campuses have been accredited or reaccredited under AACCUP and this can be attributed to the effort of the teachers. Moreover, the fact that formal cases are rare in each college/campus is a manifestation that teachers and administrators are able to work out their team conflicts healthily and there is team effectiveness in what they are committed to do.

It is also very vivid in Table 4 that the order of weighted means obtained by the three dimensions of team building capacity is as follows: *knowledge of procedures and policies* (3.87-High); *working out team conflicts* (3.83-High) and *contribution to team effectiveness and discussion* (3.70-High). The high mean score of the faculty members along knowledge of procedures and policies suggests that they have the ability to know, understand, and clarify college procedures and policies as well as team building activities. On the other hand, the high mean score relative to working out team conflicts suggests that the faculty members have the ability to healthily deal with college conflict, build trust and use effective communication techniques to reduce college conflict. Meanwhile, the high mean score of the respondents along contribution to team effectiveness and discussion reflects the faculty members' ability to participate in discussions, crafting of rules, listening to colleagues and empathizing with colleagues.

Table 4. Team Building Capacity of the Faculty Members as Assessed by the Deans and the Faculty Members Themselves

Indicators	Deans	Faculty	Average
	Weighted Mean	Weighted Mean	
Knowledge of procedures and policies	3.98 (High)	3.76 (High)	3.87 (High)
Contribution to team effectiveness and discussion	3.74 (High)	3.67 (High)	3.70 (High)
Working out Team Conflicts	3.82 (High)	3.85 (High)	3.83 (High)
Grand Mean	3.84 (High)	3.76 (High)	3.80 (High)

On the whole, the high team building capacity of the faculty members demonstrates the CSUans ability to become a team player. According to Katzenbach and Smith (2004) people who have high team building capacity shows their complementary skills as they are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and common approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable.

Specifically, the high team building capacity along knowledge of procedures and policies reveals that "*when teachers are not sure of their performance or project goals, they are able to clarify them with their college deans*" (3.92-high). In short, they can freely confer and seek the assistance of their deans in matters when they are hard up or confused in accomplishing what they ought to do in their work. It may also be that the teachers are not afraid to ask help from colleagues and superiors. They just feel comfortable seeking assistance because there are no barriers for them to do so. Additionally, the foregoing statement also means that the the team members and team leaders of the university are democratic and collaborative in their approach. Participation is a good element of their governance and this ensures optimum satisfaction among the faculty members. Congruently, the faculty members also enjoy working together and they have fun and productive time together.

The high performance of the respondents along knowledge of procedures and policies dimension reflect that the *teachers are aware that the roles of their colleagues are well defined and are continually reviewed and updated as the college evolves* (3.89-high). Put it simply, it means that teachers know the boundaries of their work and there is no overlapping of roles and functions. It must be noted that overlapping of roles and functions is one of the root causes of

conflict in a team. When redundancy of things to do in an organization is also present, there is wastage of resources. Significantly, this data also implies that the faculty members and their college deans have set procedures and protocols to ensure that things are orderly and run smoothly. Everyone gets the opportunity to have their say in the setting of rules and role expectations. Along the way, the college deans also ensure that every faculty member gets updated with the latest procedures and new assignments.

The high mean obtained by the statement. *I understand the links between my personal performance goals, team goals, college goals, and organizational goals and if not I clarify them with my college dean* (3.87-high) is a reflection that the faculty members are immersed in the determination of goals to be achieved in the college and in the campus. They have more or less a sense of ownership of the goals that they ought to accomplish and this is more ensured as they are able to immediately clarify confusions of goal achievement to their college deans. It also shows that there exists team climate in their colleges and campuses as there is no resistance of the tasks on hand from the faculty and they are able to work through group problems. Reddin (2008) says that the team climate is characterized by interaction between individuals and units. The team climate places a high value on communication in group settings. It is not just two-way communication that is important, but also communication multi-way, upwards, down-wards and laterally. There is less concern than average about power differentials between individuals or units.

Still along high rating of the faculty members along knowledge of procedures and policies, it can be said that the *faculty members are aware that the work procedures are detailed and, when appropriate, they are created with input from the colleagues themselves* (3.86-high). Furthermore, *they know the formal and informal teambuilding activities which are carried out with my colleagues and they understand why their college is structured the way it is and they are given opportunities to comment and/or improve upon it* (3.85-high)

The data unlocked in the study suggest that the faculty members are knowledgeable of the rules, systems and procedures of their college and they get quick on with the task on hand because they spend little time in doing it. It may also imply that the faculty members have a thorough understanding of the procedures for agreeing on their objectives and planning the way they perform their tasks. In short, they all have a shared understanding of the college's goals and objectives. Tuckman (2005) believes the team development process can be sub-conscious but if the group is aware of the stages then the team can be more effective more rapidly. This quicker extra performance is of particular interest in teaching. Leaders should be able to identify the cycle of their team to know when it is likely to be the highest performing and also when it will tend to lack motivation. The forming stage involves identifying the task and accomplishing it. The group gathers information about the tasks and other team members. There is discussion on the standard organizational processes and people are concerned with routines and organizational issues.

Meanwhile, the high team building capacity of the respondents along working out team conflicts shows that *they know and practice specific communication techniques to communicate with my college dean* (3.90-high). Perhaps, this would mean that the faculty members have mastered the way they can best relate with their college deans. Usually, the deans are their former colleagues and contemporaries and with the number of years that they have been together, they have already established an effective way to communicate with them based on their personality type and management style.

The high team building capacity relative to working out teams is also reflected in the high mean score relative to the statement, *I realize that trust is an integral part of college effectiveness and I actively look for ways to build trust between*

the other colleagues and myself" (3.88-high). Such ability of the faculty members to trust their colleagues and superiors and to constantly build trust in the college makes them feel that indeed trust is the most basic component of a healthy and meaningful workplace. They perceive that even if the faculty members are intelligent or capable of doing a lot for the college, if there is no trust which binds them together, all of these attributes are in vain. It is therefore assumed that these faculty members see trust as a foundation of an effective and productive college. Without trust, they cannot do anything productive and meaningful.

Similarly, the high rating of the faculty members along working out team conflicts are evident in their high rating to these statements, *I actively seek feedback from other colleagues in relation to my contributions to the college* (3.86-high)*; I effectively use the agreed-upon communication methods and channels that have been collectively established by our college* (3.83-high)*; I help others when they are struggling to meet their performance or project goals"* (3.79-high). This finding means that the faculty members have the ability to deal with college conflict, build trust and use effective communication techniques to reduce college conflict. They believe that feed backing is the engine for them to understand and thresh out their difficulties together and following the procedures or protocols is essential in ensuring a healthy and meaningful relationship and team climate in their colleges and campuses.

According to Türk (2001) and Woodmann and Pasmore, (2002), a key factor of the development of a learning organization and organizations in general is the creation of a well-functioning feedback system. The feedback system comprises different means to gain feedback both at the individual's and organization's level. The feedback culture may be viewed from the aspects of the feedback giver, feedback content, and of the applied means. Feedback, an appraisal interview, and a development discussion form a feedback system which is based on management by objectives. Targeted management requires setting the targets and following them.

Finally, the high team building capacity relative to contribution to team effectiveness and discussion are revealed in these statements: *I actively listen to other colleagues and avoid downplaying their viewpoint if it is different from mine* (3.88-high)*; When participating in college discussions, I consciously try to contribute and recognize the contributions other colleagues make* (3.79-high)*; I participate in the creation of ground rules or behavioral operating guidelines when college meetings and discussions go off-track* (3.73-high)*; I actively try to empathize with other colleagues' issues, even if I do not personally agree with them* (3.68-high).

The high rating along the foregoing statements imply that the faculty members respect and listen to each other's point of view. They do not just reject ideas coming from their superiors and colleagues without fully understanding them. Altogether they try to keep order and contribute to the tasks at hand. In effect, they feel a sense of team because they share responsibilities for the college's success or failure. They just fully trust each other and closely monitor others who are working on specific tasks and extend a helping hand when they are not accomplished on time. In the same vein, the faculty members can also be said to be expressing their criticisms constructively during meetings and have fully accepted each other as members of the college and campus.

Loxley (2007) expressed the vital role of communication in the development of team environment. He said that "Communication involves an observable interchange of information and subtle interactions of power, attitudes and values. Effective teams require reliable communication processes, with clearly defined responsibilities and appropriate delegation.

Individuals need to listen frequently to each other and collaborate in order to develop mutual knowledge, which enhances communication. Joint decision making and formal and informal interchanges can also enhance communication.

Level of Team Building Capacity of Faculty Members as Assessed by the Deans and Faculty Members Themselves

The frequency count and percentage of respondents based on the levels of team building capacity is shown in Table 5. Of the 218 respondents 120 or 55.00 percent faculty members have been rated as having **high** team building capacity (61-80 points). The high team building capacity of these respondents suggests that they have the ability to know, understand, and clarify college procedures and policies as well as team building activities. They, too, are equipped with the knowledge and skills on how to deal with college conflict, build trust and use effective communication techniques to reduce college conflict. Significantly, these faculty members have the competency to participate in discussions, crafting of rules, listening to colleagues and empathize with colleagues.

Table 5. Level of team building Capacity as perceived by the faculty themselves and their deans

Level of Team Building Capacity	Frequency	Percentage
Low (21 – 40)	1	.5
Moderate (41 – 60)	26	11.9
High (61 – 80)	120	55.0
Very High (81 – 100)	71	32.6
Total	218	100

A further look on Table 5 shows that 71 or 32.60% have **very** high team building capacity gaining 81-100 points. Moreover, 26 or 11.90% have been rated with a team building capacity of moderate with points ranging from 41-60 and 1 or 0.25% has obtained a rating of low with points between 21 to 40.

Teaching Effectiveness of Faculty Members as Assessed by the Deans and Students

It is also the interest of this research to investigate the teaching effectiveness of the faculty respondents. Teaching effectiveness refers to the delivery of instruction that eventually results in academic excellence. In this study, teaching effectiveness was measured using the NBC 461 Evaluation for Teachers. There are four dimensions of teaching effectiveness that was measured namely, commitment; knowledge of subject matter; teaching for independent learning; and management of learning.

Table 6 shows that the overall rating of the respondents in all the four dimensions is **Very Satisfactory** (3.41). The weighted mean of the four dimensions are as follows: *Teaching for independent learning* (3.55-Very Satisfactory); *teaching commitment* (3.50-Very Satisfactory); *knowledge of subject matter* (3.46-Very Satisfactory) and *Management of learning* (3.27-Very Satisfactory).

Table 6. Teaching Effectiveness of the Faculty Respondents as assessed by the Students and College Deans

Indicators	Students Weighted Mean	Deans Weighted Mean	Average
Teaching Commitment	**3.44** (VS)	**3.55** (VS)	**3.50** (VS)
Knowledge of subject matter	**3.40** (VS)	**3.52** (VS)	**3.46** (VS)
Teaching for Independent Learning	**3.30** **(S)**	**3.63** **(VS)**	**3.47** **(VS)**
Management of Learning	**3.14** **(S)**	**3.40** (VS)	**3.27** (VS)
Grand Mean	**3.30** **(S)**	**3.52** (VS)	**3.41** **(VS)**

The Very Satisfactory rating of the faculty members relative to teaching for independent learning implies that they have the ability to organize teaching-learning processes to enable students to maximize their learning potentials. With respect to teaching commitment, the faculty members' very satisfactory rating suggests that they have a deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the students' well-being and for the advancement of his/her discipline.

Significantly, the very satisfactory rating obtained by the faculty members along knowledge of subject matter indicates that they show scholarship and expertise in his/her chosen field of discipline. Finally, the very satisfactory rating obtained in the management of learning dimension shows that the faculty members are competent to create and manage a conducive learning environment and at the same time guide, monitor, and evaluate student learning.

Comparing the ratings of the students and deans, the Table 6 shows that the rating of the students is lower than the rating of the deans as reflected in the means of 3.30 (Satisfactory) for the students and 3.52 for the deans.

The high teaching effectiveness relative to teaching for independent learning is reflected in the statement *"The teacher implements practical teaching strategies wherein students could apply the concepts learned (3.71-high) and "The teacher constructs test questions and exercises which develop critical thinking" (3.60-high).* The first statement suggests that the teachers are competent to carry out teaching strategies that marry theory and practice. In here, the teachers show a repertoire of practical teaching strategies which the students are able to see proper application of the things they learn in the lecture in real life situations.

Moreover, the Very Satisfactory rating on teaching effectiveness along teaching for independent learning shows that the teachers have the competence to "*Give due recognition to students performance/students' potentials (*3.55-high)*; Encourage students to learn beyond what is required* (3.47-high)*; and Give assignment/work to students to stimulate*

independent study (3.45-high). All of these abilities of the teachers suggest that they are equipped with the principles and theories of knowledge and learning which they utilize in their own classes. As they are able to master the psychology of learning, they are able to teach their students in a way that lead them to better learning outcomes and meaningful interaction inside the classroom.

On the other hand, the very satisfactory teaching effectiveness of the respondents along teaching commitment shows that they "*Regularly come to class well-groomed and well-prepared" (*3.56)*; and "Orient the class on teacher and students roles at the start of the semester"* (3.51-high)*.* The fact that the teachers come to class well-groomed implies that they have a good grasp of personality development. This may be because the teachers see themselves as role models of students. At all times, they have to be properly dressed because they play a critical role in the holistic development of the students. On the other hand, coming to class well prepared is an indication of their professionalism. They know their duties and responsibilities as teachers and short changing them is not a good attitude. Meanwhile, the teachers' ability to orient the class reveals their competence to set direction and establish classroom rules, regulations and routines to ensure smooth conduct of teaching and learning process. They believe that orienting the students as to expectations and the norms of the classroom is a vehicle towards creating a conductive classroom atmosphere which results to greater learning outcomes.

Similarly, the very satisfactory teaching commitment of the respondents imply that they *"Show enthusiasm and positive attitude towards work (*3.50-high)*; Keeps accurate records of student performance and prompt submission of the same* (3.48-high)*; Allows flexibility to meet for a specific needs, interest and capabilities of individual students"* (3.45-high). All these indicators of teaching commitment reveals that CSU teachers are energetic in their teaching and they show great deal of professionalism in what they do. It also reveals that they are matured and seasoned teachers who know the eclectic approach of teaching which is indicative of their flexibility to teach based on the students' unique learning styles, interests and aptitudes of their students.

Finally, the very satisfactory teaching effectiveness of the respondents relative to knowledge of subject matter reveals that they *"Explain the subject matter without relying solely on the prescribed textbook* (3.67-high) and*; Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge of the subject"* (5.52-high)*.* The ability of the faculty members to explain the subject matter outside the textbook may indicate that they explain the concepts based on their own experiences. Practical applications are used to make the students see the realities of life from the theories and concepts that they discuss.

In the same vein, the competence of the teachers to demonstrate their up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter suggests that they undertake continuous professional development by attending seminars, conferences and trainings that allow them to keep abreast of the latest trends, issues and concerns in their own field of expertise. It must be noted that teachers in the university are always allowed to participate in seminars, conferences and trainings as these are established parameters in the grant of Performance Based Bonus (PBB), SUC leveling and AACCUP accreditation. As these are what the university is following, more and more faculty members are able to further hone their knowledge and skills which make them more effective in the discharge of their duties and responsibilities.

In addition, the very satisfactory teaching effectiveness of the teachers along knowledge of subject matter suggests that they *"Cite application of topics learned to daily life activities* (3.44-high)*; Explains the relevance of present topics of the previous lessons* (3.36-high)*; and Relates the subject matter to relevant current issues"* (3.32-high). The effectiveness of the teachers in citing application of topics learned to daily life activities and relating subject matter to relevant current

issues imply that they use examples on how students can apply mathematical formulation, scientific concepts and social science in dealing with daily real life situations. They give emphasis on the idea that everything the students learn in school are useless unless they know their applications in solving all human problems, issues and concerns. In short, the teachers are pragmatic in their approach because they see the value of what they teach based on how they help students be prepared to hurdle all the challenges, problems and crises in life.

Level of Teaching Effectiveness of the Faculty as Perceived by the Students and College Deans

Table 7 shows the level of teaching effectiveness of the faculty as perceived by the deans and students. Of the 218 faculty respondents, there are 159 or 72.9 percent respondents who have obtained a **Very Satisfactory** rating or garnered points ranging from 61-80); 42 or 19.30 percent have outstanding rating; and 17 or 7.8 percent were rated Satisfactory with points ranging from 41-60. None has been rated fair and poor.

The Very Satisfactory rating of the faculty members shows that CSU has a teaching force that have a high knowledge of subject matter marked by scholarship and expertise in their chosen field of discipline and high commitment or deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the students' well-being and for the advancement of their discipline. Moreover, the data also suggest that CSUs instructional staff have the ability to organize teaching-learning processes to enable students maximize their learning potentials and they are equipped with the ability to manage learning thus, creating and managing a conducive learning environment and at the same time guide, monitor, and evaluate student learning.

Table 7. Level of teaching effectiveness of the faculty as perceived by the students and the College Deans

Level of Teaching Effectiveness	Frequency	Percentage
Poor (1 – 20)	-	-
Fair (21 – 40)	-	-
Satisfactory (41 – 60)	17	7.8
Very Satisfactory (61 – 80)	159	72.9
Outstanding (81 – 100)	42	19.3
Total	218	100

Comparison between the Perceptions of the Faculty and Deans on the Organizational Trust, Team Building Activity and Teaching Effectiveness

It was hypothesized in the study that there is no significant difference in the organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness of the respondents as assessed by the deans and faculty/students. Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference in the assessment of the deans and students along teaching effectiveness but not for organizational trust and team building capacity. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 8. Comparison between the perceptions of the faculty and deans/students on the organizational trust, team building activity and teaching effectiveness of the respondents

Variables	Mean	Computed t-value	Probability
Organizational trust			
Deans	88.87		
Faculty	88.26	0.302[ns]	0.763
Team Building			
Deans	76.80		
Faculty	75.11	1.227 [ns]	0.221
Teaching Effectiveness			
Students	66.99		
Deans	70.53	4.412*	0.000

ns = not significant
*=significant at 0.05

The significant difference in the assessment of the deans and students relative to teaching effectiveness is reflected in the computed t-value of 4.412 with a probability value of 0.000. This difference reveals that faculty respondents have been rated lower by the students than the deans having a mean of 66.99 for the students and 70.53 for the deans. The lower rating given by the students along teaching commitment, knowledge of subject matter, teaching for independent learning and management of learning can be attributed to the fact that they tend to know better their teachers than the deans. It must be noted that the assessment of the students is based on their 54 contact hours with their teachers while the deans assess the teachers only once when they conduct their evaluation every semester.

According to Seldin (2009), student ratings have become synonymous with faculty evaluation in the United States. The mere mention of faculty evaluation to many college professors conjures up mental images that it means primarily a student evaluation. Although there is still a wide range of opinions on their value, Seldin noted that "student ratings are the single most valid source of data on teaching effectiveness". In fact, there is little evidence of the validity of any other sources of data (Marsh & Roche, 2007). There seems to be agreement among the experts on faculty evaluation that student ratings provides an excellent source of evidence for both formative and summative decisions, with the qualification that other sources also be used for the latter.

Meanwhile, the absence of difference in the assessment of deans and faculty members relative to organizational trust and team building means that both have the same rating on these aspects. The absence of difference in the organizational trust between deans and faculty is shown in the computed t-value of 0.302 and probability of 0.763 and team building obtained a computed value of 1.227 and probability value of 0.221.

The lack of difference in the assessment of deans and faculty members along organizational trust and team building capacity implies that there is similar rating on how the faculty members have rated their organizational trust and team building capacity as their college deans.

Comparison on the Organizational Trust Scores by Campus Assignment as Perceived by the College Deans and Faculty Members Themselves

One of the hypotheses that is investigated in the study is the significant difference in the organizational trust of the faculty members when grouped according to their campus assignment. Table 9 shows that there is a significant difference in the organizational trust scores of the faculty members based on their campus assignment. Significantly, Gonzaga campus has high significant difference in organizational trust scores as compared to other campuses. This is revealed in the F ratio of 3.538 and a probability of .001. The high significant difference in the organizational trust scores of Gonzaga campus suggests that faculty members from this campus perceive the University to have high integrity, dependability, control mutuality, satisfaction, commitment and communal relations. They see that their college, campus and the university as a whole are treating them fairly and justly and it can be relied on to keep its promises. It also implies that faculty members of Gonzaga campus are more confident and happier and more satisfied as compared to other campuses of the university. They, too, value their relationship with their organization and perceive the university to be very helpful in their growth and development.

The high organizational trust of the respondents can be attributed to the fact that most of the faculty members of this Campus have rendered more than 15 years in the campus. Their profile shows that they have ageing faculty workforce which supports also the findings of the study that there exist a relationship between organizational trust of the faculty members with their length of service in the university. As they have been in the university for a substantial number of years, they have already developed a high sense of organizational trust marked by high confidence with CSU. In short, they have been dependable, satisfied and committed to the university.

Moreover, since organizational trust is primarily developed by the college deans and the Campus Executive Officers at the Campus level, there must be something good on how the they work with their subordinates. Perhaps, how they relate with their subordinates can be characterized by openness, dependability, mutual confidence, integrity and satisfaction. However, for this to be conclusive, another study must be conducted along this line.

Table 9. Comparison on the organizational trust scores by Campus Assignment as perceived by the College Deans and Faculty Members Themselves

Group	Mean	Probability	Statistical Inference
Andrews	82.92	.015	Not Significant
Aparri	92.04	.026	Not Significant
Carig	85.07	.051	Not Significant
Gonzaga	92.00	.016	**Highly Significant**
Lal-lo	98.29	.023	Not Significant
Lasam	83.25	.014	Not Significant
Piat	90.17	.056	Not Significant
Sanchez Mira	90.97	.043	Not Significant

Comparison on the Team Building Scores by Campus Assignment as Perceived by the College Deans and Faculty Members Themselves

Another hypothesis that is investigated in the study is the significant difference in the team building scores of the respondents when grouped by campus. Table 10 shows that there is a significant difference in the team building scores of the faculty members based on their campus assignment. Significantly, again Gonzaga campus has high significant difference in organizational trust scores as compared to other campuses. This is revealed in the F ratio of 3.846 and a probability of .001. The significant difference in the team building capacity scores of Gonzaga campus can probably be attributed to the kind of team environment provided by the Campus Executive Officer (CEO) and College Deans. Interview with the CEO and College Deans for the purpose of explaining this phenomenon reveals that the kind of management they employ is collegial in nature.

Table 10. Comparison on the Team Building scores by Campus Assignment as perceived by the faculty and deans grouped

Group	Mean	Probability	Statistical Inference
Andrews	75.21	.071	Not Significant
Aparri	80.72	.090	Not Significant
Carig	72.36	.086	Not Significant
Gonzaga	76.27	.001	**Highly Significant**
Lal-lo	81.42	.085	Not Significant
Lasam	67.25	.086	Not Significant
Piat	74.17	.076	Not Significant
Sanchez Mira	75.33	.041	Not Significant

They treat everyone as a co-equal and they always express that they are in their positions only for a season. The reason for treating everyone as co-equal is due to his belief that everyone can become a CEO and college dean. The experience of the present CEO reveals that he never expected that he can become the campus administrator and it was never his dream to become one. This is the reason why he keeps on stressing collegial relationship in his management because everyone just takes turn to become the head of the campus and college. Thus, everyone has to be respected and the inputs of everyone have to be considered. This is fundamentally the reason behind the favorable team environment of the campus and colleges in the campus.

Comparison on the Teaching Effectiveness scores by Campus Assignment as perceived by the College Deans and Students

It is also hypothesized that there is no significant difference in the teaching effectiveness when grouped by campus. Table 11 shows that there is a significant difference in the teaching effectiveness scores of the faculty members based on their campus assignment. Significantly, Gonzaga campus has high significant difference in organizational trust scores as compared to other campuses. This is revealed in the F-ratio of 4.890 and a probability of .000. The high significant difference in the teaching effectiveness scores of the faculty from Gonzaga campus can mean that they have better and higher teaching commitment, knowledge of subject matter, teaching for independent learning and management of learning. The high teaching commitment of these teachers corroborates the finding of the study that they have also high organizational trust.

Teachers who have high organizational trust are also committed to their work. As they are committed to their duties and responsibilities, they are therefore able to become productive in their tasks.

Table 11. Comparison on the teaching effectiveness scores of faculty as assessed by the College Deans and Students grouped by campus

Group	Mean	Probability	Statistical Inference
Andrews	70.83	0.787	Not Significant
Aparri	67.04	0.082	Not Significant
Carig	71.60	0.085	Not Significant
Gonzaga	69.36	.000	**Highly Significant**
Lal-lo	64.04	0.074	Not Significant
Lasam	64.50	0.014	Not Significant
Piat	66.28	0.023	Not Significant
Sanchez Mira	73.17	0.041	Not Significant

This assumption is clearly affirmed in the study of Celep and Yilmazturk (2012) who investigated the relationship between organizational trust, organizational commitment and teaching performance in state school teachers in the city of Goalkug. The results showed that teachers' trust in management improved their organizational commitment and teaching performance. They concluded that organizational trust was a prerequisite for organizational commitment and teaching performance. Also, teachers with high organizational trust were more committed to their teaching.

Relationship between Organizational Trust of the Respondents and their Team Building Capacity and Teaching Effectiveness

Test of relationship between organizational trust of the respondents and their team building capacity and teaching effectiveness is shown in Table 12. The data reveal that there is a **High** significant relationship between their organizational trust and team building capacity but not for their organizational trust and teaching effectiveness. This is shown in the correlation coefficient of 0.520 and a probability of .000 (Highly Significant) for team building and correlation coefficient of 0.102 and a probability of 0.077 (Not Significant) for teaching effectiveness.

Table 12. Relationship between organizational trust and teambuilding and teaching effectiveness

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Organizational Trust and			
Teambuilding	0.520	0.000	**Highly significant**
Teaching Effectiveness	0.102	0.077	Not Significant

This finding reveals that team building capacity of the faculty members is greatly influenced by their organizational trust. Faculty members who possess high organizational trust are able to show high team building capacity. However, the absence of relationship between organizational trust and teaching effectiveness implies that teaching effectiveness is not influenced by the level of organizational trust of the faculty members. Irrespective of the level of organizational trust, their teaching effectiveness is still high.

The finding of the study supports the claim of Axelrod (2004) who asserted that organizational trust is seen as a necessary antecedent for cooperation and team building and leading to constructive and cooperative behavior vital for long-term relationships. He further claimed that trust is vital for both team building capacity within the organization and strategic alliances as well as research and development partnerships.

On the other hand, the absence of relationship between organizational trust and teaching effectiveness suggests that trust is not an antecedent to teaching effectiveness. One does not necessarily have organizational trust in order to have high teaching effectiveness.

The lack of correlation between organizational trust and teaching effectiveness supports the study of Zolin (2004) who found out that the teaching performance of the teachers in Texas High School is not influenced by their level of organizational trust. He averred that teaching performance is basically influenced by numerous factors such as the teachers' personal and professional attributes as well as the characteristics of the learners, the learning process and the teaching situation. To attribute teaching performance to a single factor such as organizational trust does is a misconception.

Relationship between organizational trust and the profile variables

Table 13 shows the relationship between organizational trust and the profile variables of the respondents. Test of relationship reveals that the teachers' organizational trust is related to their years of service with a correlation coefficient of 0.172 and probability of 0.003 (Highly significant). This finding suggests that organizational trust is influenced by the years of service of the faculty members. The higher is their years of service in the university, the higher is their organizational trust. Perhaps, the years of service is a factor to the level of organizational trust because as more years a teacher spends in the university, the better would be his or her appreciation of the systems, operations and management of the organization. Their experiences with the university make them become confident with organization and see the benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness of their college, campus and the university at large.

Table 13. Relationship between organizational trust and the profile variables

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Sex	-0.100	0.085	Not significant
Age	0.098	0.089	Not significant
Educational Attainment	0.055	0.345	Not significant

Academic rank	0.020	0.727	Not significant
Years in the Service	0.172	0.003	**Highly significant**

The finding of the study supports the claim of Meyer and Allen (2007) who suggested that employees with longer length of service or organizational tenure have higher confidence, commitment and attachment to the organization. They presented that senior employees exhibited higher measured commitment than new or middle tenure employees did. These findings are also supported by Liou and Nyhan (2004), who found a positive relationship between tenure and occupational commitment (t = 3.482). In this study, the results corresponded since older teachers responded as having a higher level of organizational trust to their occupation. In short, the older employees are committed to their leader's values and the organization's mission and they are the ones who have a strong commitment to the occupation. This is one factor why they remain in the organization.

Relationship between Team Building Capacity and the Profile Variables

Another hypothesis that is tested in this study is to test whether there is a significant relationship between team building capacity and the profile variables of the respondents. Test of Pearson Product Moment Correlations in Table 14 reveals that there is no significant relationship between team building and the profile variable of teachers. This data implies that sex, age, educational attainment, academic rank and length of service of the faculty members do not influence their level of team building capacity. Put simply, sex, age, educational attainment, academic rank and years in the service are not related to team building capacity.

Table 14. Relationship between team building and the profile variables

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Sex	0.026	0.648	Not significant
Age	-0.054	0.354	Not significant
Educational Attainment	0.054	0.355	Not significant
Academic rank	-0.019	0.737	Not significant
Years in the Service	0.044	0.453	Not significant

Relationship between Teaching Effectiveness and the Profile Variables

The last hypothesis that is tested in this study that there is no significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and the profile variables. Table 15 reveals that there is a relationship between teaching effectiveness and the profile variables. This is reflected in the correlation coefficient of -0.142 and 0.014 probability for sex; -0.117 correlation coefficient and probability of 0.042 for age and correlation coefficient of -0.133 and probability of 0.022 for educational attainment. The

study therefore rejects its null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance because the test of relationship reveals that sex, age and educational attainment are related to teaching effectiveness. In short, the level of teaching effectiveness of teachers is influenced by their sex, age and educational attainment. Essentially, male, young, and those with lower educational attainment have higher teaching effectiveness as compared to their counterparts.

Table 15. Relationship between teaching effectiveness and the profile variables

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Sex	-0.142	0.014	**Significant**
Age	-0.117	0.042	**Significant**
Educational Attainment	-0.133	0.022	**Significant**
Academic rank	0.017	0.771	Not significant
Years in the Service	-0.081	0.160	Not significant

The higher teaching effectiveness of male teachers than the female teachers is asserted by Jaap Scheerens (2004) in his study Teacher Characteristics that Influence Teaching Effectiveness Among Urban Schools in New York. His research claimed that male teacher respondents performed better in teaching than their female counterparts. Some of the attributes of male teachers is their ability to ensure better classroom management and discipline, establishing higher learning outcomes, curricular alignment, and scaffolding students' task engagement.

Meanwhile, the higher teaching effectiveness of younger teachers can be attributed to the fact that the bulk of the faculty respondents which constitute 60 or 27.5 percent have rendered 6-10 years followed by 47 or 21.5 percent having rendered 11-15 years. The high teaching effectiveness of the younger teachers was averred by Brophy, J. (2011) in his study titled Generic Aspects of Effective Teaching. He found out in his research that younger teachers are more energetic in teaching, they are capable of relating well with students, they are better in establishing achievement expectations and use effective teaching strategy than the older teachers.

Finally, the higher teaching effectiveness of the teachers with lower educational attainment has been affirmed by Ballou and Podgursky (2005) in their study titled Recruiting Smarter Teachers. They found out that teachers having lower educational attainment are able to do better teaching than those who have higher level of schooling. They attribute this reality to the fact that teachers with lower educational attainment are more inclined to do instructional functions rather than research tasks. This foregoing finding can also be reflected in the university because based on the requirement of NBC 461, those who occupy instructor and assistant professor positions have to do more of instruction rather than research and extension. In the case of CSU, those who occupy these academic ranks are non-masters and doctorate degree holders. Moreover, this finding is corroborated by the fact that in terms of the profile of the faculty respondents, majority of them are occupying Assistant Professor positions (95 or 43.5 percent).

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the foregoing findings, the study concludes that Cagayan State University has a promising instructional staff imbued with high level of organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. As this is the case, the kind of relationship that exists between and among the faculty members and officials of the university is founded on mutual confidence, satisfaction and commitment. Altogether, they exhibit positive attitude such as high morale, effective task performance and a clear relevance to the university as they work interdependently, are committed to common goals, and produce very good instructional performance. While this is observable in all campuses of the university, this situation is very evident among the teaching force of CSU Gonzaga who are worthy of commendation because they exhibit the highest organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness.

The study has proven that a major factor that influences the team building capacity of the faculty members is their organizational trust. This shows that there is indeed a positive or direct relationship between organizational trust and team building capacity. However, the study disproves some studies claiming the direct relationship between organizational trust and teaching effectiveness.

Interestingly, the only demographic variable that influences organizational trust of teachers is their length of service. But with respect to teaching effectiveness, the study concludes that sex, age, and educational attainment of teachers are factors that influence teachers' level of teaching effectiveness. Essentially, male, young and those with lower educational attainment are teachers who have higher teaching effectiveness.

Finally, the study has demonstrated that team building capacity is not influenced or has no positive relations with the teachers' sex, age, educational attainment, academic rank and length of service.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

In view of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are submitted:

1. The management of CSU must continue nourishing the high level of organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness of the teachers by continuing its existing programs and activities as well incentives to its employees;
2. Teachers from Gonzaga Campus must be given commendation for their collective and high organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. Giving them more assignments or tasks can be the best way to exhibit their high organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness because for sure they will be able to contribute to the realization of the three-fold mandate of the university;
3. The Human Resource Management of the University must revive the PRAISE of CSU as this can be the best engine to reward and give incentives to best performing faculty members of the university. In so doing, their high organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness can be maintained, if not, further enhanced.
4. Faculty members who have rendered more years of service in CSU must also be tapped in various programs, projects and activities of the university for they give promising and high team building skills and provide conducive

team environment . Involving them in all these undertakings is a sure path towards the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of their college, campus and university at large;

5. To ensure high teaching performance of the faculty members, college deans must give more time monitoring and evaluating the performance of teachers who are female, old, and those with higher educational attainment because they have the tendency to have lower teaching effectiveness as compared to their counterparts;

6. An in-depth study has to be done on the factors that make the teaching force of CSU Gonzaga to have the highest organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness. Unlocking the factors along these concerns can be a valuable input for other Campus Executive Officers to build and nurture those factors in their campus so that their teachers would also have the same high organizational trust, team building capacity and teaching effectiveness.

7. A similar study has to be investigated determining what stage of team building has been attained by the different campuses of CSU and what team building strategies have been implemented or adopted in the different campuses to have a more comprehensive study of team building concept as experienced by the CSUans.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1] Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., Gilbert, N. L., 2006. "Foci and Bases of Employee Commitment: Implications for Job Performance", Academy of Management Journal, 39, pp. 464-482.

[2] Celep C, Yilmazturk OE. (2012) The Relationship among Organizational Trust, Multidimensional Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support in Educational Organizations. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2012;46(0):5763-76.

[3] Colquitt J. A., B. A. Scott, and J. A. LePine, "Trust, Trustworthiness, and Trust Propensity: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Unique Relationships With Risk Taking and Job Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 92, 2007, pp. 909-927.

[4] Cook, J., Wall, T., 2010. "New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Nonfulfilment", Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, pp. 39-52.

[5] Costigan, R. D., Ilter, S. S., Berman, J. J., 2008. "A Multi-Dimensional Study of Trust in Organizations", Journal of Managerial Issues, 10, pp. 303-317.

[6]   Dirks, K. T. and Ferrin, D. L. (2012). "Trust in Leadership: Meta-Analytic Findings and Implications for Research and Practice". Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 611-628.

[7]   Hurst, D. K., 2004. "Of Boxes, Bubbles, and Effective Management", Harvard Business Review, 62, pp. 78-88.

[8]   Islamoğlu, G., Birsel, M., Börü, D., 2007. "Kurum İçinde Güven", İnkılap Yayınları, İstanbul.

[9]   K. Van den Bos, H.A. Wilke, and E.A. Lind, "When Do We Need Procedural Fairness? The Role of Trust in Authority," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 75, 2008, pp. 1449-1458.

[10] La Porta, R., Lozez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R.W., 2007. "Trust in Large Organizations", American Economic Review, 87, pp. 333-338.

[11] Lane, C. 2008. 'Introduction: Theories and Issues in the Study of Trust.' In Trust within and between Organizations, Conceptual Issues and Empirical Applications, edited by C. Lan, and R. Bachman, 1−30. Oxford: Oxford University Press

[12] Lee, D., and A. D. Stajkovic. 2005. Interpersonal trust and emotion as predictors of cooperation in work teams. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting, Honolulu, hi, August 5−10.

[13] Porter, T. W., Lilly, B. S., 2006. "The Effects of Conflict, Trust, and Task Commitment on Project Team Performance", International Journal of Conflict Management, 7, pp. 361- 376.

[14] R. Galford and A. Seibold Drapeau, The Trusted Leader: Bringing Out the Best in Your People and Your Company, The Free Press, 2002.

[15] Van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., Lind, E. A., 2008. "When do We Need Procedural Fairness? The Role of Trust in Authority", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, pp. 1449-1458.

[16] Zand, D. E., 2012. "Trust and Managerial Problem Solving", Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, pp. 229-239.