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Power is said to be the primary, underlying, and deep-seated element in human communication (Beebe, S., Beebe, S. & Redmond, M. 2011 p227). Knowing how to use it, consciously or unconsciously, to manage the direction of communication or to achieve desired results, bestows dominance upon the user.

In a relationship, power is manifested and employed in various ways. Communication experts have been studying this phenomenon since the time of Aristotle when he identified the three sources of personal power – Ethos, Logos, and Pathos. The persuader was said to have used either his personal qualifications, emotions, or reasoning to sway his listeners. Subsequent researchers in the west have explored power as manifested in various so-called compliance-gaining-strategies. These strategies are used in persuading people to comply to requests or orders.

Cultural orientations, too, play a role in influencing others. Hofstede (2001) identified power distance as an influential force in the way people behave. In his study, he identified high-power-distance as the dominant orientation among Filipinos in the corporate world. Particular characteristics of high-power-distance cultures are the following: Inequality of individuals, dependence on superiors, and unquestioning acceptance of directives from them. In a study of Filipinos in the multinational corporations in the Philippines, Del Villar (2012) confirmed Hofstede’s findings that Filipinos in multinational corporations indeed have high-power-distance orientation and that their behavior were influenced by their orientation.

It should be noted that the compliance-gaining-strategies mentioned above were developed in countries with low-power-distance orientation. It would be interesting to construct a typology of strategies specifically used in a high-power distance culture like the Philippines. Thus, this study about a Filipino typology of compliance-gaining strategies.

Knowing the important role power plays in people’s lives and the influence of power-distance in the Filipino culture, this study aimed to develop a typology of compliance-gaining strategies particular to Filipinos. Specifically, the following questions were raised:

1. What are the underlying factor structures of the compliance-gaining strategies identified by Filipinos?
2. What are the compliance-gaining strategies preferred by Filipinos?
3. What is the influence of high-power-orientation in the choice of strategies?
4. What are the similarities and differences between the Filipinos’ compliance-gaining strategies and those developed by Western theorists?

**Study Frameworks**

This study identified two major concepts to guide the search for the Filipino typology. These were: Filipinos’ high-power-distance cultural orientation and compliance-gaining-strategy.

**Power**

Beebe, et al. (2011) defined power as “the degree to which a person is able to influence or control his or her relational partner (227).” They identified it as the “back story” to whatever problems people might be experiencing in their relationships. They further explained that an appreciation of the role of power in interpersonal relationships can greatly aid in effectively managing conflicts. Conflicts may arise from the following situations: Knowing that one possesses more power and knowing that one abuses power. In an idyllic situation, participants “negotiate a mutually acceptable and rewarding power relationship” (Beebe, et al.,
Overtime, the participants develop schemes to maneuver each other and the situation to achieve their objectives.

In an interpersonal situation, the types of relationship call for specific ways of negotiating power. Beebee, et al. (2011) identified two types of relationships:

- Complementary relationship where “one partner usually dominates …most of the decisions…People in this type of relationship experience relatively few decision-making conflicts, because one partner readily defers to the other” (228).
- Symmetrical relationship where “both partners behave toward power in the same way, either both wanting power or both avoiding it” (228).

Wheeles, L., Barraclough, R., & Steward, R (1982) argued that “without power, compliance does not happen. Interpersonal power may be regarded as the perceived bases of control that a person has over another person’s behavior” (33). The use of power in a relationship is considered compliance-gaining. Power use is a “potential for influence and influence is a result of actualized power” (34). In other words, power is a requisite for compliance.

Power is also used in the classroom. Richmond, V. & McCroskey, J (1983) posited that power in the classroom refers to the teacher’s capability to control students’ behavior. This kind of power does not exist unless students perceive teachers to possess power. Students’ perceptions are therefore more important than that of the teacher’s in determining power in the classroom.

French & Raven (2001) concurred that “to have social power means to have social influence”(89). For influence to be achieved power must be perceived as present in the person exerting the influence. The bases of power come in five forms: Reward, Coercion, Legitimate, Expert, and Referent. Of all the forms, coercion is found to be “the least favored…caused decreased attraction and increased resistance [while] reward increased attraction and decreased resistance” (89). The researchers distinguished between compliance and persuasion by defining the former as “mainly concerned with behavior change” while the latter “deals with changes in beliefs, attitudes, motivations, intentions and behavior ”(90).

**High-power-distance as a cultural orientation of Filipinos**

Hofstede (1980. In Gudykunst, 2003) ranked the Philippines a high number 4 in power-distance among 53 countries. The dominant characteristics of high power cultures, particularly evident among Filipinos, are: Inequality of individuals, dependence on superiors, unquestioning acceptance of directives from them, emphasis on obedience at home, virtue of respect for elders, and high respect for those in authority.

The family is where values related to power-distance are first learned. As Hofstede, G. Hostede, J.G., and Minkov, M. (2012) claimed, “All people started acquiring their mental software immediately after birth, from the elders in whose presence they grew up…” (67). In high-power-distance cultures, children learn to be respectful and submissive to their parents… and “this lasts through their adulthood…as long as the parents are alive…The pattern of dependence on seniors …pervades all human contacts” (67). This enculturation carries over to the children’s lives outside the family.

The school, where children spend an average of 20 years is where the “mental programming” that is started at home continues. Teachers instill the values of respect and submission. As Hofstede et al argued “the role pair parent-child is replaced by the role pair teacher-student… Teachers are treated with respect or even
fear…Teachers are never publicly contradicted or criticized and are treated with
deference even outside school” (69).

The values developed at home and in school are carried over to the workplace.
“The role pairs parent-child, teacher-student… are now complemented by the role
pair boss-subordinate, and it should not surprise anybody when attitudes toward
parents, especially fathers, and toward teachers, which are part of our mental
programming, are transferred toward bosses” (73).

In a study conducted by Del Villar (2012) it was found that Filipinos in the
multinational sector indeed belong to the high-power culture. From the survey’s 385
respondents from 15 multinational corporations in the Philippines, it was revealed
that generally, there was inequality in the workplace, subordinates were dependent on
and did not question their superiors, older people were respected. These were all
indications of a high-power culture orientation.

Compliance-gaining strategies

Specific schemes to control the other person/s in an interpersonal
communication are called compliance-gaining strategies. A number of past
researches have developed different typologies. Among these were:

- Marwell and Schmitts’ 16 compliance-gaining strategies (1967) were said to
  have “laid a strong foundation in the area of compliance-gaining research by
  providing a starting point with which to compare future results and an
  empirically-grounded taxonomy which may prove useful for a variety of
  purposes.” The 16 compliance-gaining-strategies are:

  1. Promise where the target complies if there is a reward waiting
  2. Threat where an “ultimatum” is issued to achieve compliance.
  3. Expertise (positive) where a reward awaits because of the “nature of
     the situation”
  4. Expertise (negative) where a punishment awaits because of the “nature of
     the situation”
  5. Liking when the actor is friendly and helpful thus putting the target in
     a similar state that would cause compliance
  6. Pregiving where a reward is given prior to the request
  7. Aversive stimulation ignores the use of punishment until a compliance
     is achieved
  8. Debt attributes guilt to the target for non-compliance
  9. Moral appeal suggests morality to get compliance
  10. Self-feeling (positive) increases targets self-esteem when compliance
     is given
  11. Self feeling (negative) decreases self-esteem when compliance is not
     given
  12. Altercasting (positive) suggests that a “good person” complies
  13. Altercasting (negative) suggests that a “bad person” does not comply
  14. Altruism asks for compliance by “due to the actor’s desperate situation
  15. Esteem (positive) suggests that the target is “valued as a better person
     for complying”
  16. Esteem (negative) suggests that others will not look kindly on the
     target for not complying

These 16 were further classified into 5 clusters:

1. Rewarding (promising)
2. Punishing (threatening)
3. Expertise (displaying knowledge)
4. Impersonal commitments (moral appeals)
5. Personal commitments (debts)

- Schenck-Hamlin, W., Wiseman, R., & Georgacarakos, G. (1982) developed a model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. Four classifications of strategies were developed:
  1. Strategies based on sanctions
     a. Ingratiation
     b. Promise
     c. Debt
     d. Esteem
     e. Allurement
     f. Aversive stimulation
     g. Threat
     h. Guilt
     i. Warning
  2. Strategies based on need
     a. Altruism
  3. Strategies based on explanation
     a. Direct request
     b. Explanation
     c. Hinting
  4. Strategies based on circumvention
     a. Deceit

  A number of other strategies were developed each emphasizing certain contexts and purposes. Cialdini (2001) built on 6 principles that people use in the market place. Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey (1984, 1987) developed 22 strategies mainly used by the teacher in the classroom. Miller, Roloff, & Seibold (1977) improved on Marwell & Schmitt’s decreasing the original number from 16 to a compact typology of only 4. Falbo (1977) developed a taxonomy of 16 strategies using the “Machiavellian strategies.” Levine & Wheeless (1990) identified 53 tactics for “situational consistency and use and nonuse patterns.”

**Method**

Since the study was exploratory in intention, it employed both quantitative and qualitative techniques with the survey as its main method.

**The respondents**

One hundred seventy five students from randomly selected classes in a state university in Metro Manila were included in Phase 1 of the study when strategies were generated using an open ended questionnaire.

Five hundred ninety respondents from randomly selected classes from the same university were included in Phase 2.

**Research instruments**

The following research instruments were used:

1. **Questionnaire #1** is an open response questionnaire about what one thinks are the compliance-gaining strategies used by parents, teachers, boy/girlfriends, friends, sales people, politicians, and strangers. The purpose of this questionnaire is to generate the probable compliance-gaining-strategies of
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Filipinos. The rationale for asking respondents to report on what they observe in others rather than what they themselves experience was because “asking people to report on their own reasons is likely to elicit much less comprehensive responses than asking them for reasons that people in general may experience” (Bippus and Daly, 1999, 64. In Del Villar 2010). Since this is an open response questionnaire, there was no limit to the number of answers each respondent could give. The questions asked were: What will make people comply to persuasive attempts of parents? Teachers? Boy/Girlfriends? Friends? Sales people? Politicians? Strangers?

2. Questionnaire #2: is a 130 item Likert type questionnaire summarizing the strategies generated from Questionnaire #1. Examples of items are: Filipinos generally comply if the requester is respectable, if the requester is an elder, if the requester has good looks, or because they want to show gratitude.

3. In-depth-interview: is an unstructured interview with selected respondents about their choice of strategies, situations where those strategies were most often employed, and reasons why those strategies were preferred.

Data analysis
1. To address question #1 (What are the underlying factor structures of the compliance-gaining-strategies identified by Filipinos?) the Factor Analysis test was done to the results of Questionnaire #2. The Factors generated comprised the compliance-gaining strategies.

2. To address question #2 (What are the compliance-gaining-strategies preferred by Filipinos?), the 14 Factors were ranked according to their Mean scores. The top 5 were considered as the preferred compliance-gaining strategies of Filipinos.

3. To address question #3 (What is the influence of high-power-orientation to the choice of strategies?) the 5 most preferred strategies were analyzed to see if any of them were influenced by power orientation.

4. To address question #4 (What are the similarities and differences between Filipinos’ compliance-gaining strategies and those developed by Western theorists?) a qualitative comparison was done between the strategies used by Filipinos and those found in Western strategies. Reasons for the differences in preferences were inferred from the results of the interviews with selected respondents.

Results

Demographic profile of respondents in Phase 1

One hundred seventy five respondents participated in the administration of Questionnaire #1. They came from seven randomly selected classes from a state university in Metro Manila.

Five hundred ninety respondents from randomly selected classes of the same state university participated in the survey using Questionnaire #2. Sixty percent (354) were females while 39% (230) were males. Ages ranged from 16 to 26, where 22.6% (133) belonged to the 16 to 17 age bracket, 48.7% (287) belonged to the 18 to 19 age bracket, 20.5% (121) belonged to the 20 to 21, and the rest (7.2% or 42) belonged to the 22 and above group. The 590 respondents came from different year levels. Twenty three percent (136) were freshmen, 25% (148) were sophomores, 31% (183) were juniors, 14.4% (85) were seniors, and the rest 6.1% (35) were in their 5th or 6th years.
The underlying factor structures of the compliance-gaining strategies of Filipinos

Results revealed a 14 Factor model explaining 76.11% of the total variance in the data. The 14 Factors were named: Reason, Friendship, Affection, Credibility, Rules, Security, Gift, Enjoyment, Intimidation, Compassion, Family, Sincerity, Power, and Interest.

Factor 1: Reason and Substance
Eight tactics clustered together because they were all related to the use of reason or substance as a way of making people comply. Using Cronbach’s Alpha, the internal reliability of the items under this Factor was □=.88 which showed high reliability among them. The items under Factor 1 were: Filipinos generally comply because an acceptable reason is given, because complying is good for others, it is for the common good, it is honorable, it is the result of the requester’s wisdom and good motive, the message has substance, and it is based on principles. As disclosed by some of the respondents, they willingly complied if in return it would be for the good of their fellow humans. They said that they could detect if the requester’s motive for seeking their compliance was guided by wisdom and substance by the way he supported his arguments. Especially important were evidence why their compliance would result to positive outcomes.

Factor 2: Friendship
Seven tactics related to friendship gathered under this Factor. Together, their internal reliability was a very high □=.90. The items under Factor 2 were: Filipinos comply if the requester is a friend, if they share a history, togetherness, or memories, if the requester is a very close friend, if they both value friendship, and if the requester is warm and pleasant. A number of respondents admitted that they found it easy to comply if the person asking was a friend. In cases where he was not one, it was sufficient that he was warm and friendly. Friendship among Filipinos is important. As Mercado (1974) argued, Filipinos are very particular about keeping harmony within his circle of friends. As much as possible he would avoid diverging from his group for fear of shame. And one very important way of uniting with the group was by complying to its requests. What Mercado said was true as related by some of the respondents. One specifically admitted that if one of his friends made a request, he would readily give in “for what are friends for if not for lending a ready hand.”

Factor 3: Affection
Tactics that were related to affection clustered under this Factor. Their internal reliability was a high □=.89. These tactics were: Filipinos comply if they want affection, romance, love, care, intimacy, and seduction. Some respondents divulged that often, they complied to requests in return for some forms of affection especially from their partners and family members. This kind of strategy was especially useful in close relationships such as within the family, between partners, and among close friends. Filipinos, being naturally affectionate people, are not only quick to show affection but also need a return of affection from their close relations. As some of the respondents disclosed, if they have to comply to a partner’s request in return for a show of affection, they would happily oblige. Or as one mother shared, she would readily comply to her child’s request for a treat because she would be rewarded with a warm hug and a kiss.
Factor 4: Credibility

Strategies under this Factor were those about using nice words, being able to speak well, having a good diction, having a pleasant personality, having credibility, charm, accommodation, and good looks. Their internal reliability was a high $\square=.87$. As some respondents disclosed, the requester’s credibility was important in making them comply to his requests. How he delivered his message was crucial in their decision to comply. Some respondents shared that they readily followed their teachers’ orders if they thought they were credible. Some teachers, they disclosed, were not credible because they did not speak well nor did they have an authoritative personality.

Factor 5: Rules, responsibility, obligation

The seven tactics that grouped under this Factor were those that have to do with obligation, being lawful or according to rules, those that reflect responsibility, those that are reasonable or part of one’s job, or are based on morals. Their internal reliability was $\square=.84$. Being on the right is important to some respondents when it comes to deciding whether or not to follow an order. What the requester was asking for must be according to what was right. Others also said they followed orders because it was their obligation. A specific example given was that of a daughter who followed her mother’s order not to have a romantic relationship while still in school. She followed, even if she was unhappy, because it was her obligation as a daughter.

Factor 6: Security

Two strategies clustered under this factor: those related to safety and security. The internal reliability was $\square=.91$. Some respondents revealed that vital to them were matters of security and would willingly give anything that would enhance their security. One respondent opined that it was human nature to secure oneself from any harm because it was basic survival. He shared that his parents bought an apparatus for home security despite its exorbitant price. He recalled that the sales person was very effective in convincing his parents about the need for protection from the growing incidents of crime in the city.

Factor 7: Gifts, compliment, and incentive

Four strategies related to gifts, rewards, compliment, praise and incentive grouped under Factor 7. Their internal reliability was $\square=.73$. Respondents felt that at times, a gift softened their resistance and made them comply to a request. The gift made the requester pleasing to the receiver’s eye. There were also times when they felt obliged to return the gesture by way of compliance. Whatever the gift, tangible or intangible, a simple trinket, a souvenir from another place, a delicacy, flowers, candies, or some words of compliment, its effect is the same – it is appreciated. Filipinos, by nature, value receiving gifts as much as giving them. It is one of their means of connecting with others.

Factor 8: Enjoyment

Tactics that bring about fun, delight, and humor clustered under Factor 8. Their internal reliability was $\square=.72$. A number of respondents shared that whatever initial hostility they have toward the requester dissolved when he displayed a good sense of humor or behaved in a delightful way. This behavior could be explained by the nature of the Filipinos. A number of worldwide surveys ranked the Filipinos among the happiest people. It must be
in their nature to be happy, to enjoy life, to take things in stride, and to trust that God will take care of them.

Factor 9: Intimidation, discipline, and punishment

Five strategies all related to being strict, being disciplined, avoiding humiliation, being pressured, or being intimidated clustered under Factor 9. Their internal reliability was = .73. According to some respondents, there were times when a requester threatened to make them comply to his request. And because they were threatened, they were pressured to give in. Examples of situations where this happened were: when a father threatened to ground a son for misbehaving, or a daughter for coming home late, and when a teacher threatened a misbehaving student with a failing mark. In these instances, the threat worked quite well because the authority figures (parents, teachers) were respected if not feared.

Factor 10: Compassion

The strategies under this Factor were the ones about pity, compassion, shedding tears, using emotion, and pleading. Their internal reliability was = .77. When some of the respondents were asked for the reasons they use this tactic, they reasoned that there were instances when the use of emotion was very effective. Examples mentioned were: When persuading a parent to increase an allowance or when asking a would-be-partner to commit to a relationship. It could also be used when asking a superior for a raise or a friend for a loan.

Factor 11: Family and loyalty

The strategies under Factor 11 were all about showing gratitude, valuing tradition, family unity and harmony, loyalty, and simply being one of the family. The internal reliability was = .61. A number of respondents agreed that using family as a strategy proved to be very effective in the Filipino culture. Even if one were not a family but were ‘one of the family’ or ‘like family’ then he could still be persuasive. Specific examples of this strategy in action were: Borrowing very personal items like clothes or household items, money, and asking a favor. Because Filipinos value the family they would do everything within their power to make sure it is happy and secure.

Factor 12: Sincerity and fairness

This Factor was all about being sincere, fair, just, and patient. The internal reliability was = .73. Respondents who were asked about this strategy admitted that it was an important quality in a requester. If s/he displayed sincerity and fairness s/he was more easily believed and obeyed.

Factor 13: Power-based strategy

This Factor reflected the inherent power of the one asking for compliance such as a person of influence, an elder, a parent, a superior or boss, or an authority. The internal reliability was = .72. When asked about this strategy, most respondents agreed that certain individuals possessed power by virtue of their age, position, and status in society. In general, Filipinos highly regarded the elderly. In important family decisions, the elders were sought for their advice because of their wisdom and experience. So, what they said were usually followed. This kind of respect for the elders were extended outside the home. As Hofstede (Hofstede, et al., 2012) argued, what started as a parent-child relationship becomes a teacher-student relationship in school, and later superior-subordinate relationship in the workplace. This kind
of programming continues and is deeply ingrained in the Filipino psyche. That is why, generally, Filipinos respect and follow their elders or superiors.

The present findings partially confirmed that of Kearney, et al. (1984, 1987) where they mentioned power bestowed upon the teacher as a function of his/her position. Although the present study revealed an extension of that power to other contexts.

This study also supported the Beebe, et al (2011) research where power was identified as the “back story” in relationships. They emphasized that an appreciation of power can help manage conflicts.

Factor 14: Interest and quality

This factor included five tactics that echoed interest, novelty, quality, worth, and a need being met. The internal reliability was □=.61. When asked about this tactic, a number of respondents agreed that the quality of the product they were buying mattered a lot. If it was of good quality and there was a need for it, they were easily swayed by the seller.

Table below shows the 14 Factors, their reliability ratings, the items that grouped under each Factor, and their respective Factor loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Reason and substance (alpha=.8819)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q108. If an acceptable reason is given.</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q119. If it will be good for my fellow human beings.</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q123. If it will be for the common good.</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q124. If it is honorable.</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q128. If the requester has wisdom.</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66. Because of the substance in the message.</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q68. If the reason is based on principles.</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q77. If the requester has a genuine motive.</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Friendship (alpha=.9022)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q102. If the requester is a friend.</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q107. If they share a history with the requester.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q109. If they share togetherness with the requester.</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q110. Because the requester is a very close friend.</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q72. Because they value friendship.</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q92. If the requester is warm and pleasant.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q95. If they share memories with the requester.</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Affection (alpha=.8877)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q117. Because they want affection.</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Because they want romance.</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63. If the requester uses seduction.</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q76. Because they want love and care.</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q80. Because they want intimacy.</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Words, delivery, looks (alpha=.8687)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. If the requester uses nice words.</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51. If the requester speaks well.</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q52. If the requester is credible. 0.672
Q57. If the requester is accommodating. 0.687
Q58. If the requester has good diction. 0.723
Q70. If the requester has a pleasant personality. 0.673
Q74. If the requester makes a good speech. 0.755
Q33. If the requester has charms. 0.601
Q88. If the requester has good looks. 0.645

**Factor 5: Rules, responsibility, obligation** (alpha=.8421)

Q100. If it is their obligation. 0.632
Q25. If it is the lawful thing to do. 0.667
Q34. If it is according to the rules. 0.636
Q46. Because it is their responsibility. 0.731
Q47. Because it is reasonable. 0.717
Q48. Because it is part of their job. 0.641
Q53. If the reasons is based on morals. 0.605

**Factor 6: Security** (alpha=.9066)

Q60. If their safety is at stake. 0.772
Q67. If their security is at stake. 0.722

**Factor 7: Gift, compliment, and incentive** (alpha=.728)

Q13. If there is a gift, reward, or a treat. 0.723
Q89. If there is an incentive. 0.65
Q65. If they are praised by the requester 0.706
Q7. If they are complimented 0.607

**Factor 8: Enjoyment** (alpha=.7158)

Q24. If the requester is fun to be with. 0.704
Q45. Because the requester is delightful. 0.649
Q99. If the requester has a sense of humor. 0.661

**Factor 9: Intimidation, discipline, and punishment** (alpha=.725)

Q17. If the requester is strict. 0.627
Q26. If they are being disciplined by the requester 0.623
Q27. Because they do not want to be humiliated. 0.652
Q43. If they are intimidated. 0.734
Q6. Because they are being pressured. 0.704

**Factor 10: Compassion** (alpha=.7688)

Q61. Because they pity the requester. 0.734
Q73. If they feel compassion for the requester. 0.694
Q87. If the requester sheds tears. 0.634
Q35. If the requester uses emotion. 0.666
Q32. If the requester pleads. 0.748

**Factor 11: Family and loyalty** (alpha=.6085)

Q30. Because they want to show gratitude. 0.725
Q111. If family tradition is at stake. 0.65
Q113. For the sake of family unity and harmony. 0.645
Q81. If loyalty is at stake. 0.611
Q121. Because the requester is like family. 0.623

**Factor 12: Sincerity and fairness** (alpha=.7277)
The preferred strategies of Filipinos

The 14 Factors were analyzed to determine which of them were the preferred strategies of the respondents. To do this, the Mean scores of each of the 14 Factors were computed and ranked from highest to lowest. Among the 14, the 5 most preferred were Factor 13: Power distance orientation, followed by Factor 6: Security, Factor 7: Gifts, compliments, and incentives, Factor 2: Friendship which ranked equally with Factor 14: Interest and quality, and Factor 11: Family. These were the strategies Filipinos generally preferred in situations where they made a request, gave an order, or generally made others comply to what they wanted.

1. Factor 13: Power-based strategy

Factor 13 ranked the highest with a Mean score of 4.27 (SD=.70) in the 8 items that clustered under it. This means that respondents agreed almost strongly to all the items that referred to power as manifested in different forms. The manifestations of power were: Power by someone who was influential, someone who was an elder, a parent, a superior or boss, or an authority. In the Filipino society this is understandable because, by nature, Filipino culture is a high-power-orientation culture. Hofstede (1980. In Gudykunst, 2003) in his study of corporations all over the world ranked the Philippines a high number 4 among 53 countries. It is not uncommon to find characteristics such as dependence on superiors, unquestioning acceptance of directives from them, virtue of respect for elders, and high respect for those in authority in the home, in school, and in the workplace. This orientation is deeply entrenched in the Filipinos “mental programming” which according to Hofstede (Hofstede, et al. 2012) starts early in a child’s life and extends to the time he works for a living. Children are traditionally socialized to unquestioningly respect their parents, obediently follow orders from their teachers, and be dutifully compliant employees in the workplace. As Hofstede argued, “this pattern of dependence on seniors…pervades all human contacts” (67).

The high-power-orientation among Filipinos was confirmed by Del Villar (2012) in her study of intercultural sensitivity of Filipinos in multinational corporations. The study revealed that generally, older people
were highly respected and that subordinates were compliant and commonly did not question their superiors.

From these findings, it was understandable why power orientation was a top choice as a compliance-gaining strategy among the Filipino respondents. Given their high-power-orientation, it seemed natural for them to use strategies that were based on power. The five items under Factor 13 also had a moderately high reliability of $\alpha=.72$ which means that the items that clustered under it correlated with each other.

2. Factor 6: Security

The Factor that ranked second in terms of Mean score (4.21, SD .903) was security. This means that the respondents agreed to the two items that referred to safety and security. Looking at the Filipino culture, it was understandable why security was important to them. Some respondents strongly supported their choice of security as a strategy because they knew it was vital especially in a developing country where a big portion of the population was hungry and unemployed, and where peace and order still remained to be addressed by the government. This Factor's reliability was a high $\alpha=.91$ which means that the two items highly correlated with each other.

3. Factor 7: Gift, compliment, and incentive

Third ranking Factor was that which referred to anything about receiving gifts, rewards, incentives, praises, or compliments. Its Mean score was 4.139 (SD=.758). This means that Filipino respondents agreed that they observed or personally experienced using gifts, rewards, compliments, praise, compliments or incentives as ways of seeking compliance. In the interviews, respondents admitted to being somehow influenced by gifts and compliments, immediately given or promised, in exchange for compliance to some requests. This Factor’s reliability was $\alpha=.73$ which was moderately high.

4. Factor 2: Friendship

The Factor on Friendship ranked number 4 where seven related items clustered. The seven items were about: valuing friends, sharing history and memories, sharing togetherness, and feeling warm and pleasant. The Mean score for this Factor was 3.98 (SD=.76). As admitted by a number of respondents, friendship in the Filipino culture is highly valued such that if a friend asked a favor it would most likely be granted. There were instances when even the most difficult favors were granted for the sake of “pakikisama” or the Filipino value of conforming which was often practiced among close friends.

4. Factor 14: Interest and quality

This Factor ranked equally with Factor 2 in terms of Mean score (3.98) and SD (.76). The items that clustered under this Factor were those that referred to interest in the message or product being offered, novelty, quality, worth of the offer, and need for the offer. As shared by a number of respondents, for them to accept an offer, be it a product or a service, it should conform to good quality.

5. Factor 11: Family and loyalty

Included among the most preferred was Factor 5: Family and loyalty where items related to family clustered. Those items suggested family unity and harmony, tradition, loyalty, or being ‘like family.’ The Mean score of this Factor was 3.96 (SD=.807). It was understandable why this Factor rated among the most preferred because Filipinos highly valued the family. It
would therefore not be difficult to convince someone to comply if it would be beneficial to his/her family. As discovered, it was not difficult to find a respondent with a family member who was an OFW (overseas Filipino worker). In a report by POEA (Del Villar 2009) 10% of the population worked in different parts of the world in different capacities (permanent, temporary, irregular) in different categories (professional and technical workers, managerial workers, clerical workers, sales workers, service workers, agricultural, or production workers). These workers remitted their earnings to their families back home. Documented cases disclosed that working abroad was not easy but those OFWs persevered for the sake of their families.

**Differences between the present compliance strategies and those developed in the west**

Two compliance strategies were chosen to compare with the present study. These were the more commonly used ones among Filipino researchers: Marwell & Schmitt (1967) and Schenck-Hamlin, et al. (1987). Below is a matrix comparing the Marwell & Schmitt strategies with that of the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expertise (displaying knowledge)</td>
<td>• Liking when the actor is friendly and helpful thus putting the target in a similar state that would cause compliance</td>
<td>1. Reason &amp; substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impersonal commitments (moral appeals)</td>
<td>• Moral appeal suggests morality to get compliance</td>
<td>2. Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal commitments (debts)</td>
<td>• Threat where an “ultimatum” is issued to achieve compliance.</td>
<td>3. Affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rewarding (promising)</td>
<td>• Promise where the target complies if there is a reward waiting</td>
<td>4. Words, delivery, looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pregiving where a reward is given prior to the request</td>
<td>5. Rules, responsibility, obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-feeling (positive) increases target’s self-esteem when compliance is given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Altercasting (positive) suggests that a “good person” complies</td>
<td>6. Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Esteem (positive) suggests that the target is “valued as a better person for complying”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Esteem (negative) suggests that others will not look kindly on the target for not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Gift, compliment, incentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing the two compliance-gaining strategies, it was apparent that not all the present study’s strategies had exact counterparts in Marwell & Schmitt’s 1967 and 1987 versions. The seven strategies that did not have counterparts in Marwell & Schmitt’s were:

- Factor 2: Friendship
- Factor 3: Affection
- Factor 6: Security
- Factor 8: Enjoyment
- Factor 11: Family and loyalty
- Factor 13: Power-based strategy
- Factor 14: Interest and quality

It was apparent that these seven Factors were found only in the Filipino culture and not in the Western culture as reported by Marwell and Schmitt. Possible explanations inferred from interviews with respondents were that: Friendship was given so much importance to the point that if the requester was a friend or was like a friend, his

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Enjoyment</td>
<td>Threat where an &quot;ultimatum&quot; is issued to achieve compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidation, discipline, punishment</td>
<td>Expertise (negative) where a punishment awaits because of the &quot;nature of the situation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debt attributes guilt to the target for non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aversive stimulation ignores the use of punishment until a compliance is achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altercasting (negative) suggests that a &quot;bad person&quot; does not comply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compassion</td>
<td>Altruism asks for compliance &quot;due to the actor's desperate situation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family &amp; loyalty</td>
<td>Impersonal commitments (moral appeals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sincerity &amp; fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Power-based strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interest &amp; quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
request would easily be granted; Affection, especially from a loved one was highly valued such that if it were to be given in exchange for a request, such a request would be willingly granted; safety and security were also given so much importance so that if granting a request would be the cost then it would be willingly given; Enjoyment was also highly sought such that the cost of granting a request was seen as acceptable in exchange for it; Family was highly valued so that requests in exchange for anything that would benefit it was an easy cost to pay; Power was so deeply entrenched in the Filipino psyche such that people would easily comply to requests emanating from superiors, parents, or elders without much question; And lastly, a careful consideration was also given to one’s interest in and quality of a product/service being offered. Because money to most Filipinos was hard earned, a great deal of thought was given before it was spent on a product/service.

Another compliance typology compared with the present study was that developed by Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982). Below is a matrix comparing the two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategies based on explanation</td>
<td>1. Reason &amp; substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Rules, responsibility, obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Gift, compliment, incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategies based on sanctions</td>
<td>9. Intimidation, discipline, punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strategies based on actor’s need or altruism strategies</td>
<td>10. Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Family &amp; loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Sincerity &amp; fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Power-based strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the Schenck et al. (1982) typology with that of the present study’s, it was apparent that not all the strategies have counterparts in both studies. The present study’s strategies not found in the Schenck et al. study were:

- Factor 2: Friendship
- Factor 3: Affection
- Factor 5: Rules, responsibility, obligation
- Factor 6: Security
- Factor 8: Enjoyment
- Factor 11: Family and loyalty
- Factor 12: Sincerity and fairness
- Factor 13: Power-based strategy
- Factor 14: Interest and quality
Again, it was noticeable that the Filipino cultural orientation played a role in the respondents’ choice of strategies. When the respondents were asked for probable explanations for their choices of strategies that reflected the above Factors, the explanations given were: They would willingly do anything for their friends; they would readily comply in exchange for the affection of their loved ones; they would willingly comply if it were an obligation or responsibility; if compliance would be for the sake of their family; if the requester displayed purity of heart; if the requester was a superior, an elder, or a parent; and finally, if the offer was of good quality. The only Schenck strategy with no counterpart in the present study was the one based on circumvention. No single strategy related to deceit was generated. A possible explanation for this could be, that the respondents were young students and that their circumstance at the time of the survey might not have been an ideal ground for deception. Another reason could be that deception might have been subsumed under Factor: Reason and substance because the deceiver might have used reason to mislead.

Based on the above comparison of the new typology with those of Marwell et al. and Schenck et al., it was apparent that there were differences in the compliance-gaining strategies preferred by Filipinos and those developed by Western theorists.

**The new compliance-gaining questionnaire**

From the 14 Factors generated from this study, the new compliance-gaining strategy questionnaire is presented below. Instructions on scoring and interpretation are included to allow future researchers to conduct their own analyses. The items under each of the 14 Factors have been tested for internal reliability resulting in moderate to high levels of reliability. This means that the items that grouped under each Factor correlated with each other.

**Compliance-gaining strategies**

Below are compliance-gaining strategies commonly used to gain your compliance. Rate each statement by marking the column that best describes how you feel about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I generally comply ...</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If an acceptable reason is given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If the requester is a friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Because I want affection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If the requester uses nice words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If it is my obligation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If it will be good for my fellow human beings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If my safety is at stake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If there is a gift, reward, or a treat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I share a history with the requester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Because I want romance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If the requester speaks well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If the requester is fun to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If it is the lawful thing to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If the requester uses seduction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If I share togetherness with the requester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Because of the substance in the message.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If the requester is credible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If it is according to the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If the requester is strict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If the requester has a pleasant personality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If the reason is based on principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Because I value friendship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If the requester has good diction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Because it is my responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because the requester is delightful.
If am being disciplined by the requester
Because it is reasonable.
If the requester is accommodating.
If it is honorable.
Because the requester is a very close friend.
If the requester has charms.
Because it is part of my job.
If my security is at stake.
If I am being pressured.
If the requester pleads.
If the requester is warm and pleasant.
Because I want intimacy.
If the reasons are based on morals.
If there is an incentive.
If the requester has a sense of humor.
If family tradition is at stake.
If the requester is sincere.
Because I pity the requester.
Because I do not want to be humiliated.
If I am praised by the requester
If the requester makes a good speech.
If I share memories with the requester.
If the requester sheds tears.
Because the requester is like family.
If the person asking is influential
If I am intimidated.
If I am complimented
If I feel compassion for the requester.
If loyalty is at stake.
If there is novelty in the offer.
If the requester is a superior or boss.
If the requester has wisdom.
If the requester is an elder.
For the sake of family unity and harmony.
If it will be for the common good.
If the requester if fair and just.
If the requester is an authority.
Because of the quality of the offer.
If the requester has a genuine motive.
Because the offer is worthy.
Because I want to show gratitude.
If the requester has good looks.
If I am interested in the offer.
If the requester is a parent.
If the requester is patient.
If the requester displays emotion.
If a need is met by the offer.

**Scoring and interpretation**

Add all items under each Factor and compute the Mean. The Factor with the highest Mean is the most preferred Factor/Strategy.

Factor 1: Reason and substance (Items 1, 6, 16, 22, 30, 58, 61, 65)
Factor 2: Friendship (Items 2, 9, 15, 23, 31, 37, 48)
Factor 3: Affection (Items 3, 10, 14, 21, 38)
Factor 4: Words, delivery, and looks (Items 4, 11, 17, 20, 24, 29, 32, 47, 68)
Factor 5: Rules, responsibility, and obligation (Items 5, 13, 18, 25, 28, 33, 39)
Factor 6: Security (Items 7, 34)
Factor 7: Gift, compliment, and incentive (Items 8, 40, 46, 53)
Factor 8: Enjoyment (Items 12, 26, 41)
Factor 9: Intimidation, discipline, and punishment (Items 19, 27, 35, 45, 52)
Factor 10: Compassion (Items 36, 44, 49, 54, 72)
Factor 11: Family and loyalty (Items 42, 50, 55, 60, 67)
Factor 12: Sincerity and fairness (Items 43, 62, 71)
Factor 13: Power-based strategy (Items 51, 57, 59, 63, 70)
Factor 14: Interest and quality (Items 56, 64, 66, 69, 73)

**Conclusion**

As has been revealed by the results of this study, five Factors strongly influenced Filipinos’ choice of compliance-gaining strategies. These were power, security, gifts, friends, interest, and family. Inferring from the reasons given by the respondents, their choices reflected their intercultural orientations among which were: deep respect for those in power as a function of their age or position; security of their family because they are the most valued; gifts because they are one of the most tangible means of expressing affection, respect, and appreciation for their fellow humans; interest and quality because the products or services they get must be commensurate to the money they worked hard to earn.

In developing a compliance-gaining typology that were rooted in Filipino cultural orientations, strategies would now be reflective of what truly motivated those choices unlike in the past, when foreign strategies were used to explain native phenomena.

Although the 14 Factors or strategies were validated and tested for reliability, it should be noted at this point that further tests could be done on other Filipino groups to determine if the Factors were applicable in extraordinary situations. For example, patient-doctor situations might be different, especially in high-risk patient condition.

One strategy that did not appear in the present study but was discovered in the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) research was that of deception. As earlier explained, the situation of the present study’s respondents might be different in that their circumstance around the time of the survey might not have suggested any forms of deception. Or it could be that deception, as they experienced, might have been masked by careful explanation or reasoning.

In the future, the new compliance questionnaire could also be correlated with the power-distance cultural orientation using a valid instrument to further test its claim about the important influence of power on the respondents’ choice of strategies. This correlation could further strengthen this study’s claim about the important role of power on the Filipinos’ compliance-gaining strategies.
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