EXAMINING THE CORRELATIONS OF GOODWILL WITH COMPETENCE AND TRUSTWORTHINESS A TEST IN THE PHILIPPINE SETTING

Jose Carlo Garcia de Pano
Asst. Prof., Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
College Secretary, College of Arts and Letters
University of the Philippines Diliman
(jgdepano@up.edu.ph)

Abstract

With the controversies and challenges surrounding the concept of goodwill as a dimension of ethos, the current study aimed to test its correlations with competence and trustworthiness which have always been deemed as more concrete and steadier ethos facets. After administering the survey, which was composed of Source Credibility Measures (McCroskey & Teven, 1999) and an open-ended question, to 167 students of University of the Philippines Diliman, the results suggest that there were moderate to strong correlations between and among the three ethos factors, suggesting their "intercorrelatedness." More than reaffirming the position of goodwill as a measure of credibility, the findings disclose that the major factor affecting ethos may be cross-cultural in character.

Keywords: goodwill, competence, trustworthiness, ethos dimensions, ethos in the Philippine setting

Introduction and Rationale

Ethos, being a matter of perception and subject to individual judgment, may be best described as "the image of the source in the minds of receivers" (Anderson & Clevenger, 1968, as cited in Teven, 2008, p. 385). As an Aristotelian artistic mode of persuasion that operates at a "different level or

plane of classification" (Rosenthal, 1966, p. 126), it is certainly able to establish its importance in the field of communication (McCroskey, 1986; McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Its crucial functions in various communicative acts are clearly defined that the concept itself is seldom challenged. Despite its stability as an influence in persuasive communication, however, scholars argue over its facets.

Among the dimensions of ethos, it is goodwill, which is defined as the caring factor of communication source, covering the speaker's understanding, empathy, and responsiveness (McCroskey, 1992, as cited in McCroskey & Teven, 1999), that garners the most attention from academics presumably due to its unique nature. Its constancy as a factor of credibility is quite controversial as it is often interrogated (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). While the classical rhetorical theory and other empirical studies derived from such tenet suppose that it is a consistent and stable measure of ethos (McCroskey, 1986; McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Teven, 2008), contemporary research argues that goodwill may not be the third dimension of source credibility; that ethos might have only two dimensions—competence (also referred to as authoritativeness) and trustworthiness (also labeled as character); that a different set of determinants of ethos exist; or that goodwill is subsumed in other elements of ethos (Eisend, 2006; Holtzman, 1966; McCroskey, 1966; McCroskey & Dunham, 1966; McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Ostermeier, 1967; Sereno, 1968; Sereno & Hawkins, 1967; Tuppen, 1974). Although varying in claims, all these presuppositions share a common inquiry on the validity of goodwill as a gauge of source credibility. They raise a valuable theoretical concern with regard to the systematic position of goodwill not just in ethos, but more widely, in the field of persuasion and communication.

In the local setting, ethos is also often studied and tested at different levels and in various communication transactions (Cristobal, 2002; de Pano, 2011; Florentino, 2010; Madrigal, 1992; Relao, 2011; Tulio, 2015). Despite this, there is very limited literature focusing mainly on the inclusion of goodwill in the dimensions of source credibility. There is inadequate attempt to scrutinise its operations and its associations with the first two ethos facets.

The aforementioned contentions and the ongoing debate on the solidity of goodwill's dimensionality warrant an empirical investigation that would examine its value and legitimacy as a measure of ethos. There could be different methods to perform such; and one of which is to test its correlations with the first two, more widely accepted, dimensions. Significant and strong correlations among the three may suggest that goodwill is in fact, a functional dimension of ethos in the Philippine setting. On the other hand, insignificant

and weak associations may lead to dropping of goodwill from its supposed triadic relation with competence and trustworthiness. They might as well reveal invaluable conceptual understandings that may open venues for identification of other possible ethos elements in the Philippines.

Related Literature

Interpretations of the Aristotelian rhetoric emphasise the inclusion of goodwill in the fundamental elements of ethos (Bulan & de Leon, 2002; McCroskey, 1986; McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Scholars of this tradition believe that while there could be different terms to describe the third credibility factor, they all refer to the very core characteristics of goodwill, thus, confirming its influence on ethos. More than this, there is also empirical proof that verifies not only the validity of goodwill as a considerable gauge of ethos but even its significant correlations with the two other facets of source credibility (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). The strength of goodwill is further highlighted by citing its dimensions—understanding, empathy, and responsiveness—that are believed to also shape one's credibility in general (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). In terms of measurability, it is also proven, more than once, that goodwill may be quantified, just like how the first two ethos facets could be numerically evaluated (McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

Another assumption based on observed data is that goodwill a steady ethos factor, but in lieu of treating it independently, scholars believe that it should be seen as a factor subsumed in other ethos elements. This means to say that while goodwill may be classified as a confirmed dimension, its independence from competence and trustworthiness may not be affirmed (McCroskey & Young, 1981, as cited in McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

The functions of goodwill are exemplified at various levels of communication, and in different contexts. It is reputed to be a construct that operates not only in the realm of public speaking but even in other communicative acts that inherently overlap with public communication; an example would be political persuasion. Goodwill is said to be "an important characteristic of political candidates in the minds of voters" (Teven, 2008, p. 392). Given this assumption, it is further reasoned that goodwill, also referred to as ‘caring,' "has been ignored by many contemporary researchers as a function of misanalysis and misinterpretation of data in a wide variety of empirical studies" (p. 392). Although very specific to political rhetoric, the finding demonstrates the fluidity of goodwill as one of the shaping mechanisms of ethos. It goes to show that, empirically, goodwill can institute

its vital post in different communication acts. Said result as well provides support to the revalidation claim on goodwill's function in gauging one's ethos which, in turn, tremendously affects the source effectiveness and communication quality in varying situations (McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

Despite the empirical evidence proving and strengthening the position of goodwill in the universal dimensions of ethos, there are scholarly assumptions stating other views. The first side of such perspective supposes that instead of goodwill, dynamism is the third facet of source credibility (Sereno & Hawkins, 1967; Tuppen, 1974); while the other side is either silent on the existence of the third dimension or offer a different set of ethos factors, hence, neither confirming nor debunking either goodwill or dynamism as the third credibility facet (Hellmueller & Trilling, 2012; Holtzman, 1966; McCroskey & Dunham, 1966; Ostermeier, 1967; Sereno, 1968). It simply maintains the constancy of the first two dimensions—authoritativeness and character.

One of the reasons dynamism is assumed to be the third factor of ethos is that in selected research on credibility, it exhibits consistency with the two less controversial dimensions. In a study, for instance, on the effect of source's nonfluency on attitude towards the speaker's credibility, the findings reveal that dynamism is more than just correlated with competence and trustworthiness, but more importantly, has a significant influence on one's credibility (Sereno & Hawkins, 1967). This correlation may be a strong indication of dynamism's capacity to measure an aspect of ethos, crucially characterising it as a quantifiable gauge of credibility.

Not limiting the ethos facets to only three, Tuppen (1974), in his research on the dimensions of credibility, claims that dynamism is the third of five credibility clusters. It is considered, then, a strong stimulus in shaping one’s credibility and likeability. The other four are the trustworthiness cluster which is similar to safety and character dimensions; the competence cluster which emphasises the source’s authoritativeness and qualifications; the co-orientation cluster which is explained as having or sharing the same set of interests (leading to higher credibility level assigned by raters or receivers of the message); and the charisma cluster which pertains to the unique personality traits of the source that make him/ her appealing and believable to the audience (Tuppen, 1974).

Although the above-mentioned clearly suggests that dynamism may be a factor of credibility, Ostermeier's (1967) research casts doubts on its role as an ethos determinant. His study demonstrates the validity and reliability of competence and trustworthiness but denies the consistency of dynamism. In

fact, "the results lend some support to the recently expressed belief that dynamism may not be a significant persuasive factor in determining the credibility of a source" (p. 144). This findingdefinitely questions the locus of dynamism in the acknowledged dimensions of ethos.

The ongoing debate between goodwill and dynamism is neutralised by being silent on the third possible dimension of ethos, and instead, focusing on only two clusters—competence or authoritativeness and trustworthiness or character—that are relatively steady across various research (Holtzman, 1966; McCroskey & Dunham, 1966; Sereno, 1968). Holtzman (1966), for example, uses only the two aforesaid factors in measuring one's credibility. McCroskey and Dunham's (1966) theoretical assumptions offer the almost similar position, where solely the two are deemed significant devices in assessing ethos in persuasive communication. In the same fashion, Sereno (1968), in a study on ego-involvement, credibility, and belief-discrepant communication, upholds the reliability of the same ethos facets by considering only them in translating the concept of credibility into numbers.

Amidst the varying arguments on the third facet of ethos, Eisend (2006) proposes a quite different take. His view implies that credibility is not just multifactorial, but as well multifaceted in terms of the specific communication element being measured in a persuasive act. This viewpoint implicitly suggests that in different transactions, especially in marketing communication, credibility may have many faces corresponding to individual communication components. The central tenet of his theory asserts that source credibility, in general, has three clusters: "inclination toward the truth (‘will tell the truth'), potential of truth (‘knows the truth'), presentation of truth (‘appears, to tell the truth')" (Eisend, 2006, p. 23). Examination of these concepts may show that they may be connected with the previously discussed credibility dimensions, only they are more encompassing and cover a wider range of constructs shaping source ethos.

The opposing claims on selected ethos dimensions not only prove the complexity of its structure as they also necessitate an investigation on the third influential facet of source credibility. The theories and assumptions stated previously, to a great degree, illustrate the strength and power of both competence and trustworthiness as quantifiable gauges of credibility, but fail to come up with a coherent third ethos factor.

The arguments of the classical rhetorical theory supporting the presumption that goodwill is a dimension of ethos; the studies arguing otherwise, and instead offering the possibility that dynamism may be a more accurate measure than goodwill; and the empirical data opening avenues for

construction of a new set of ethos elements that reflect only the characteristics of authoritativeness and character, all point to the central idea of the current study—problematisation of goodwill's dimensionality through determining its correlations with competence and trustworthiness in a specific geographic site. In general, this would allow scholars to have a grasp of the exemplifications of goodwill's functions in the Philippine context which, in turn, can extend another setting where its assumed power in measuring source credibility could be revisited.

Current Study

As previously mentioned, the current research contends that there is substantial evidence, both theoretical and empirical, that requires a re-examination of goodwill as a dimension of ethos. Although the physical location is not a variable of interest in this study, it is imperative to contextualise this paper since the definition of ethos itself suggests that it could be a function of culture, hence, of the environment or the locale. Taking this into account, it must be noted that the inquiry on goodwill in this study is limited to selected cases in the Philippine setting. Therefore, all correlational tests and their results are assumed to be taken in said context.

The paper aims to answer the question: "What are the correlations between goodwill, and competence and trustworthiness dimensions of ethos?" From this problem, three research questions are formulated:

> RQ_1: How is goodwill correlated with competence or authoritativeness dimension of ethos?
> RQ_2: How is goodwill correlated with trustworthiness or character dimension of ethos?
> RQ_3: How is goodwill correlated with competence and trustworthiness dimensions of ethos?

Method

The focal point of the research primarily lies in testing the relationships of goodwill with the first two dimensions that are empirically and conceptually proven to be measures of ethos—competence and trustworthiness—, and with both. To meet these objectives, the researcher utilised McCroskey and Teven's (1999) Source Credibility Measures (with alpha reliabilities that range from

0.80 to 0.94), contextualised in different situations to partly control the possible unnecessary and unsolicited effect of 'circumstance' or 'interaction environment' on credibility ratings.

Three modified versions of Source Credibility Measures (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), based on three different communication situations, and were employed in the survey. The first version asked the respondents to each think of one of his/ her teachers in college, and rate his/ her credibility according to the bipolar characteristics included in the instrument. The second and third versions had the same instructions, but the second one's subject was a politician, while the third one, a leader of a religious sect.

Together with the Source Credibility Measures (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), an open-ended question was also included in the survey questionnaire. Said question asked each respondent to list down other factors aside from the adjectives incorporated in the McCroskey and Teven's instrument that he/ she considered in evaluating the credibility of the source.

The respondents were composed of 167 students (originally 180 but 13 of which did not complete the forms), coming from six different sections, taking a basic communication course at the University of the Philippines College of Arts and Letters, Diliman campus. Among the many students of the University, the researcher specifically chose this set of respondents because of their almost similar demographics.

The first group of students who rated the credibility of the "teacher" was composed of 58 respondents. The second group which assessed the credibility of the "politician" had 57 respondents, and the last set who evaluated the credibility of the "church leader" had 52.

The participating students were given ten minutes to complete the questionnaires. Briefings were done before and after the implementation proper to ensure that the respondents understood the instructions clearly and that the instrument itself did not cause any confusion.

The data were processed by summing the scores for each of the dimensions of credibility. These scores underwent statistical treatment to determine if they had significant correlations. As stated earlier, statistically significant relationships of the three ethos facets could validate goodwill's position in credibility measurement.

Findings and Discussions

Goodwill scores gathered from 167 respondents from the three sets representing hypothetical sources—the teacher for the first group, the political

candidate for the second group, and the church leader for the third group—indicate that, at .05 alpha level, there was a significant, moderate to strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.599) between goodwill and competence or authoritativeness dimensions of ethos. Almost the same result was observed in the case of the other ethos dimension; it was found that there was a significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.771) between goodwill and trustworthiness or character. While it was not directly part of the objectives, the correlation between competence or authoritativeness and trustworthiness or character dimensions was also measured. The same assumption was proven in this instance—there was a significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.731) between the two. Table 1 summarises the aforementioned findings.

Table 1: Overall Correlations between Goodwill and Other Dimensions of Ethos

Variables	Number of Observations	p-value	Spearman's rho
Goodwill and Competence	167	0.000*	0.599
Goodwill and Trustworthiness	167	0.000*	0.771
Competence and Trustworthiness	167	0.000*	0.731

* *significant at .05 alpha level*

The significant correlations between goodwill and the two other factors of credibility may argue that if competence and trustworthiness are deemed concrete and more consistent measures of credibility, then, goodwill should also be positioned at the same level. Its statistically significant correlations with each of the first two ethos facets would signal that the three factors assess the very same concept. The findings, to a particular extent, reaffirm the propositions of the Aristotelian rhetoric, assuming that a triadic association among competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill exist; and that they are regarded as foundations of credibility (Bulan & de Leon, 2002; McCroskey, 1986; McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

While it may be proposed that the associations of goodwill with competence and trustworthiness do not guarantee its reliability as a measure of credibility, it should be noted that a chunk of available literature does not contest the validity of the first two ethos faces (Hellmueller & Trilling, 2012; Holtzman, 1966; McCroskey & Dunham, 1966; McCroskey & Young, 1981, as cited in McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Ostermeier, 1967; Sereno, 1968). It follows then, that, if competence and trustworthiness are empirically proven determinants of credibility, with the correlations maintained by goodwill with the two, it might be safe to assume that it as well captures a considerable part of the ethos. This supposition is further emphasised by the nature of the

correlations established by goodwill with the other two credibility dimensions. Goodwill's positive correlations with competence and trustworthiness would mean that they move in the same direction—in a manner that when the source's goodwill is deemed high, his/ her competence and trustworthiness are also rated high; when the source's goodwill is evaluated low, his/ her competence and trustworthiness levels are as well evaluated low. All these results not only support the classical rhetoric's assumption anchored in the Aristotelian tradition, but also validate the claims of more contemporary scholars on the validity, reliability, and measurability of goodwill (McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

Despite the limited sample size, the findings may nevertheless suggest three theoretical and practical assumptions. First, even if ethos is deemed to be a function of culture (Bulan & de Leon, 2002); meaning, its elements may vary from one culture to another, the results stated above may propose that its components may be universal. In other words, although the most specific factors that shape ethos dimensions may be different from one cultural setting to another cultural setting, the facets they refer to are much the same. The three major ethos elements or factors, then, function universally. This supports the assumption of the reliability of the three ethos clusters as concrete bases of source credibility (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Taking this line of argument, it may be further supposed that goodwill, just like competence and trustworthiness, is also a valid dimension of ethos in the Philippine setting.

Second, while some scholars propose other ethos dimensions in the local environment, for instance, language and charisma (Cristobal, 2002), the current study findings reveal that goodwill as an element of ethos still holds a vital position in the Filipino culture. This means to say that even though Filipino credibility may be a wider concept that is determined by factors more than those originally theorised by Aristotle and other Western scholars, goodwill does not lose its crucial power to partly gauge one's credibility. It is, indeed, a solid construct that can accurately define a portion of ethos.

Third, the findings above strengthen the equal influence of goodwill, as with competence' and trustworthiness', on one's credibility ratings. The statistics presented earlier may claim that the three dimensions enjoy almost the very same degrees of effect on source ethos. Again, in spite of the relatively small sample size of this study, the results may presuppose, or at least, offer a sample-limiting view, that goodwill stands on the same plane where competence and trustworthiness do.

The assumption that goodwill may be a valid and reliable measure of credibility in communication transactions is further emphasised by the

responses gathered from the open-ended question included in the latter part of the survey. The characteristics and/ or descriptions listed down by the respondents, which according to them, were the other elements they took into consideration as they assessed the credibility of the hypothetical source are as follows: accommodating, approachable, articulate, caring, committed, compassionate, considerate, experienced, formal, frank, friendly, good natured, has good command of the language, has good family background, has good track record, has the ability to connect with others, honest, humble, interesting, kind, leads to facilitating peace, loving, merciful, open-minded, passionate, presents accurate facts, reputable, respectful, sensible, strict, understanding, unbiased, and witty. Table 2 presents these findings.

Table 2: Other Factors Considered in Assessing Source Credibility

Characteristics	Relation to Goodwill	Characteristics	Relation to Goodwill
Accommodating	✓	Humble	✓
Approachable	✓	Interesting	
Articulate		Kind	✓
Caring	✓	Leads in facilitating peace	✓
Committed	✓	Loving	✓
Compassionate	✓	Merciful	✓
Considerate	✓	Open-minded	
Experienced		Passionate	✓
Formal		Presents accurate facts	
Frank		Reputable	
Friendly	✓	Respectful	
Good natured	✓	Sensible	
Has good command of the language		Strict	
Has good family background		Understanding	✓
Has good track record		Unbiased	✓
Has the ability to connect with others	✓	Witty	
Honest	✓		

Examining the descriptions given by the respondents, it may be concluded that most of them (Refer to the highlighted words in Table 2) are, in fact, connected with the concept of goodwill. This exhibits consistency with the

survey results which empirically indicate its acceptability as a credibility measure. The highlighted descriptions in Table 2 also stress the definition of goodwill as "caring" or "intention" dimension (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). In sum, the other factors provided by the respondents and their obvious connections with the third ethos dimension only all the more strengthen goodwill's dimensionality in the Philippine setting.

Since it may be assumed that the interaction environment or the context might have affected the findings, it was seen necessary to separately test the correlations of goodwill with the two other ethos factors in the three situations stated earlier. In the first case where the teacher was the hypothetical source, it was found that, at .05 alpha level, there was a significant, moderate, positive correlation (p=0.002, r=0.409) between goodwill and competence. On the other hand, there was a significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.636) between goodwill and trustworthiness. For competence and trustworthiness dimensions, same was identified; there was a significant, strong, moderate correlation (p=0.000, r=0.569) between them. These findings (summarised in Table 3), being parallel with the overall correlations discussed above, may, in some degree, argue that the nature of goodwill, even of ethos in general, is not greatly influenced by the interaction environment, context, or the source himself/ herself. Meaning, regardless of who is evaluated or the subject of assessment, the three facets of ethos are still equally and relatedly utilised.

Table 3: Correlations between Goodwill and Other Dimensions of Ethos in the First Group (Teacher as the Hypothetical Source)

Variables	Number of Observations	p-value	Spearman's rho
Goodwill and Competence	58	0.002*	0.409
Goodwill and Trustworthiness	58	0.000*	0.636
Competence and Trustworthiness	58	0.000*	0.569

**statistically significant at .05 alpha level*

The implications of the findings for the first group extend to the unswerving results for the other two sets (presented in Tables 4 and 5). In the second group where the hypothetical source was the political candidate, it was seen that, at .05 alpha level, there were significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.670) between goodwill and competence; and significant, very strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=.0.881) between goodwill and trustworthiness. Additionally, the almost same degree of association was

observed in the case of competence and trustworthiness, having a significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.662).

Table 4: Correlations between Goodwill and Other Dimensions of Ethos in the Second Group (Political Candidate as the Hypothetical Source)

Variables	Number of Observations	p-value	Spearman's rho
Goodwill and Competence	57	0.000*	0.670
Goodwill and Trustworthiness	57	0.000*	0.881
Competence and Trustworthiness	57	0.000*	0.662

**statistically significant at .05 alpha level*

Aligned with the first two groups, for the third group where the hypothetical source was the church leader, it was found that, at .05 alpha level, there were significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.628); significant, strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.765); and significant, very strong, positive correlation (p=0.000, r=0.833) between goodwill and competence, goodwill and trustworthiness, and competence and trustworthiness, respectively.

Table 5: Correlations between Goodwill and Other Dimensions of Ethos in the Third Group (Church Leader as the Hypothetical Source)

Variables	Number of Observations	p-value	Spearman's rho
Goodwill and Competence	52	0.000*	0.628
Goodwill and Trustworthiness	52	0.000*	0.765
Competence and Trustworthiness	52	0.000*	0.833

**statistically significant at .05 alpha level*

In order to further examine the relationships between goodwill and the other two ethos dimensions, multiple correlation coefficients were computed (summarised in Table 6). From the responses and ratings of 167 respondents, it was found that goodwill had moderate to strong association (R=0.832) with competence and trustworthiness, combined; competence had moderate to strong association (R=0.871) with goodwill and trustworthiness, combined; and trustworthiness had moderate to strong association (R=0.720) with goodwill and competence, combined. These tests were performed to countercheck the results yielded by the statistical procedures performed previously. As expected, the results confirm the substantial and considerable relationships between and among the three ethos dimensions.

Table 6: Multiple Correlation Coefficients of the Three Ethos Dimensions

Variables	Number of Observations	R-value
Goodwill, and Competence and Trustworthiness (Combined)	167	0.832
Competence, and Goodwill and Trustworthiness (Combined)	167	0.871
Trustworthiness, and Goodwill and Competence (Combined)	167	0.720

All the findings presented above certainly exhibit consistency in terms of establishing the connections of goodwill with the other two ethos aspects. Without discounting the limitations set by the sample size, the results may claim that goodwill is significantly correlated with competence or authoritativeness and trustworthiness or character, which may lead to the presumption that all the three constructs measure the very same concept. Aside from this, the findings may not only substantiate goodwill's crucial position as an ethos facet but as well propose that it should not be taken out of its triadic association with competence and trustworthiness as the statistics show that they still maintain significant connections. Indeed, the figures support the assertions of studies that reveal conclusions parallel with the Aristotelian tradition. Most importantly, the processed data may partially provide a description of how ethos and goodwill operate and move in the Philippine setting. They illustrate that while Filipino culture may be different from other cultural settings, and even if ethos may be deemed dependent on one's culture, the very same factors affect source credibility level across different cultural spaces.

Conclusions and Implications

The findings of the current study, while carrying some limitations on the sample procedure and size, may conclude that goodwill up to this day still maintains its strong relationships with competence or authoritativeness and trustworthiness or character. In effect, the results go to show that just like the two more concrete facets of ethos, it as well plays a crucial role in gauging one's perceived source credibility.

In the wider context and broader perspective, the data generated for this study may imply that (1) goodwill should regain its key post in the realm of ethos taking into consideration its strong correlations with the other two

ethos dimensions; (2) goodwill's contribution to measuring one's credibility may not be denied; (3) the concept of goodwill is anchored in its definition as caring or intention factor of credibility; (4) even if ethos is defined as a function of culture and geographic space (Bulan & de Leon, 2002), the major elements that shape it may be presumed to be crossing cultural boundaries; and (5) while it is somehow proven in this research, alongside the arguments of related literature, that competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill are valid and reliable measures of credibility, the study design and the results could not claim that they are the sole determinants of ethos. This leads to the supposition that there may be other credibility facets present in the Philippine setting. Thus, it may be recommended to further examine ethos in the Filipino culture to comprehend its totality and its role in communicative acts is transpiring in a unique geographic location such that of the Philippines'.

References

Bulan, C. & de Leon, I. (2002). *Communication 3: Practical speech fundamentals, experimental edition*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

Cristobal, F. (2002). *A study on the role of Joseph Ejercito Estrada's ethos on his rise to power*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

De Pano, J. C. (2011). An experimental study on the effect of Roman Catholic priests' marital status on their credibility as public speakers as perceived by the students of a Roman Catholic school. *JATI: Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *16* (1), 55-76.

Eisend, M. (2006). Source credibility dimensions in marketing communication-A generalised solution. *Journal of Empirical Generalisations in Marketing Science*, *10* (2), 1-33.

Florentino, J. (2010). *The effects of selected speaker characteristics on ethos and persuasion at the initial interpersonal level ass measured through compliance-gaining among students of the University of the Philippines Diliman*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

Hellmueller, L. & Trilling, D. (2012). *The credibility of credibility measures: A meta-analysis in leading communication journals, 1951-2011*. Paper presented at the WAPOR 65th Annual Conference in Hong Kong.

Holtzman, P. (1966). Confirmation of ethos as a confounding element in communication research. *Speech Monographs*, *33* (4), 464-466.

Madrigal, A. (1992). *Dimensions of ethos: A study in the Philippine setting*. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, *33* (1), 65-71.

McCroskey, J. C. (1986). *An introduction to rhetorical communication*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

McCroskey, J. C. & Dunham, R. E. (1966). Ethos: A confounding element in communication research. *Speech Monographs*, *33* (4), 456-463.

McCroskey, J. C. & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A re-examination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 90-103.

Ostermeier, T. H. (1967). Effects of type and frequency of reference upon perceived source credibility and attitude change. *Speech Monographs*, *34* (2), 137-144.

Relao, E. K. (2011). *Politicians in the public eye: A study on the relationship between the source credibility and para sociability of selected politician endorsers and the publics' voting behaviour during the May 2010 national elections*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

Rosenthal, P. I. (1966). The concept of ethos and the structure of persuasion. *Speech Monographs*, *33* (2), 114-126.

Sereno, K. K. (1968). Ego-involvement, high source credibility, and response to a belief-discrepant communication. *Speech Monographs*, *35* (4), 476-481.

Sereno, K. K. & Hawkins, G. J. (1967). The effects of variations in speakers' nonfluency upon audience ratings of attitude toward the speech topic and speaker's credibility. *Speech Monographs*, *34* (1), 58-64.

Teven, J. J. (2008). An examination of perceived credibility of the 2008 presidential candidates: Relationships with believability, likeability, and deceptiveness. *Human Communication*, *11* (4), 383-400.

Tulio, M. N. (2015). *A study on the effects of selected vocal qualities on the credibility of lectors and commentators ministry members as public speakers as perceived by Roman Catholic students at the University of the Philippines Diliman*.

Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

Tuppen, C. J. S. (1974). Dimensions of communicator credibility: An oblique solution. *Speech Monographs*, *41* (3), 253-260.