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Abstract: With the conceptual controversies revolving around source credibility and considering the crucial role it plays in the realm of political persuasion, this paper examined how President Rodrigo Roa Duterte utilized the three Aristotelian ethos dimensions—competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill—in all his four state of the nation addresses (SONAs) from 2016 to 2019. Specifically, the study, through content analysis, investigated if these components were significantly related. Results revealed that there were significant associations between competence and goodwill and trustworthiness and goodwill. However, there was no significant association between competence and trustworthiness. Apart from offering interesting insights about the rhetoric and persuasive capacity of a populist national leader, the findings, more importantly, provided crucial theoretical implications for the supposed triadic interaction of the aforementioned facets of source credibility in the context of Philippine political communication. At the more practical level, the results of this study urge both scholars and practitioners to reexamine the usual components that are deemed to shape source credibility and consider the possibly changing structure of this factor of persuasion.
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Being a democratic country that maintains a presidential form of government, the political structure of the Philippines has three fundamental branches: the Legislative, the Judiciary, and the Executive (Official Gazette, n.d.-a). Although these three ideally share the same amount of power, it could be argued that the Executive arm seems to have the greatest influence over the public not only because the populace directly elects the officials that constitute this branch but also due to the human face it presents in the figure of the president. Considering this and the assumption that the chief executive generally represents the nation in the global political arena, it is crucial for them to establish an impressive persona before the public. That is, whether the president appears before a few people in a small gathering or deliver a speech in front of a crowd, they are expected to preserve their reputation as this may be vital in the country’s official dealings.

Among the various speeches the president gives, the state of the nation address (SONA) may be said to be the most interesting because it is prescribed by the law. Article VII, Section 23 of the 1987 Philippine Constitution requires the head of the executive branch of the government to deliver the SONA before Congress (where the House of Representatives and the Senate convene in a joint session) upon the latter’s invitation every fourth Monday of July (Official Gazette, n.d.-b). Apart from reporting the
administration’s accomplishments in many different aspects of the sociopolitical system, the SONA also grants the president a venue to discuss their future agenda, make justifications for their past decisions, and even improve public perceptions of their leadership. For instance, Navera (2006) observed that in former President Arroyo’s 2004 SONA, she not only defended her political choices regarding international affairs but also forwarded an image of a leader who had much concern for her people. Navera (2006) further argued that “in this speech, she presented herself as softened version of her persona in 2002 and 2003” (p. 44). Former President Aquino also utilized the SONA to emphasize both the achievements of his administration and how his leadership significantly differed from that of Arroyo (Abinales, 2013).

From the preceding examples, it becomes clear that the SONA could function not only as a vehicle for information dissemination but also as the president’s rhetorical tool which may aid them in creating, shaping, and projecting a favorable public image. Following this line of thought, it may be posited that although the SONA is not supposed to be about the chief executive’s personality, this kind of public address cannot be completely detached from the nation’s most powerful leader. That is, the SONA may be a manifestation of the president’s quality and style of leadership. With this, it may be further presumed that the SONA could be employed as a device to enhance (or, if necessary, repair) the image of the state head. This may be particularly essential for a populist leader like Rodrigo Roa Duterte—the 16th president of the Philippines—as this may guarantee the favorable position of the voting public.

Unlike his predecessor, who is known for being diplomatic and refined, Duterte is often portrayed as carefree, rough, and spontaneous. However, his landslide victory in the last 2016 national elections and the continuous support of many Filipinos would attest to his unquestionable ability to persuade the public to be on his side and act favorably toward his projects. Interestingly, Duterte’s rhetoric has the power to challenge the country’s political landscape by somehow bending the usual criteria that determine one’s persuasiveness. As a public speaker, he appeals very effectively to many people. Even if he uses what many would describe as coarse language on several occasions, he is still undeniably able to convince his audience that his patriotism would only deepen his care for the country and its citizens. Indeed, the orator in him tends to defy the established theories of rhetorical communication which are widely used in assessing the success of persuasive transactions; yet, in many circumstances, he seems to triumph in penetrating the very core of many Filipinos’ value systems and eventually win their loyalty.

If Duterte remains to be a highly persuasive source despite his controversial language and unconventional manner of conversing, the next question points to the factors that affect a speaker’s capability to persuade the message receivers. The classical rhetorical tradition anchored in Aristotle’s theory presupposes that the means of persuasion are classified into three: logos (logic), pathos (emotions), and ethos (source credibility; Demirdogen, 2010; McCroskey, 1986). Of these modes, there is merit in contending that the third one is the most dominant. The bases of such argument stem from the observation that much persuasion literature offers evidence of its instrumental function in persuasive interactions (Teven, 2008) and from the idea that ethos alone may be considered a separate and a unique kind of persuasion (Rosenthal, 1966).

Regardless of its authority in persuasive communication, source credibility is not immune to controversies. One of the biggest issues it faces is connected with the components that make up its multifaceted structure. Although the Aristotelian dimensions of good sense, good moral character, and goodwill (Niu & Ying, 2016) receive substantial support from more contemporary scholarship that respectively labels the three as competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill (McCroskey, 2007; McCroskey & Teven, 1999), the classical rhetorical tradition is still surrounded with questions. Such interrogations stem from standpoints that uphold or use only one or two of the three Aristotelian ethos facets (e.g., Applbaum & Anatol, 1973; Tormala & Petty, 2004; Wanzenried & Powell, 1993) and from perspectives that implicitly challenge the third ethos dimension—goodwill—by operationalizing dynamism as a factor of source credibility (e.g., Sereno & Hawkins, 1967; Tuppen, 1974; Wanzenried & Powell, 1993). These, among other related conceptual debates, urge scholars to revisit the interconnectedness of the three aforesaid factors. Those viewpoints which argue that source credibility can be measured even without employing all the three elements originally proposed by Aristotle or that it can be gauged via a different third dimension
warrant an empirical investigation to determine the relationships between and among competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill.

Because ethos plays a significant role in the realm of political persuasion (e.g., Mshvenieradze, 2013; Teven, 2008), it makes sense to examine its dimensions in the context of a political message. Given the importance of the SONA rooted in the fact that it is demanded by the law (Official Gazette, n.d.-b), studying the components of source credibility as they are reflected in Duterte’s four SONAs (from 2016 to 2019) would facilitate better comprehension of their operations in relation to political communication. Aside from this, this kind of research would also open avenues where the rhetoric of a very popular leader could be further comprehended. In a nutshell, the purpose and significance of this paper are twofold: (a) it is able to examine the interconnections of the three ethos dimensions using the SONAs as communication acts, and (b) it attempts to understand a piece of Duterte’s rhetoric through theoretical propositions that largely center on source credibility and persuasion.

**Literature Review**

**Brief Context of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte’s Rhetoric**

The current Philippine president has been gaining much attention from the international community not exactly for good reasons. In fact, he has been known because of his foul mouth and apparent unpresidential behaviors. For example, a few months before he was elected to office and during the campaign season, he cursed the Pope because of the traffic jams his visit caused in the nation’s capital (Ranada, 2015a). The following year, in a gathering of local officials, he insulted then United States President Barack Obama after the latter expressed his concern over the extrajudicial killings happening in many parts of the country (Ranada, 2016). Even international organizations, like the United Nations (UN), were not shielded from Duterte’s tirades. When he was asked about his reaction to the possibility of the UN investigating the crimes allegedly committed by certain branches of the state, he was quick to swear it and talked about global issues the UN failed to resolve (Esmaquel, 2015).

Although all those undiplomatic remarks may sound utterly shocking to audiences outside the Philippines, most Filipinos have disturbingly become used to it as Duterte consistently demonstrated this kind of rhetoric throughout his political career and prior to winning the presidential race. McCoy (2017) observed that during his campaign, Duterte used intense language to communicate his policy against drug dealers. Curato (2017) made similar comment by stating that “Duterte’s language, needless to say, has been a cause for alarm” (p. 149). These, among his other actions, might be the reasons he is often tagged as an authoritarian leader. Teehankee (2016) mentioned that “the rise of Duterte can potentially usher in a regime of neoauthoritarianism in the Philippines” (p. 293). This is not surprising as he often praises the dictatorial regime of late President Marcos (Mendez, 2019).

As a populist president, there has been no attempt on his part to conceal his emotions or use less offensive vocabulary when communicating his ideas and responding to queries. On the contrary, it seems that he intentionally exhibits a rough personality through his word choice everytime he faces the public—a typical characteristic of contemporary populism (Curato, 2017)—to create an image of a determined leader. What is intriguing in Duterte’s appeal to the Filipino people is that, despite his impolite language that is generally not reflective of Filipino culture, he still manages to leave a good impression on the public. His trust ratings remained impressively high in the recent years even if his administration’s flagship project (i.e., the so-called war on drugs) has been put into question by human rights advocates (McCoy, 2017).

One explanation for Duterte’s constant popularity is found in Curato’s (2017) argument: “In Duterte’s case, his use of gutter language lends credibility to the urgency of saving the republic” (p. 149). In other words, instead of frowning upon his foul mouth, the public rather interprets his verbal messages as indications of genuineness to solve the country’s gravest problems, that his aggressive expressions are not meant to ruin the nation’s reputation because these are just mere displays of his frustrations with the inefficient system. With his even higher approval ratings as of 2019 (de Vera, 2019), there is reason to argue that Duterte’s rude demeanor and uncalled-for statements work to his political advantage and do not necessarily harm his ethos as a public figure. This being the case, it would be interesting to examine how a populist leader like him manages his source
credibility in his public appearances, especially during occasions that are greatly relevant to the country such as the SONA.

**Presidential Speeches and the State of the Nation Address**

Public speeches are considered to be among the most powerful political weapons at the president’s disposal (Schaefer, 1997) for several reasons. First, presidential addresses, like inaugural speeches, can enhance the highest leader’s charisma, given the effective use of appropriate rhetorical techniques (Emrich et al., 2001). That is, these communicative acts can strengthen the connection between the president and the public as “studies of charisma emphasize the strong emotional and affective bond between leaders and followers” (Emrich et al., 2001, p. 528). Second, they serve as platforms that allow the president to address adverse situations (Eshbaugh-Soha, 2010a). Although the processes involved here are often mediated (i.e., political leaders having to depend on the media to disseminate their messages; Schaefer, 1997), the art of public speaking, whether through the television or via the radio, could allow the chief executive to build a sympathetic relationship with the masses.

Third, presidential speeches may carry prompts or signals directed to specific agencies of the government to assist the executive branch in fulfilling its mandate, implementing its projects, and rendering its basic services to the people (Eshbaugh-Soha, 2010a, 2010b). It follows, then, that they can also reinforce the ties maintained by the head of the executive arm with the legislative bodies and judicial institutions of the government. Fourth, these public addresses may contain the administration’s cultural policies, which may indicate the government’s take on the country’s cultural industries (Kim & Jin, 2016). Lastly, they may also incorporate metaphors that communicate the president’s ideological stances (Lu & Ahrens, 2008) and statements that echo their moral principles (Deason & Gonzales, 2012). Through these messages that mostly center on traditions, norms, practices, and beliefs, the executive power critically contributes to the process of defining the nation’s identity.

Among the numerous speeches that the president has to present, the SONA—which underscores the current leadership’s achievements, outlines significant national plans, and provides an opportunity to discuss solutions to the country’s most pressing concerns—is considered one of the most important (Navera, 2006). Discussing the concept of democracy through the SONAs of former presidents, Navera (2014) claimed that these speeches allow leaders to participate in the process of reinforcing national values: “It also implies that public addresses of national importance like the SONA serve as an opportunity for national leaders to engage in what Campbell and Jamieson (2008) call ‘a public meditation on values’” (p. 214). “Such public meditations exemplify the symbolic processes by which a collectivity of individuals comes to see itself as an entity—a group, a community, a nation—with an identity that unifies its members and distinguishes them as a group” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 140). In other words, by highlighting the central principles celebrated by the public in the SONA, the president is able to strengthen the distinct qualities of the nation, which could uplift people’s morale.

Philippine history would also attest to the importance of the SONA. For instance, even while recovering from a health problem in a hospital in the United States, then-President Elpidio Quirino still delivered his annual state of the nation report to Congress via radio broadcast at the exact time when it was supposed to be given (Official Gazette, n.d.-b). During the martial law era when Congress was abolished and the House of Representatives was literally closed, former President Marcos still presented his yearly SONA to an assembly either at the president’s residence or in a historic park at the heart of the country’s business district (Official Gazette, n.d.-b). These examples clearly illustrate how each head of the republic valued the annual address aimed at informing the public about the country’s socio-politico-economic status.

Even in other countries such as the United States, the state of the union (SOTU) address is deemed important because through this, the president can emphasize selected issues and make the public see them as the most salient ones. For example, in Oliver et al.’s (2011) research, they found that statements about drugs given during the president’s annual reports to the country could affect the public’s perceptions about illegal drugs. This suggests that these messages are generally capable of setting the public agenda; thus, the head of the executive department may use them to push forward the administration’s most valuable projects. Aside from this, these public speeches may also be utilized to tackle the president’s legislative
priorities (Schaefer, 1997) and call on the responsible bodies to act on the proposed policies.

Indeed, the power of the SONA as a rhetorical and political instrument cannot be underestimated. Although it may seem that it is just one of the routine speeches given by the president, its faculty to initiate crafting of vital policies and affect people’s attitudes toward the government cannot be dismissed. Thus, it may be very well argued that this type of political message is always an interesting subject of analysis.

Aristotelian Theory of Persuasion and Source Credibility Dimensions

The framework originally conceptualized by Aristotle may be used in problematizing a part of Duterte’s rhetoric, specifically his use of source credibility as a mode of persuasion in all the four SONAs he delivered from 2016 to 2019. At the most basic level, the classical rhetorical tradition proposes that successful persuasion is a result of effective control of logos, pathos, and ethos (McCormack, 2014; Mshvenieradze, 2013). The first mode refers to the speaker’s intellect, rationality, and method of reasoning (Higgins & Walker, 2012; McCroskey, 1986). The second one—pathos—is generally about the source’s emotional appeal (Aho, 1985; Higgins & Walker, 2012; McCroskey, 1986). Finally, “ethos is the attitude toward a source of communication held at a given time by a receiver” (McCroskey, 2001, p. 83). This means of persuasion is more commonly referred to as source credibility (McCroskey, 1986; McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

Among the various persuasive tools, it may be argued, based on Aristotelian tradition, that ethos is the most powerful (Cooper, 1932, as cited in McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Its uniqueness is further reflected in the argument that it could be detached from its association with pathos and logos as it can be conceptually independent (Rosenthal, 1966). The assumed independence of source credibility from emotional and logical appeals may be treated as a product of its strength as a persuasive apparatus; it acts as the foundation of the persuasion triangle (with the two other sides being pathos and logos). Although many scholars argue that all the three are needed in ensuring successful persuasion (e.g., McCormack, 2014; Mshvenieradze, 2013), ethos perhaps plays the most critical part. In fact, it is considered a key factor when speakers can sustain the audience’s attention (Umeogu, 2012). In brief, it may be assumed that the powers of both emotional and logical petitions are anchored in source credibility. Without acceptable ethos ratings, it would be difficult for pathos and logos to perform well and produce a desirable outcome.

Although its dissociation from pathos and logos is contested based on more contemporary theorizations pointing to their conceptual overlaps (Cheng, 2012), its strength as an artistic instrument of persuasion is seldom challenged. In fact, it is deemed to be an important construct in many settings of communication, particularly in relation to politics (e.g., Alsamydai & Al Khasawneh, 2013; de Pano, 2016; Mshvenieradze, 2013; Teven, 2008). This is not surprising taking into account the claim that voting decisions (Alsamydai & Al Khasawneh, 2013), opinion change (Hovland & Weiss, 1951), trustworthiness (Singletary, 1976), believability (Teven, 2008), and likeability (Teven, 2008)—some variables that are frequently associated with political endeavors—are found to be related to ethos.

The conceptual complexity of source credibility is mostly pronounced in its dimensions. As mentioned in the preceding sections, Aristotle’s good sense, good moral character, and goodwill (Niu & Ying, 2016) are interpreted by more recent theorizations as competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Adhering to the classical labels of ethos facets, Niu and Ying (2016) proposed that the first dimension is characterized by the source’s experience, expertise, and authority; the second one, by upholding justice, honesty, and stateliness; and third, by understanding, empathy, and responsiveness. McCroskey and Teven (1999) made almost the same classifications by positing that competence is defined, among other descriptors, by the source’s intelligence, training, and expertness; trustworthiness, by honesty, honor, and genuineness; and goodwill, by sensitiveness, care for the message receiver, and concern for the audience.

In spite of the empirical evidence that supports the validity of each of the three previously discussed dimensions in gauging source credibility (e.g., McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Teven, 2008), their triadic synergy is still challenged by assumptions that confirm or utilize only one or two of these dimensions (e.g., Applbaum & Anatol, 1972, 1973; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Tormala & Petty, 2004; Wanzenried & Powell, 1993). Of the three, trustworthiness may be presumed to be the least controversial as it is one of the two
ethos elements (the other one being competence or expertise) found to be consistently accepted across the literature (McCroskey & Teven, 1999; O’Keefe, 2002). Additionally, some studies suggest that it is even a stronger component than competence or other source characteristics (e.g., Lui & Standing, 1989; Wang & Scheinbaum, 2018). Even the models that only partially subscribe to the classical rhetorical theory recognize its capacity to appraise source credibility (e.g., Applbaum & Anatol, 1972; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Patzer, 1983). Like trustworthiness, competence is also a recognized factor of ethos (e.g., Conley, 2010; McCroskey & Teven, 1999; O’Keefe, 2002).

The foregoing discussions imply that goodwill is the most questionable Aristotelian ethos facet. This supposition partly stems from viewpoints that put forward the idea that dynamism (how the speaker presents the self) partnered with other components may be a better barometer of source credibility (Sereno & Hawkins, 1967; Tuppen, 1974). From this, it may be assumed that overt behaviors during public presentations (i.e., manner of delivery) may have greater weight than signals of being caring (i.e., goodwill). Another model that interrogates goodwill’s position in the realm of persuasion may be found in Eisend’s (2006) study, which conceptualized source credibility in marketing communication as having the following dimensions: “inclination toward truth (‘will tell the truth’), potential of truth (‘knows the truth’), presentation of truth (‘appears to tell the truth’)” (p. 23). Clearly, the first two components could be viewed as translations of trustworthiness and competence, respectively. This suggests that the conflict lies in the third factor, which somehow contradicts the conceptual basis of goodwill by contending that appearing to tell the truth (putting emphasis on observable behaviors rather than on intention as in the case of goodwill) affects the evaluation of source credibility.

Although most of the issues revolving around source credibility are related to goodwill, it must be noted that there are more contentious concepts associated with ethos which are not exactly parallel with those advanced by the classical rhetorical tradition rooted in Aristotle’s theory. Some examples include attractiveness or physical appearance (Demirdogen, 2010; Giffin, 1967; Patzer, 1983; Singletary, 1976), composure (McCroskey et al., 1974), extroversion (McCroskey et al., 1974), articulation (Singletary, 1976), manner of delivery (Demirdogen, 2010), and sociability (McCroskey et al., 1974), among others.

Given, then, the conceptual debates on the composition of source credibility which, in one way or another, challenge the triadic association of the Aristotelian ethos dimensions, this paper aims to determine the relationships between and among competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill. Because source credibility performs a critical function in political persuasion (Demirdogen, 2010; Mshvenieradze, 2013; Teven 2008; Wanzenried & Powell, 1993), there is logic in examining the relations of its assumed facets as they are manifested in the SONA. Again, the rationale for choosing this speech type as subject and context of analysis mainly stems from the argument that it is one of the most important public addresses given by the president (Navera, 2006). The decision to focus on the current president’s four SONAs (2016 to 2019), as discussed in the preceding segments, is rooted in Duterte’s unique communication styles. With all these justifications, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: Is there a significant association/relationship between the use of competence and the use of trustworthiness to establish source credibility in President Rodrigo Roa Duterte’s state of the nation addresses?

RQ2: Is there a significant association/relationship between the use of competence and the use of goodwill to establish source credibility in President Rodrigo Roa Duterte’s state of the nation addresses?

RQ3: Is there a significant association/relationship between the use of trustworthiness and the use of goodwill to establish source credibility in President Rodrigo Roa Duterte’s state of the nation addresses?

Method

All the four SONAs delivered by Duterte from 2016 to 2019 were examined through content analysis to answer the research questions. This method was found to be an effective way of scrutinizing political speeches (e.g., Deason & Gonzales, 2012; Tetlock, 1981) particularly televised presidential addresses (e.g., Lewis, 1997) that report the status of the country like
the state of the union address (e.g., Oliver et al., 2011) or the SONA in the case of the Philippines. Official transcripts of Duterte’s SONAs were downloaded from the website of the Official Gazette (https://www. officialgazette.gov.ph/).

Unit of Analysis

Because of the length of the four SONAs (approximately 348 minutes and 25 seconds; about 90 pages of transcriptions, single space), every speech was systematically broken down into manageable statements as this technique has been observed to work effectively in the same research context (e.g., Deason & Gonzales, 2012). Each statement could be any of the following: (a) a sentence or a group of sentences, (b) a phrase or a group of phrases, or (c) a combination of both that carried a complete thought and centered on a particular idea. As the official transcripts of the four SONAs posted on the Official Gazette’s website already divided each address (by providing spaces in between paragraphs or groups of words) assumingly based on Duterte’s oral delivery, these divisions were adopted for this study. Except for the 70 remarks that had to be paired with either the immediately preceding or following statement (otherwise, they would not exhibit coherent thought), all the other statements were analyzed based on how they were originally presented in the transcriptions. A statement from the 2017 SONA may be used to illustrate the reason for combining some of the remarks: “At this point, allow me to take a step back in time, in 1901. In 1901, there was known as Balangiga, and that is Eastern Samar. It was the time for Philippine-American War” (Official Gazette, n.d.-d, Second State of the Nation Address). If this statement had not been paired with the next one, it would not have made any meaning, hence could not have been analyzed.

Excluding the opening greetings (e.g., enumerating the names of selected government officials) and the closing remarks (e.g., thanking the people for attending), 573 statements were analyzed: 157 from the 2016 SONA, 193 from the 2017 SONA, 80 from the 2018 SONA, and 143 from the 2019 SONA.

Coding Procedure and Data Analysis

Each statement was coded for three categorical variables: (a) competence, (b) trustworthiness, and (c) goodwill. Each of these had two levels: (a) present or (b) absent. The first level denotes that the statement had references or allusions to those source credibility components, whereas the second level implies their absence. To help the coders assess each statement accurately, they used the descriptors (for each ethos dimension) included in the source credibility measures—an instrument developed by McCroskey and Teven (1999) with alpha reliabilities ranging from .80 to .94 (McCroskey, 2007)—as guides. For example, in evaluating whether a statement communicated competence, the coders, in addition to utilizing the operationalizations and situational examples of said ethos dimension, also employed the instrument’s subcomponents in adjectival forms (e.g., intelligent, expert, trained).

Based on the cited instrument (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), each of the three facets of source credibility had six adjectives describing it. Competence was composed of the following descriptors: (a) intelligent, (b) trained, (c) expert, (d) informed, (e) competent, and (f) bright; for trustworthiness: (a) honest, (b) trustworthy, (c) honorable, (d) moral, (e) ethical, and (f) genuine; and for goodwill: (a) caring, (b) has people’s interest at heart, (c) unselfish, (d) concerned with people, (e) sensitive, and (f) understanding. To further dissect each ethos component, for every statement that was coded to contain that particular dimension, the strongest subcomponent was also determined. For example, if a statement was evaluated to convey trustworthiness, that statement was more closely explored to pinpoint which among the six descriptors of trustworthiness had the strongest presence.

There were two coders for this study who independently coded all the 573 statements from Duterte’s SONAs. Each coder was randomly assigned two of the four SONAs. The first coder was the principal investigator himself. The second coder, who was a former communication instructor in a large university in the Philippines, did not know any of the paper’s main objectives or research questions. He was simply given very detailed instructions on how to process the data. Before starting, the two coders coded sample statements from the SONAs of past presidents to ensure that they had the same understanding of the variables. Both coders can speak and read English and Filipino fluently—a crucial criterion as the SONAs were written and delivered using the two languages alternately.

The intercoder reliability rates for all the variables, which were derived by having the coders independently
rate 60 statements (10.47% of the population), ranged from .87 to .88 (percent agreement) and .73 to .76 (Cohen’s kappa). These scores may be said to be satisfactory based on Landis and Koch’s (1977) assumptions that kappa values between .61 and .80 demonstrate substantial agreement. Table 1 summarizes these figures.

Table 1
Coded Variables and Their Cohen’s Kappa and Percent Agreement Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cohen’s κ</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test of association was performed to determine if there were significant associations or relationships between (1) competence and trustworthiness, (2) competence and goodwill, and (3) trustworthiness and goodwill at α = 0.05 level.

Results

Out of the 573 statements from Duterte’s 2016 to 2019 SONAs, 256 (44.68%) had elements associated with the competence dimension, 249 (43.46%) had references related to the trustworthiness dimension, and 243 (42.41%) had allusions identified with goodwill dimension. The data also revealed that 114 (19.90%) statements had both competence and trustworthiness (suggesting that 44.53% [114 out of 256] of statements that demonstrated competence also demonstrated trustworthiness; and 45.78% [114 out of 249] of statements that demonstrated trustworthiness also demonstrated competence); 138 (24.08%) had both competence and goodwill (indicating that 53.91% [138 out of 256] of statements that displayed competence also displayed goodwill; and 56.79% [138 out of 243] of statements that displayed goodwill also displayed competence); and 138 (24.08%) had both trustworthiness and goodwill (implying that 55.42% [138 out of 249] of statements that illustrated trustworthiness also illustrated goodwill; and 56.79% [138 out of 243] of statements that illustrated goodwill also illustrated trustworthiness). Tables 2 and 3 present these findings, whereas Table 4 provides examples of statements from the four SONAs where specific source credibility dimensions and combinations of these dimensions were found.

Table 2
Statements Displaying Competence, Trustworthiness, and Goodwill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source credibility dimensions</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>f/n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>43.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>42.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and trustworthiness</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and goodwill</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness and goodwill</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Cross Tabulations of Statements Displaying Source Credibility Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source credibility dimensions</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Goodwill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source credibility dimensions</td>
<td>Examples from Duterte’s SONAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>“When I decided to seek the presidency of this republic, I knew what the ills of our country were; I knew their causes; and I was briefed on those who caused the causes” (Official Gazette, n.d.-c, First State of the Nation Address).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To address the congestion in our seaports, we modernized the Ports of Iloilo, General Santos and Cagayan de Oro and Zamboanga. We shall complete strategic road and bridge projects and some of the road sections shall be widened and improved to address the worsening traffic. (Official Gazette, n.d.-d, Second State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I have friends and political supporters whom I appointed to public office and then dismissed or caused to resign. I need not mention their names or recount the circumstances surrounding their removal or resignation. Media has more than amply reported that. (Official Gazette, n.d.-e, Third State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Catharsis is what we, individually and collectively, need to do today – not tomorrow but today. Self-purgation followed by the resolve to do what is right and proper, is good for the nation’s health” (Official Gazette, n.d.-f, Fourth State of the Nation Address).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>By giving representation to indigenous peoples, women, children, and sultanates, and key stakeholders in the drafting of the Bangsamoro Basic Law, we ensure a Bangsamoro government that truly reflects the aspirations of our Muslim brothers and sisters as well as our indigenous brethren [applause]. (Official Gazette, n.d.-d, Second State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore believe that it is now time for Congress to approve a new version of the Salary Standardization Law. Ngayon na. [applause] And to the teachers, alam mo dito who toil and work tirelessly to educate our young. Kasali na po dito ‘yung hininhiing ninyo. Hindi naman masyadong malaki, pero it will tide you over during these hard times. A little bit bigger than before. [applause] This is intended to increase the salaries of national government workers, including teachers and nurses. Nurses, correct [applause]. (Official Gazette, n.d.-f, Fourth State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and trustworthiness</td>
<td>The recent uncovering of the massive fraud perpetrated against the public health insurance system proves that corruption is pervasive. Huge amounts of medical funds were released to cover padded medical claims and imaginary treatment of ghost patients. I am grossly disappointed. The government is conned of millions of pesos which could be used to treat illnesses and possibly save the lives of many. Thus I ordered the NBI to arrest and cause the prosecution of those liable. I appointed a new PhilHealth President, whom I know is a man of integrity, a military man, a former military officer, and gave him marching orders to prioritize ridding the agency of corruption. (Official Gazette, n.d.-f, Fourth State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and goodwill</td>
<td>We will also prioritize the rehabilitation of drug users. We will increase the number of residential treatment and rehabilitation facilities in all regions of the country. The Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) will facilitate the preparations for the use of military camps and facilities for drug rehabilitation. (Official Gazette, n.d.-c, First State of the Nation Address)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness and goodwill</td>
<td>“I wish to assure everyone though that vindictiveness is not in my system. Just like you and I, all equal treatment and equal protection are what I ask for our people” (Official Gazette, n.d.-c, First State of the Nation Address).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The statements enumerated here were quoted from the four SONAs derived from Official Gazette’s website. There were also statements that had all the three source credibility dimensions (and none of the dimensions) but they were not included in the examples because the paper examined the relationships between two of the (three) dimensions at a time.
Results of chi-square tests revealed that there was no significant association between the use of competence and the use of trustworthiness, $\chi^2(1) = 0.22$, $p = .641$, $\varphi = .02$ in building source credibility in Duterte’s SONAs. However, significant associations were found between competence and goodwill: $\chi^2(1) = 25.05$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .21$, and between trustworthiness and goodwill: $\chi^2(1) = 30.53$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .23$. These significant relationships were determined to have small to medium effect sizes.

In addition to the main objectives of this paper anchored in testing the relationships between and among the ethos dimensions first conceptualized by Aristotle, the presence of each ethos subcomponent, still based on the items in McCroskey and Teven’s (1999) instrument, was also recorded. After processing the data, it was found that for the competence dimension, the descriptor “competent” was the most frequently coded; for the trustworthiness dimension, it was the descriptor “trustworthy”; and for the goodwill dimension, it was the descriptor “has people’s interests at heart.” The elements that were least frequently coded were the following: “trained” and “expert” for the competence dimension; “moral” for the trustworthiness dimension; and “understanding” for the goodwill dimension. Table 5 provides the details of these findings.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$f/n$</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$f/n$</th>
<th>Goodwill</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$f/n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.13%</td>
<td>HPIH*</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>63.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.09%</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.67%</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.62%</td>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Has people’s interests at heart

Although the processed data showed that competence was the most frequently employed source credibility dimension, followed by trustworthiness, and eventually, by goodwill, the data indicated that they were almost equally used in all the SONAs of Duterte. Therefore, it would not make much sense to interpret the slight differences in the frequency counts or resolve why one component was utilized a bit more than the other. Instead, it would be more interesting to understand why Duterte adopted all the three ethos factors in his speeches.

Three explanations may be cited for the use of the competence dimension. First, being the highest government official, Duterte was expected to perform his duties in the most efficient manner; hence, his speeches definitely emphasized the accomplishments of his administration and its future plans to sustain economic growth. Second, being a politician who did not have much experience at the national level, there is reason to believe that Duterte was more accustomed to overseeing a much smaller territory; thus, he was criticized for being a micromanager in some areas of the government, especially with regard to law enforcement operations (Cupin, 2017). Perhaps because of these criticisms, he had to continuously strengthen his image as a capable national leader. Third, as he made grand and almost unbelievable promises—ranging from solving the transportation issues and traffic jams in the capital (Ranada, 2015b) to defeating heinous crimes in the first six months of his term (Ramirez, 2016)—during the campaign, he had to consciously highlight his achievements to communicate his leadership’s capacity to deliver in equally important sectors despite unfulfilled promises related to other segments of the socioeconomic system.
Duterte’s constant reference to the elements of trustworthiness in his SONAs was not very surprising as it could be seen as one of his means of maintaining his high trust and approval ratings despite the controversies surrounding his administration. Apart from this, it may also be perceived as his way of balancing or countering his rude and unpresidential verbal expressions. That is, because Duterte often spoke an offensive language (Curato, 2017), the inclusion of statements that depicted him as trustworthy in his annual reports to the Filipino people could repair and improve his image. More significantly, it could be used to forward the argument that his foul mouth was a product of the spontaneous reaction and not necessarily a sign of a dishonorable and unethical public official; that as the country’s human face, he could guard his unnecessarily rough style of communicating to represent the nation diplomatically.

Another plausible elucidation may be found in the idea that because trustworthiness—or good moral character in Aristotle’s rhetoric (McCroskey, 2007; Niu & Ying, 2016)—is one of the two more stable factors of source credibility across related studies (McCroskey & Teven, 1999; O’Keefe, 2002) and was even found to overpower competence in select communication settings (Lui & Standing, 1989; Wang & Scheinbaum, 2018), any attempt to enhance one’s ethos necessitates the extensive employment of this dimension. Without it, it might be challenging to establish source credibility. Further, it is trustworthiness that is linked with opinion change (Hovland & Weiss, 1951)—a crucial variable in political persuasion. In the case of Duterte, then, his steady use of trustworthiness in his SONAs (and even in his other speeches) could partly explain the sustained favorable attitudes of the public toward him.

Like the first two ethos dimensions, goodwill was also present in the large portion of the four SONAs. Because goodwill, compared with competence and trustworthiness, may be posited to be the most personal based on McCroskey & Teven’s (1999) definition that it communicates the communication source’s care and concern for the message receivers, one of the possibilities why it was considerably employed in Duterte’s speeches might be rooted in the general qualities of the Filipino culture. In Grimm et al.’s (1999) study, the Philippines is described as having a collectivistic culture. Because Filipinos tend to value good interpersonal relations as reflected in their culture that celebrates collective efforts, it may be argued that expressions of goodwill could have a positive impact on Duterte’s ethos. By incorporating this factor, he successfully made the listeners feel that he cared for them and that their interests were his priorities. The act of constantly interchanging his language, his use of the vernacular, and the many adlibs in all his SONAs (specifically directed to the public as if he was actually conversing with the people) would also somehow confirm his goals to connect with the greater masses (who could appreciate his speeches only through the television or the radio), to show that he was sensitive to their needs, and to illustrate his concern for them—features that distinguish goodwill from other facets of ethos (McCroskey & Teven, 1999).

Among the concepts associated with the first ethos dimension, the adjective “competent” was coded most frequently. That is, most of the statements that were evaluated to communicate competence could be best described using the descriptor “competent.” Although it may sound redundant, it could suggest that out of the six qualifiers, said adjective was the most encompassing; that the other subcomponents belonging to the same source credibility facet were perhaps subsumed under it. For example, if a certain statement signaled more than one subfactor (e.g., “expert,” “trained,” and “intelligent”), that statement was probably classified under the descriptor “competent.” This pattern was also evident in the trustworthiness dimension, where the most frequently coded descriptor was “trustworthy.” Whereas these findings seemingly opened avenues where the conceptualizations of the two ethos facets might be interrogated, it must be noted that the subdimensions of source credibility are deeply connected with one another; thus, overlaps should be expected. One interesting thought about the preceding findings is that they somewhat confirmed the appropriateness of the contemporary labels given to the Aristotelian dimensions of good sense (competence) and good moral character (trustworthiness) because their adjectival counterparts (“competent” and “trustworthy”) were observed to embody the other measures employed to gauge these two ethos factors accurately.

In the case of goodwill, the descriptor “has people’s interests at heart” was the most frequently recorded. This finding was not very consistent with what was anticipated as goodwill was more often interpreted as the caring construct (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Said adjective, then, was expected to be the most dominantly
used in the statements that alluded to the aspects of goodwill as it could presumably somehow cover all the other five descriptors (like in the case of the first two ethos components). However, because of Duterte’s strong personality and use of vulgarities, his messages were not constructed to depict him as someone soft or very caring. Nevertheless, he made it a point that his statements assured the public that the interests of the country were considered in all his decisions. By doing this, he maintained his image as a tough president, but at the very same time, enhanced his ethos through its goodwill dimension. In a nutshell, the four SONAs delivered by Duterte from 2016 to 2019 framed him as a competent and trustworthy leader who valued the interests of the Filipino people.

The almost equal counts of the three source credibility dimensions in Duterte’s SONAs could result in hastily drawing the conclusion that the three factors of ethos were significantly related. However, it was found that only competence and goodwill, and trustworthiness and goodwill were significantly associated; there was no significant association between competence and trustworthiness. The context of Duterte’s rhetoric, this would suggest that his use of goodwill in his speeches was not independent of his uses of competence and trustworthiness respectively; everytime he employed goodwill, it was expected that he would also individually utilize each of the two other ethos dimensions. In essence, it may be contended that in building good and sympathetic connections with the members of the public, Duterte as well communicated that he was a capable leader whom the public could trust.

The findings on the statistically significant relationships between competence and goodwill, and between trustworthiness and goodwill, provided partial support to the assumptions of the classical rhetorical tradition advancing the triadic association among good sense (competence), good moral character (trustworthiness), and goodwill (McCroskey & Teven, 1999; McCroskey & Teven, 2008) especially in relation to political persuasion (Teven, 2008). Finally, these interactions strengthened the claim that source credibility should be treated as a multidimensional variable (Eisend, 2006; McCroskey, 2007; Whitehead, 1968).

The non-significant result for the relationship between competence and trustworthiness was indeed unforeseen as these two were often regarded as the steadier factors of ethos. As briefly mentioned earlier, even those perspectives that did not assign much importance to goodwill upheld the validity of the first two facets (e.g., Applbaum & Anatol, 1973; Eisend, 2006; McCroskey et al., 1974; Patzer, 1983). Because they were consistently correlated in determining source credibility, the finding presented here, despite failing to offer support for that relationship, could be used as justification for reopening the debates on the composition of ethos. It could serve as starting point for fresh discussions on its structure. Because it is a product of perception (O’Keefe, 2002) and a function of time and culture (Bulan & de Leon, 2002), it is not at all impossible that the changing sociopolitical atmosphere has also transformed the conceptualization of ethos, thus, affecting the interactions of the elements that constitute it.

Another way to treat the somehow anomalous finding is by accommodating the possibility that goodwill could potentially act as the base of source credibility or the middle figure in a Venn diagram (Figure 1). That is, as a construct, its power allows it to connect individually with both competence and trustworthiness. This kind of analysis would reinforce the notion from past studies that goodwill could be a strong unit of ethos (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), and in certain cases, may be the strongest source credibility dimension in predicting the movements of variables related to persuasive communication in the context of politics (Teven, 2008).

In the end, the current study not only problematized Duterte’s persuasive appeals as reflected in his SONAs from 2016 to 2019 as it also attempted to expand the classical rhetorical tradition rooted in Aristotelian principles by examining the relationships between and among the three ethos dimensions. Whereas only two of the three tested associations were statistically significant, the implications of the findings could never be underestimated as they advanced unignorably critical questions that may ultimately lead to theoretical developments.
Limitations and Future Directions

Although the method of analyzing the SONAs (i.e., breaking them down into statements) in this project was based on studies done in the past (e.g., Deason & Gonzales, 2012), one limitation of such technique was that it did not account for the manner of delivery and other nonverbals that could have affected the coding of source credibility components. In future scholarly endeavors, researchers might want to consider coding videotaped speeches as they could provide more details. Apart from this, coding for more variables may also be explored. For instance, instead of focusing solely on source credibility, the two other artistic modes of persuasion could be included. By doing this, more comprehensive analyses coming from the interactions of the three persuasive devices may be forwarded. In terms of ethos subcomponents, in lieu of choosing which among them has the strongest presence, they could each be rated as either present or absent as this system might yield more interesting findings.

In terms of the study’s focal point and unit of analysis, future research may center on other speech types that may also signal how leaders make use of the available persuasive tools to enhance or repair their image and propel their political agenda. The different times when the addresses were given may as well be coded as these could be good sources of analysis especially when relating them to significant events happening in the bigger sociopolitical space. Lastly, it would be a good idea to problematize how persuasive styles may differ from one kind of speech to another (e.g., formal addresses versus impromptu speeches).
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