

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

Abigail Gegante¹, John Vincent Aliazas²

¹Prudencia D. Fule Memorial Elementary School, San Pablo City, Philippines

²Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Philippines

ABSTRACT: This study investigated the relationship between innovative organizational atmosphere and teaching performance among full-time faculty members at Laguna State Polytechnic University – San Pablo City Campus, with creative efficacy as a mediating variable. Using a descriptive correlational design, data were collected from 100 full-time instructors across eight colleges through validated survey instruments measuring five dimensions of innovative organizational atmosphere: research-centered culture, culture supporting innovation, mutual relationship and respect, creativity and innovation character, and critique and criticizing culture. Results revealed that the institution demonstrated a moderately evident innovative organizational atmosphere, with creativity and innovation character scoring highest among the dimensions. Faculty self-assessed their teaching performance as above average across all dimensions: task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive performance. Creative efficacy levels were rated as quite confident overall. Correlation analyses showed significant positive relationships between innovative organizational atmosphere dimensions and creative efficacy, with mutual relationship and respect demonstrating the strongest correlation. All organizational atmosphere dimensions significantly correlated with teaching performance, particularly critique and criticizing culture. Creative efficacy strongly correlated with all performance dimensions, with adaptive performance showing the highest relationship. Mediation analysis confirmed that creative efficacy partially mediates the relationship between innovative organizational atmosphere and teaching performance, with both significant direct and indirect effects. These findings suggest that fostering innovative environments enhances teaching effectiveness both directly and through building faculty creative confidence, providing dual pathways for institutional improvement. The study contributes valuable insights for educational administrators seeking to enhance teaching performance through strategic organizational culture development and faculty empowerment initiatives.

KEYWORDS: Innovative Organizational Atmosphere, Faculty Performance, Creative Efficacy

I. INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education, the quality of instruction and the organizational climate play pivotal roles in achieving educational excellence. The Philippines, through various regulatory frameworks and quality assurance mechanisms, has been actively pursuing improvements in its educational system to meet global standards and address local challenges. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has consistently emphasized the need for higher education institutions (HEIs) to maintain and enhance their academic standards while fostering an environment conducive to innovation and excellence (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, 2020).

The Philippine Qualifications Framework (PQF), established through Republic Act No. 10968, sets clear standards for qualification outcomes across different levels of education, emphasizing the importance of maintaining high-quality instruction to ensure that graduates possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and competencies required by their respective industries (Orbeta et al., 2023). The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) further delineates the competencies expected from educators, serving as a blueprint for teacher quality across various domains, including content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages, and personal growth and professional development (Department of Education, 2022).

Recent studies have highlighted the importance of innovative organizational atmospheres in educational institutions. Martinez and Santos (2021) found that institutions with strong innovative cultures demonstrate higher levels of teacher satisfaction and improved student outcomes. However, the impact of such environments among university instructors remains understudied, particularly in the Philippine context. The continuous improvement initiatives mandated by CHED through various memoranda underscore the importance of Higher Education Institutions in establishing and sustaining quality assurance systems that foster

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

innovation and excellence in teaching (Garcia & Reyes, 2022). A significant gap exists in understanding how innovative organizational environments influence the teaching efficacy and overall performance of instructors in HEIs, especially considering the differential impact on various employment arrangements (Santos & Cruz, 2024).

The role of organizational atmosphere in supporting teaching excellence has been well-documented in recent literature. Mendoza and Lee (2023) found that supportive and innovative organizational climates contribute significantly to improved teaching practices and student outcomes. Moreover, the implementation of the PQF and PPST has created new challenges and opportunities for HEIs, as their practical implementation may vary significantly among university instructors due to differences in institutional engagement, access to resources, and professional development opportunities (Tan & Rodriguez, 2023). The ongoing digital transformation in education, accelerated by recent global events, has further underscored the need for innovative organizational approaches; however, the capacity of institutions to support their instructors in adapting to these changes varies significantly (Lopez et al., 2024).

The Laguna State Polytechnic University (LSPU), as one of the premier state universities in the CALABARZON region, has consistently demonstrated its commitment to providing quality education and producing competent graduates across various disciplines. Established in 1984 through Batas Pambansa Blg. 482 and attaining its university status in 2007 through Republic Act 9402, LSPU has grown significantly with its four campuses strategically located across the province of Laguna (Laguna State Polytechnic University, 2023). The Province of Laguna, situated in the CALABARZON region, has experienced remarkable economic growth and industrial development, creating an increasing demand for highly skilled graduates and heightened expectations for educational institutions to deliver quality instruction (Provincial Government of Laguna, 2023).

LSPU's organizational structure primarily focuses on full-time instructors, a common arrangement in many Philippine higher education institutions that allows the university to maintain operational flexibility while addressing the diverse needs of its growing student population (Rivera & Santos, 2023). The university's commitment to innovation is reflected in its recent initiatives to enhance technological infrastructure and promote modern teaching methodologies, with significant investments between 2020 and 2023 in digital learning platforms, faculty development programs, and research facilities across its campuses (LSPU Annual Report, 2023). The effectiveness of these initiatives may vary among university instructors due to several factors, as full-time faculty members typically have greater access to institutional resources, professional development opportunities, and involvement in academic planning processes (Mendoza et al., 2022).

Recent studies conducted within LSPU have identified varying levels of teaching efficacy among faculty members. Torres and Reyes (2023) found significant differences in student outcomes between classes taught by full-time instructors, particularly in specialized courses that require extensive laboratory work or practical applications. Both internal policies and external frameworks, such as the Philippine Qualifications Framework and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, guide the university's ongoing efforts to maintain its quality standards. Various support mechanisms have been established, including mentoring programs, research grants, and professional development opportunities (LSPU Quality Assurance Office, 2023).

Understanding the relationship between innovative organizational atmosphere and teaching efficacy becomes particularly crucial as institutions continue to expand their academic offerings and adapt to evolving educational demands. The role of creative efficacy as a mediating factor in this relationship warrants investigation, as it may explain how organizational innovations translate into improved teaching performance. This study aims to address these gaps by examining how innovative organizational atmospheres influence the creative efficacy and performance of full-time instructors, contributing to the broader discussion on quality assurance in higher education and providing valuable insights for policy-makers and educational administrators in designing more effective support systems for university instructors.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design. This study employed a descriptive correlational research design to investigate the relationships between innovative organizational atmosphere, creative efficacy, and teaching performance among full-time faculty members. According to McBurney and White (2009), descriptive correlational designs are used in research studies that aim to provide static pictures of situations and establish relationships between different variables. This design was particularly suitable for exploring how organizational atmosphere dimensions influence creative efficacy and performance of full-time instructors at Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus.

Participants. The study participants consisted of 100 full-time instructors from Laguna State Polytechnic University – San Pablo City Campus, representing faculty members from eight different colleges. The researcher employed a purposive sampling technique, which selected participants based on specific characteristics or criteria that aligned with the study objectives. This sampling method was chosen to identify and select valuable individuals who possessed the most relevant information that addresses the research question at hand. The respondents represented diverse demographic profiles, including variations in age, gender, years of teaching experience, academic rank, and professional development activities, providing a comprehensive representation of the faculty population.

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

Research Instruments. Data collection was conducted using adopted and validated questionnaires as the primary research instruments. The study utilized four main instruments to measure the variables of interest: the Innovative Organizational Atmosphere scale, which assessed five dimensions including research-centered culture, culture supporting innovation, mutual relationship and respect, creativity and innovation character, and critique and criticizing culture; the Creative Efficacy scale; and the Teaching Performance scale, which measured task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive performance. Before the main study, a pilot test was conducted with 15 teachers to assess the internal consistency of the survey questionnaire items, with Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.826 to 0.944, indicating good to excellent reliability across all subscales.

Procedure. The research procedure involved securing permission from the Dean of each departmental college to conduct the study, with assistance from research coordinators to facilitate the distribution and collection of research instruments. The questionnaires were distributed to respondents and retrieved immediately after completion to ensure high response rates and data quality. All collected data were organized, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis and interpretation.

Data Analysis. Statistical analysis employed both descriptive and inferential techniques to analyze the relationships between variables. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to summarize the central tendency and variability of responses, while frequency counts and percentages described the distribution of categorical variables. For inferential analysis, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to determine the strength and direction of relationships between variables. To explore the mediating effect of creative efficacy on the relationship between innovative organizational atmosphere and teaching performance, the PROCESS Macro by Hayes (2020) was employed, allowing for robust mediation analysis. These statistical tools collectively supported accurate interpretation and reliable conclusions regarding the hypothesized relationships among the study variables.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. The Extent of Innovative Organizational Atmosphere

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Key Findings
Research-Centered Culture	3.46	0.446	Moderately Evident	Strongest in collaborative research engagement; weakest in mentoring programs
Culture Supporting Innovation	3.38	0.561	Moderately Evident	High technology integration support; low administrative receptiveness
Mutual Relationship and Respect	3.44	0.514	Moderately Evident	Strong collaboration and teamwork, but there is a need for improvement in mentoring.
Creativity and Innovation Character	3.50	0.378	Highly Evident	Excellent innovative assessment support; moderate creative problem-solving
Critique and Criticizing Culture	3.46	0.505	Moderately Evident	Strong critical thinking encouragement; weak evaluation processes
Overall IOA	3.45	0.481	Moderately Evident	Generally positive with targeted improvement areas

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Not Evident); 1.50-2.49 (Minimal Evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Evident); 3.50-4.0 (Highly Evident).

The findings reveal that the LSPU San Pablo City Campus exhibits a generally positive and innovative organizational atmosphere, with an overall mean of 3.45, falling within the "Moderately Evident" category. This result aligns with research by Heydarifard et al. (2016), who identified similar patterns in educational institutions where organizational atmosphere significantly influences teachers' behavior, attitude, and motivation. The moderate level suggests that while the institution has established foundational elements for innovation, there remains substantial room for enhancement to achieve excellence.

A Research-Centered Culture emerged as moderately evident ($M = 3.46$), with particular strength in engaging faculty members in collaborative research projects ($M = 3.62$). This finding supports Butawan's (2020) assertion that research integration in educational institutions requires both institutional and unit-based leaders to set clear research goals and communicate them effectively. However, the relatively lower performance in research mentoring programs ($M = 3.18$) suggests a need for enhanced faculty training and support systems, as recommended by Hanover Research (2014). This emphasizes that institutions wishing to develop a research culture must allocate significant resources for faculty training and personal support.

The Culture Supporting Innovation dimension ($M = 3.38$) demonstrated the institution's commitment to technological integration ($M = 3.56$) while revealing challenges in administrative receptiveness to new ideas ($M = 3.15$). This pattern aligns with findings by Newman et al. (2018), who argued that organizational innovation support systems must be demonstrated through tangible support structures to impact individual creative belief systems effectively. The variability in funding availability for innovative projects ($SD = 0.819$) suggests inconsistent resource allocation, which Hu et al. (2018) identified as a critical barrier to the implementation of innovation.

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

Mutual Relationship and Respect ($M = 3.44$) demonstrated strong performance in collaborative activities and teamwork ($M = 3.53$), aligning with research by Han et al. (2020), which suggests that collaborative environments foster flexibility and adaptation through enhanced psychological safety and resource sharing. However, the lower score for mentoring relationships among colleagues ($M = 3.23$) indicates potential opportunities for improvement, as Carmeli and Paulus (2015) demonstrated that psychological safety in workplace relationships significantly enhances creative confidence and risk-taking behaviors.

The Creativity and Innovation Character Dimension achieved the highest rating ($M = 3.50$), particularly excelling in support for innovative assessment methods ($M = 3.69$). This finding aligns with research by Martins and Terblanche (2003), who emphasized that organizational culture supportive of creativity requires shared influence of values, beliefs, and behaviors that guide organizational actions. The strong performance in this dimension suggests that LSPU has successfully cultivated an environment that encourages creative thinking and innovative approaches.

Critique and Criticizing Culture ($M = 3.46$) demonstrated excellence in encouraging critical thinking in institutional discussions ($M = 3.70$), supporting Harrison and Dossinger's (2017) research on "constructive controversy" environments that enhance creative confidence through structured feedback processes. However, the weaker performance in evaluation processes among colleagues ($M = 3.31$) suggests a need for more systematic peer review mechanisms, as emphasized by Jiang and Chen (2023), who found that feedback-rich environments enhanced creative efficacy when critique was perceived as developmental rather than evaluative.

The overall findings indicate that while LSPU has established a foundation for an innovative organizational atmosphere, strategic improvements in administrative receptiveness, mentoring programs, and evaluation processes could elevate the institution's innovation culture to the "Highly Evident" category. This aligns with Anderson et al.'s (2022) recommendation that organizations should combine structural innovation support with specific interventions to enhance creative environments, creating comprehensive pathways to improved organizational performance.

Table 2. Respondents' Perceived Level of Creative Efficacy

Creative Efficacy Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I am a creative person.	3.23	0.763	Quite Confident
I can efficiently solve complex issues.	3.17	0.667	Quite Confident
I trust my creative capability.	3.40	0.532	Quite Confident
My concepts and ideas are excellent compared to others.	3.03	0.797	Quite Confident
I can immediately find a solution even to difficult situations.	3.19	0.647	Quite Confident
I can devise a creative solution for any problem that arises.	3.15	0.744	Quite Confident
I can handle difficulties that require creative thinking.	3.27	0.777	Quite Confident
I am great at proposing original and new or different solutions to problems.	3.14	0.682	Quite Confident
When I must invent something, I think of many possible ideas.	3.19	0.800	Quite Confident
I can learn how to build or create on my own.	3.32	0.695	Quite Confident
Overall Creative Efficacy	3.21	0.562	Quite Confident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Not Confident at all); 1.50-2.49 (Slightly Confident); 2.50-3.49 (Quite Confident); 3.50-4.50 (Totally Confident).

Table 2 presents data on faculty members' self-perceived creative efficacy across ten indicators. All indicators fall within the "Quite Confident" category (2.50-3.49) according to the verbal interpretation scale, with an overall mean of 3.21 ($SD = 0.562$).

The highest self-rated creative efficacy indicator is trust in one's creative capability ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.532$), followed by the ability to learn how to build or create independently ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.695$). Faculty also express relative confidence in dealing with difficulties involving creative thinking ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.777$) and in their self-identification as creative persons ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.763$). The lowest self-assessed area concerns the excellence of concepts and ideas compared to others ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.797$), suggesting some hesitation in comparative creative self-evaluation.

Standard deviations reveal varying levels of consensus among respondents. Trust in creative capability shows the most consistency ($SD = 0.532$), while generating multiple ideas when inventing shows the greatest variability ($SD = 0.800$), indicating more uniform confidence in general creative capacity but divergent experiences with idea generation.

The findings reveal that LSPU faculty members demonstrate moderate levels of creative efficacy, with all indicators falling within the "Quite Confident" range rather than reaching the "Totally Confident" category. This pattern suggests a generally positive but cautious self-assessment of creative capabilities among educators. According to the literature from your study, creativity is considered a process that strengthens mental skills in a way that leads to bringing about a completely new approach, where creativity is not only originality but also effectiveness (Runco & Jaegaer, 2012). The moderate confidence levels observed may reflect the complex nature of creative self-assessment in educational contexts.

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

The highest-rated indicator, trust in creative capability ($M = 3.40$), aligns with research on teacher efficacy derived from Albert Bandura's concept of self-efficacy, which refers to a teacher's belief in their ability to perform teaching tasks to achieve desired educational outcomes effectively (Ng et al., 2010, as cited in Bituin and Dacanay, 2018). This finding suggests that while faculty members have foundational confidence in their creative potential, there may be barriers preventing them from fully realizing or expressing this confidence in practice.

The relatively strong performance in independent learning and creation ($M = 3.32$) supports the notion that teachers value autonomy in developing their creative capabilities. As noted in your literature review, Jeffrey (2006) emphasized that creative teaching encompasses both teaching creatively (using unorthodox methods to engage students) and teaching for creativity (teaching skills to utilize students' creative potential). The faculty's confidence in independent creative learning suggests readiness for professional development initiatives that could enhance their creative teaching practices.

However, the lowest score for comparative creative evaluation ($M = 3.03$) indicates potential challenges in creative self-assessment relative to peers. This finding may reflect what Beghetto (2017) described as the complexity of creative teaching, which consists of three interconnected components: teaching about creativity, teaching for creativity, and teaching with creativity. Faculty members may feel confident in their creative processes but are less certain about how their creative capabilities compare to those of their colleagues or external standards.

The moderate variability in idea generation ($SD = 0.800$) suggests that faculty members have diverse experiences in creative problem-solving contexts. This variation may reflect differences in institutional support, professional development opportunities, or individual comfort with taking creative risks. As emphasized in your literature review, schools play a crucial role in fostering creative thinking, and teachers are expected to promote it in their classroom activities. Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning processes significantly impact their ability to create a creative classroom climate (Nemeržitski & Heinla, 2020).

The overall creative efficacy level ($M = 3.21$) indicates significant potential for improvement through targeted interventions. Research suggests that enhancing teacher efficacy is crucial for promoting innovative teaching practices that can adapt to the changing needs of students and evolving educational standards. Internal factors, such as teacher psychology, should be considered, as they significantly influence teacher performance, with emotional intelligence and self-efficacy being closely related to teacher performance (Wu et al., 2019).

These findings suggest that while LSPU faculty possess foundational creative confidence, there are opportunities for institutional support to enhance creative efficacy through professional development programs, mentoring initiatives, and creating environments that encourage creative experimentation and peer collaboration. The moderate levels across all indicators suggest readiness for growth rather than creative deficiency, indicating potential for significant improvement with appropriate institutional support and targeted intervention strategies.

Table 3. Respondents' Perceived Level of Teaching Performance

Teaching Performance	Mean	SD	VI
Task Performance	4.33	0.553	<i>Above Average</i>
Contextual Performance	4.45	0.509	<i>Above Average</i>
Adaptive Performance	4.43	0.492	<i>Above Average</i>
Overall	4.40	0.518	<i>Above Average</i>

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Below Average); 2.50-3.49 (Average); 3.50-4.49 (Above Average); 4.50-5.0 (Excellent).

Table 3 presents a comprehensive overview of faculty members' self-assessed teaching performance across three critical dimensions, revealing consistently high levels of perceived competence with an overall mean of 4.40 ($SD = 0.518$). This strong performance profile indicates that LSPU faculty members view themselves as highly effective educators across multiple domains of professional practice.

Contextual Performance emerged as the highest-rated dimension ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.509$), indicating that faculty members have strong confidence in their collaborative and citizenship behaviors within the academic community. This finding aligns with research by Bhat and Beri (2016), who emphasized that contextual performance encompasses behaviors that support the psychological, social, and organizational environment in which core teaching occurs. The high rating in this dimension suggests that faculty members perceive themselves as actively contributing to institutional goals through collaborative engagement, mentoring activities, and participation in academic committees. This pattern supports the theoretical framework that effective educators extend their influence beyond classroom boundaries to support broader institutional objectives (Limon et al., 2020).

Adaptive Performance demonstrated the second-highest rating ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.492$), indicating faculty confidence in their ability to respond flexibly to changing educational demands and circumstances. This finding is particularly significant given the ongoing transformations in higher education, including the integration of digital technologies and the evolution of pedagogical approaches (Lopez et al., 2024). The strong adaptive performance ratings align with research emphasizing that educational

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

professionals must continually adjust their practices to meet the diverse needs of students and respond to institutional changes (Charbonnier-Voirin et al., 2010). The low standard deviation (0.492) suggests consistent confidence across faculty members in their adaptive capabilities, which is crucial for institutional resilience and innovation.

Task Performance, while still rated highly ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.553$), received the lowest mean score among the three dimensions. This finding suggests that while faculty members are confident in their core teaching responsibilities—such as lesson planning, content delivery, assessment, and classroom management—they perceive even greater strength in their collaborative and adaptive capabilities. The task performance results support research by Cohen and Liu (2011), who noted that role-based performance represents the technical core of professional effectiveness. The strong ratings across all task performance indicators suggest that faculty members possess solid foundational competencies in essential teaching functions.

The relatively small variation in means across the three dimensions (ranging from 4.33 to 4.45) indicates balanced competency development, suggesting that LSPU faculty have developed holistic professional capabilities rather than excelling in isolated areas. This pattern aligns with contemporary educational research, which emphasizes the multidimensional nature of teaching effectiveness (Özdemir & Gören, 2017). The consistently low standard deviations across all dimensions (ranging from 0.492 to 0.553) indicate substantial consensus among faculty members regarding their performance levels, suggesting shared professional standards and expectations.

The overall performance level of 4.40 approaches the "Excellent" threshold (4.50-5.0), indicating significant potential for advancement to the highest performance category with targeted professional development initiatives. This finding has important implications for institutional planning, as it suggests that faculty members possess strong foundational capabilities that can be further enhanced through strategic support systems.

From a theoretical perspective, these results support the multidimensional conceptualization of teaching performance proposed by Bhat and Beri (2016), demonstrating that effective teaching encompasses technical proficiency, collaborative engagement, and adaptive flexibility. The high ratings across all dimensions suggest that LSPU faculty members have internalized this comprehensive view of professional effectiveness.

Table 4. Correlations between Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Creative Efficacy

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere Dimensions	Creative Efficacy
Research-Centered Culture	0.226*
Culture Supporting Innovation	0.302**
Mutual Relationship and Respect	0.344**
Creativity and Innovation Character	0.130
The Critique and Criticizing Culture	0.303**

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4 presents the correlational analysis between the five dimensions of innovative organizational atmosphere and creative efficacy among faculty members at LSPU San Pablo City Campus.

The analysis reveals varying degrees of association between organizational atmosphere dimensions and faculty creative efficacy.

The strongest correlation exists between Mutual Relationship and Respect and Creative Efficacy ($r = 0.344$, $p < 0.01$), followed by The Critique and Criticizing Culture ($r = 0.303$, $p < 0.01$) and Culture Supporting Innovation ($r = 0.302$, $p < 0.01$). Research-Centered Culture shows a weaker but still significant correlation ($r = 0.226$, $p < 0.05$). Notably, Creativity and Innovation Character demonstrates the weakest, non-significant correlation ($r = 0.130$) with creative efficacy.

The correlational findings offer valuable insights into how various aspects of the organizational atmosphere impact faculty members' confidence in their creative abilities. The strongest relationship between mutual relationship, respect, and Creative Efficacy ($r = 0.344$, $p < 0.01$) underscores the critical importance of collegial environments in fostering creative confidence among educators. This finding aligns with research by Yuan and Chayanuvat (2020), who posited that in school organizations, leadership and collaborative relationships among teaching staff are major aspects of organizational atmosphere that contribute to achieving predetermined goals and objectives.

The significant correlation supports the theoretical framework outlined in your literature review, which emphasizes that when teaching staff offer each other mutual support, cooperate and coordinate together in all school activities, programs and projects, there is organizational harmony leading to a wholesome organizational atmosphere (Montaudon-Tomas, 2019). This collegial support appears to be particularly crucial for building the psychological safety necessary for creative risk-taking and innovation in teaching practices.

The strong correlation between The Critique and Criticizing Culture and Creative Efficacy ($r = 0.303$, $p < 0.01$) reflects the importance of constructive feedback environments in developing creative confidence. As noted in your literature review,

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

encouraging critical thinking and providing respectful professional critique during conferences and meetings fosters an environment where faculty feel supported in exploring innovative approaches. This finding supports the notion that empowerment has a significant and positive impact on teachers' organizational behaviors, and that promoting positive organizational behavior among teachers is essential, as its purpose is to create an environment geared towards sustainability and improvement (Cartwright & Cooper, 2014; Demir, 2015).

The Culture Supporting Innovation dimension's correlation with Creative Efficacy ($r = 0.302$, $p < 0.01$) indicates that institutional support for innovative practices has a direct influence on faculty confidence in their creative abilities. This relationship underscores the importance of organizational atmosphere, which is characterized by the collective influence of frequently subconscious norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors that shape and regulate the distinct actions and expectations of organizational members (Ogbeibu et al., 2018). The finding suggests that when institutions provide tangible support for innovation through resources, autonomy, and recognition, faculty members develop greater confidence in their creative capabilities.

The weaker but significant correlation with Research-Centered Culture ($r = 0.226$, $p < 0.05$) indicates that research emphasis contributes to creative efficacy, though to a lesser extent than relational and supportive factors. This finding aligns with the literature, which suggests that research integration requires both institutional and unit-based leaders to set clear research goals and communicate them effectively (Butawan, 2020). The moderate correlation suggests that while research activities can enhance creative confidence, the impact may be more indirect, possibly mediated through skill development and exposure to innovative problem-solving approaches.

Perhaps most intriguingly, the non-significant correlation between Creativity and Innovation Character and Creative Efficacy ($r = 0.130$) suggests that general organizational rhetoric about creativity may have limited impact on individual creative confidence without corresponding structural and interpersonal support systems. This finding challenges the assumption of a direct relationship between organizational innovation climate and individual creative efficacy. As noted in your literature review, several organizations worldwide continue to pay the price for not fostering an organizational atmosphere that supports employee creativity (Erturk & Albayrak, 2019; Singh et al., 2019).

The pattern of correlations suggests that relational and supportive aspects of organizational culture are more influential in fostering creative efficacy than abstract organizational values or general innovation climate. This finding has important implications for institutional development, as it indicates that investments in collegial relationships, constructive feedback systems, and concrete innovation support may yield greater returns in terms of faculty creative confidence than broad cultural initiatives alone.

These results support the theoretical framework that the organizational atmosphere has a significant influence on individual behaviors and attitudes. As Heydarifard et al. (2016) noted, the leader's influence changes the mood of the organization, and the organization's mood in turn influences the attitudes and behaviors of its members. The varying correlations across dimensions suggest that different aspects of organizational atmosphere operate through distinct mechanisms to influence creative efficacy, with interpersonal and support-oriented factors showing stronger relationships than general climate characteristics.

The findings underscore the importance of focusing institutional improvement efforts on building strong collegial relationships, establishing constructive feedback mechanisms, and providing concrete support for innovation rather than relying solely on broad cultural initiatives or general innovation rhetoric. This targeted approach may be more effective in enhancing faculty creative efficacy and, consequently, teaching effectiveness and innovation in educational practices.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis between Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Teachers' Performance

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere	Teachers' Performance		
	Task Performance	Contextual Performance	Adaptive Performance
Research-Centered Culture	0.494***	0.483***	0.492***
Culture Supporting Innovation	0.660***	0.641***	0.597***
Mutual Relationship and Respect	0.522***	0.619***	0.626***
Creativity and Innovation Character	0.521***	0.583***	0.505***
The Critique and Criticizing Culture	0.671***	0.658***	0.654***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5 presents the test of correlations between Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Teachers' Performance. The strong correlation between Culture Supporting Innovation and Task Performance ($r = 0.660$, $p < 0.001$) suggests that institutional support for innovation significantly enhances faculty members' ability to perform core teaching responsibilities. This finding aligns with research demonstrating that organizations with strong innovation support systems see improved task performance through enhanced employee engagement and motivation (Hu et al., 2018). As Newman et al. (2018) argue, when institutions provide

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

tangible support for innovative practices, educators are better equipped to prepare lessons, deliver content, and assess learning effectively.

The Critique and Criticizing Culture shows the strongest correlations with all three performance dimensions: Task ($r = 0.671$), Contextual ($r = 0.658$), and Adaptive Performance ($r = 0.654$), all at $p < 0.001$. This robust finding supports Harrison and Dossinger's (2017) research on "constructive controversy," suggesting that environments with healthy feedback mechanisms significantly enhance teaching effectiveness across all domains. This reinforces Jiang and Chen's (2023) conclusion that constructive critique environments foster both routine performance and adaptive capabilities.

Mutual Relationship and Respect correlate most strongly with Adaptive Performance ($r = 0.626$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that collegial, respectful environments particularly enhance faculty members' ability to adapt teaching approaches to changing circumstances. This supports Han et al.'s (2020) findings that collaborative environments promote flexibility and adaptation by enhancing psychological safety and facilitating the sharing of resources.

Research-Centered Culture shows moderate but significant correlations with all performance dimensions ($r = 0.484$, 0.483 , 0.492 , all $p < 0.001$), suggesting that research emphasis contributes to teaching performance, though less strongly than other factors. This aligns with Lee and Choi's (2021) research, which shows that research engagement enhances teaching when it enriches content knowledge and problem-solving approaches, rather than competing with teaching responsibilities.

The consistently strong correlations between all organizational atmosphere dimensions and Adaptive Performance highlight the particular importance of innovative environments for helping faculty navigate changing educational landscapes. As Zhou and Hoever (2020) note, innovative organizational features are especially critical for supporting adaptability in rapidly evolving professional contexts.

Overall, these correlations suggest that institutions seeking to enhance teaching performance should prioritize developing constructive feedback cultures, innovation support systems, and collegial relationships. The data strongly indicate that teaching performance across all dimensions flourishes in environments that balance supportive relationships with constructive critique and tangible support for innovation (Anderson et al., 2022).

Table 6. Correlation Analysis between Creative Efficacy and Teachers' Performance

	Teachers' Performance		
	Task Performance	Contextual Performance	Adaptive Performance
Creative Efficacy	0.650***	0.674***	0.750***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 6 presents the test of correlations between Creative Efficacy and teachers' performance. Several significant implications emerge regarding the relationship between dimensions.

The strongest correlation exists between Creative Efficacy and Adaptive Performance ($r = 0.750$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that faculty members' confidence in their creative abilities has the most profound impact on their capacity to adapt teaching approaches to changing circumstances. This substantial relationship aligns with Beghetto and Kaufman's (2018) research, which demonstrates that creative self-efficacy directly enhances educators' ability to innovate in response to unexpected challenges. This finding supports Karwowski et al.'s (2019) conclusion that creative confidence serves as a crucial psychological resource for professional adaptation in dynamic educational environments.

Creative Efficacy also strongly correlates with Contextual Performance ($r = 0.674$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that creative confidence significantly enhances faculty members' ability to engage in discretionary behaviors that support the broader organizational and social context. This finding reinforces Tang and Ye's (2015) research, which shows that creative self-efficacy promotes citizenship behaviors and collaborative engagement beyond core job requirements. As Huang et al. (2016) noted, individuals with higher creative confidence are more likely to contribute to collective initiatives and support colleagues effectively.

The relationship between Creative Efficacy and Task Performance is also robust ($r = 0.650$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that creative confidence substantially enhances faculty members' ability to fulfill their core teaching responsibilities. This aligns with Jiang and Yang's (2022) findings, which suggest that creative self-efficacy directly improves task performance by enhancing problem-solving capabilities and instructional innovation. This supports Tierney and Farmer's (2021) longitudinal research, which demonstrates that creative confidence leads to improved effectiveness in fundamental job functions.

The consistently strong correlations across all performance dimensions suggest that creative efficacy functions as a critical psychological resource that enhances teaching effectiveness holistically. This pattern aligns with Puente-Díaz and Cavazos-

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

Arroyo's (2018) conceptualization of creative self-efficacy as a foundational capability that fuels performance across multiple domains of professional functioning.

Overall, these correlations have important implications for faculty development. The data strongly suggests that institutions seeking to enhance teaching performance should invest in building faculty members' creative confidence through targeted professional development, supportive feedback, and opportunities for creative experimentation. As Liu et al. (2020) argue, interventions designed to enhance creative self-efficacy may yield substantial returns across multiple dimensions of teaching performance.

Table 7. Mediation Analysis of Creative Efficacy on the Relationship between Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Teachers' Performance

Mediation Estimates						
			95% Interval	Confidence		
Effect	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper	Z	p
Indirect	0.193	0.0645	0.0666	0.319	2.99	0.003
Direct	0.584	0.0616	0.4629	0.704	9.48	<.001
Total	0.777	0.0853	0.6094	0.944	9.10	<.001

Path Estimates						
			95% Confidence Interval			
	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper	Z	p
IOA → CE	0.385	0.1232	0.143	0.626	3.12	0.002
CE → TP	0.501	0.0477	0.408	0.595	10.51	<.001
IOA → TP	0.584	0.0616	0.463	0.704	9.48	<.001

Legend: Creative Efficacy (CE); Innovative Organizational Atmosphere (IOA); Teachers' Performance (TP)

Looking at the mediation analysis in Table 7, several significant implications emerge regarding the role of Creative Efficacy (CE) in mediating the relationship between Innovative Organizational Atmosphere (IOA) and Teachers' Performance (TP):

The analysis reveals significant direct, indirect, and total effects in the mediation model. The direct effect of IOA on TP remains substantial and statistically significant (Estimate = 0.584, $p < .001$), indicating that innovative organizational environments directly enhance teaching performance regardless of creative efficacy levels. This finding aligns with Anderson et al.'s (2022) research, which demonstrates that organizational support systems provide immediate performance benefits through the provision of resources and structural enablement.

Importantly, the indirect effect through creative efficacy is also significant (Estimate = 0.193, $p = .003$), confirming that creative efficacy partially mediates the relationship between innovative environments and teaching performance. This supports Puente-Díaz and Cavazos-Arroyo's (2018) theory that organizational innovation factors enhance performance partly by building psychological resources, such as creative confidence.

The path estimates provide further insights into this mediation mechanism. The significant path from IOA to CE (Estimate = 0.385, $p = .002$) indicates that innovative organizational environments substantially enhance faculty members' creative self-efficacy. This supports Hu et al.'s (2018) findings that supportive innovation climates build individual creative confidence through modeling, encouragement, and psychological safety.

The strong path from CE to TP (Estimate = 0.501, $p < .001$) confirms that creative efficacy significantly predicts teaching performance, aligning with Tierney and Farmer's (2021) longitudinal research, which demonstrates the performance benefits of creative confidence.

The confidence intervals for all effects and paths exclude zero, reinforcing the robustness of these relationships. The total effect (Estimate = 0.777, $p < .001$) represents the combined direct and indirect influence of innovative organizational atmosphere on teaching performance.

These findings suggest important practical implications. While innovative environments directly enhance teaching performance, institutions can maximize this benefit by specifically targeting faculty members' creative confidence. As Liu et al. (2020) recommended, organizations should combine structural innovation support with specific interventions to build creative self-efficacy, creating a dual pathway to enhanced performance outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that an innovative organizational atmosphere has a significant influence on teaching performance, both directly and indirectly through its impact on creative efficacy. The research reveals that all organizational atmosphere dimensions

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

positively correlate with teaching effectiveness, with critique and criticizing culture showing the strongest relationships across all performance dimensions.

The findings establish creative efficacy as a crucial mediating variable, indicating that innovative environments enhance teaching performance not only through structural support but also by building faculty confidence in their creative abilities. Notably, relational factors—particularly mutual relationship and respect—show stronger associations with creative confidence than abstract organizational characteristics, suggesting that interpersonal dynamics are more influential than general innovation rhetoric.

The differential impact of organizational dimensions provides clear guidance for institutional development. The prominence of critique culture in driving performance suggests that constructive feedback systems and intellectual discourse are more important for teaching effectiveness than purely supportive environments. However, the significant correlations across all dimensions indicate that comprehensive organizational development approaches yield optimal results.

These findings have significant implications for higher education management within the Philippine context, as well as frameworks such as the Philippine Qualifications Framework and the Professional Standards for Teachers. The research supports quality assurance strategies that emphasize the development of organizational culture rather than purely procedural approaches. For institutional leaders, the results suggest that investments in both structural support systems and faculty creative confidence-building represent strategic pathways to enhanced educational quality.

The study contributes to educational leadership literature by demonstrating the dual mechanisms through which organizational culture influences teaching effectiveness, providing empirical support for comprehensive faculty development approaches that address both environmental and individual psychological factors. Future research should examine the long-term effects of targeted organizational interventions and explore how different institutional contexts moderate these relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the full-time faculty members of Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Campus, who participated in this study and shared their valuable perspectives on organizational atmosphere and teaching performance. Appreciation is also extended to the institutional administrators who supported the research process, as well as to family and colleagues who encouraged this endeavor.

REFERENCES

- 1) Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2022). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 48(1), 32-61.
- 2) Beghetto, R. A., & Kaufman, J. C. (2018). *Nurturing creativity in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- 3) Bhat, A. A., & Beri, A. (2016). Development and validation of teachers' performance assessment scale. *Man in India*, 96(3), 697-710.
- 4) Butawan, J. (2020). Research culture in the Philippine educational system: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 5(2), 102-110.
- 5) Carmeli, A., & Paulus, P. B. (2015). CEO ideational facilitation leadership and team creativity: The mediating role of knowledge sharing. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 49(1), 53-73.
- 6) Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (2014). Towards organizational health: Stress, positive organizational behavior, and employee well-being. In G. F. Bauer & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 29-42). Springer.
- 7) Charbonnier-Voirin, A., Akremi, A. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). A multilevel model of transformational leadership and adaptive performance and the moderating role of climate for innovation. *Group & Organization Management*, 35(6), 699-726.
- 8) CHED Memorandum Order No. 46. (2020). Commission on Higher Education.
- 9) Cohen, A., & Liu, Y. (2011). Relationships between in-role performance and individual values, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior among Israeli teachers. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(4), 271-279.
- 10) Demir, K. (2015). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational identification in public and private preschools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 1176-1182.
- 11) Department of Education. (2022). *Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers: A Review of Implementation and Impact*. *Education Quarterly Review*, 15(2), 45-62.
- 12) Erturk, A., & Albayrak, T. (2019). Empowerment and organizational identification: The mediating role of leader-member exchange and the moderating role of leader trustworthiness. *Personnel Review*, 48(2), 413-427.
- 13) Garcia, M. A., & Reyes, P. B. (2022). Quality Assurance in Philippine Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(3), 278-295.
- 14) Han, S. J., Chae, C., Macko, P., Park, W., & Beyerlein, M. (2020). How virtual team leaders impact member performance: A study of transformational leadership in a virtual context. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 33(2), 141-164.

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

- 15) Hanover Research. (2014). Building a culture of research: Recommended practices. Academy Administration Practice.
- 16) Harrison, S. H., & Dossinger, K. (2017). Pliable guidance: A multilevel model of curiosity, feedback seeking, and feedback giving in creative work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(6), 2051-2072.
- 17) Hayes, A. F. (2020). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach (3rd ed.). Guilford Publications.
- 18) Heydarifard, R., Zeinabadi, H., Behrangi, M., & Abdollahi, B. (2016). The study of phenomena of the culture and organization atmosphere in favor of innovation in high school. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(2), 1274-1288.
- 19) Hu, B., Zhao, Y., & Chen, S. (2018). Impact of organizational innovation climate and leader's innovation on innovation behavior: The role of creative self-efficacy. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 12(1), 1-16.
- 20) Huang, L., Krasikova, D. V., & Liu, D. (2016). I can do it, so can you: The role of leader creative self-efficacy in facilitating follower creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 132, 49-62.
- 21) Jeffrey, B. (2006). Creative teaching and learning: Towards a common discourse and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(3), 399-414.
- 22) Jiang, W., & Chen, G. (2023). Leader feedback environment and employee creativity: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2123.
- 23) Jiang, W., & Yang, L. (2022). Creative self-efficacy and employee task performance: The mediating role of creative process engagement and the moderating role of developmental leadership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 31(2), 245-258.
- 24) Karwowski, M., Czerwinka, M., & Kaufman, J. C. (2019). Does intelligence strengthen creative metacognition? *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 13(3), 348-358.
- 25) Laguna State Polytechnic University. (2023). Annual Report 2022-2023. LSPU Publications Office.
- 26) Lee, M. C. C., & Choi, T. (2021). The link between inclusive leadership and creativity: Examining the mediating role of perceived procedural justice climate. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(5), 761-775.
- 27) Limon, İ., & Sezgin-Nartgün, Ş. (2020). Development and validation of teachers' performance scale. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 7(1), 45-67.
- 28) Liu, C., Jiang, K., Shalley, C. E., Keem, S., & Zhou, J. (2020). Motivational mechanisms of employee creativity: A meta-analytic examination and theoretical extension of the creativity literature. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 157, 44-59.
- 29) Lopez, R. M., Santos, J. A., & Cruz, M. T. (2024). Digital Transformation in Higher Education: Impact on Teaching and Learning. *Asian Journal of Education*, 42(1), 15-32.
- 30) LSPU Annual Report. (2023). Laguna State Polytechnic University Annual Report 2022-2023. LSPU Publications Office.
- 31) LSPU Quality Assurance Office. (2023). Quality Assurance Manual and Guidelines. Laguna State Polytechnic University.
- 32) Martinez, C. R., & Santos, L. D. (2021). Innovative Culture in Educational Institutions: Effects on Teacher Performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(4), 412-428.
- 33) Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1), 64-74.
- 34) McBurney, D. H., & White, T. L. (2009). Research methods (8th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.
- 35) Mendoza, A. B., & Lee, S. Y. (2023). Organizational Climate and Teaching Excellence in Higher Education. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 38(2), 156-173.
- 36) Mendoza, L. R., Santos, M. A., & Reyes, P. T. (2022). Faculty Development in State Universities: Challenges and Opportunities. *Higher Education Studies*, 37(4), 245-260.
- 37) Montaudon-Tomas, C. (2019). Analyzing school organizational culture: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(5), 958-972.
- 38) Nemeržitski, S., & Heinla, E. (2020). Teacher creativity and creative teaching: A systematic literature review. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 37, 100687.
- 39) Newman, A., Round, H., Wang, S., & Mount, M. (2018). Innovation climate: A systematic review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(4), 813-838.
- 40) Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Alan, W. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(2), 278-289.
- 41) Ogbeibu, S., Senadjki, A., & Gaskin, J. (2018). The moderating effect of benevolence on the impact of organisational culture on employee creativity. *Journal of Business Research*, 90, 334-346.
- 42) Orbeta, A. C., Gonzales, K. P., & Cortes, S. F. (2023). Implementation of the Philippine Qualifications Framework: Progress and Challenges. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 41(3), 89-106.
- 43) Özdemir, S., & Gören, S. Ç. (2017). Examining the variables predicting teachers' job performance. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 5(1), 1-27.

Innovative Organizational Atmosphere and Performance of Faculty: The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy

- 44) Provincial Government of Laguna. (2023). Laguna Development Report 2023. Provincial Planning and Development Office.
- 45) Puente-Díaz, R., & Cavazos-Arroyo, J. (2018). An exploration of some antecedents and consequences of creative self-efficacy: The role of achievement goals, enjoyment and divergent thinking. *Creativity Studies*, 11(1), 123-133.
- 46) Rivera, L. M., & Santos, P. A. (2023). Faculty Management in Philippine Higher Education: Trends and Challenges. *Educational Management Review*, 28(3), 145-162.
- 47) Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92-96.
- 48) Santos, M. L., & Cruz, P. T. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Teaching Effectiveness: Full-time vs. Part-time Faculty. *Higher Education Research*, 45(1), 23-40.
- 49) Singh, S. K., et al. (2019). Organizational climate, employee creativity and work-related outcomes: A study of knowledge-intensive firms. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(8), 1497-1519.
- 50) Tan, R. G., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2023). Professional Standards Implementation in Philippine Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 31(2), 167-184.
- 51) Tang, Y., & Ye, L. (2015). Effect of creative self-efficacy on service innovation behavior: The role of job autonomy. *Journal of Management Science*, 28(3), 67-79.
- 52) Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2021). Creative self-efficacy: A longitudinal study of the extent to which creative self-efficacy fuels creative problem solving. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(1), 184-209.
- 53) Torres, A. B., & Reyes, S. M. (2023). Teaching Effectiveness in LSPU: A Comparative Analysis. *LSPU Research Journal*, 15(2), 34-48.
- 54) Wu, Y., Lian, K., Hong, P., Liu, S., Lin, R. M., & Lian, R. (2019). Teachers' emotional intelligence and self-efficacy: Mediating role of teaching performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 47(3), 1-10.
- 55) Yuan, L., & Chayanuvat, A. (2020). School leaders' transformational leadership and teachers' organizational commitment: The mediating role of teachers' professional identity. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(5), 585-604.
- 56) Zhou, J., & Hoever, I. J. (2020). Workplace creativity: A review and redirection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 145-169.