Micropolitics and Credibility of Barangay Officials

Florante O. Enriquez, Rinante L. Genuba, EdD, Alger P. Dura, DPA

Abstract
This study was conducted to determine the significant relationship between micro politics and the credibility of the barangay officials it also aimed to determine the domain of micropolitics that best predicts credibility of the barangay officials in the Island Garden City of Samal. The study is a non-experimental quantitative study that applied the descriptive-correlational technique. There were 381 respondents selected through stratified sampling. Data derived from the standardized survey was subjected to statistical testing and analysis using the mean and standard deviation, Pearson r, and regression analysis. Results showed an overall high level of micropolitics and a moderate level of credibility among barangay officials. Moreover, the correlation test yielded a robust, positive, and significant relationship between micropolitics and credibility. Furthermore, it was revealed that the domain sincerity best predicts credibility of barangay officials.

Keywords: *public administration, micropolitics, credibility, regression, Philippines*

Introduction
Rationale
The Philippines need credible leaders (Suleik, 2022). Unfortunately, the world has now described the country as having the most corrupt leadership and economy, with scandals dominating the news (Fleming, 2021). The Bataan Nuclear Power Plant construction during the Marcos era and the National Broadband Network project of the Arroyo presidency for example, did not require competitive public biddings; thus, opening opportunities for massive corruption (Batalla, 2020). In addition, the Department of Justice has recorded the local governments and DPWH as having the most complaints about corruption in the country (Buan, 2021). These corruption issues have damaged the credibility of Philippine leadership.

Credibility in leadership is essential because it creates trust and engagement that impacts its reputation and profitability. People judge credibility by linking the leaders' words with their actions in this volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous environment (Sinha, 2020). In addition, credible leadership reflects constituents' satisfaction and trust in the government (Petricone, 2020). On the other hand, micropolitics speaks of moderate and small-scale interventions used to govern a large population (Scherer, 2020).

There is an association between micropolitics and credibility (Fairchild, 2019; Innes, 2021). For instance, leaders' networking ability, interpersonal influence, social astuteness, and apparent sincerity relate significantly to credibility (Bryan, 2019; Chapman, 2019; Mintrom, 2019). In addition, constituents observe how their leaders use their power and authority to obtain their desired outcomes. These observations become the basis of trust and confidence, resulting in a good satisfaction rating and credibility (Gorgijevski, 2021; Haslam, 2021).

Nevertheless, although there were research studies on micropolitics and credibility, these topics were treated separately and applied in a different setting. Therefore, there is a research gap on that aspect, which this study wanted to bridge. Therefore, this study can benefit the barangay officials and the constituents they serve, even the whole public governance.

Research Objective

This study aimed to determine the domain of micropolitics that best predicts the credibility of the barangay officials. Specifically, this study is expected to achieve the following objectives:

1. To describe the micropolitics of the barangay officials in terms of:
    1.1 networking ability;
    1.2 apparent sincerity;
    1.3 social astuteness; and
    1.4 interpersonal influence.
2. To ascertain the credibility of the barangay officials in terms of:
    2.1 integrity;
    2.2 intent;
    2.3 capabilities; and
    2.4 results.
3. To determine the significant relationship between micropolitics and the credibility of the barangay officials.
4. To identify which domain of micropolitics best predicts credibility of barangay officials.

Hypothesis

These null hypotheses tested at 0.05 level of significance:

Ho 1.   There is no significant relationship between micropolitics and the credibility of barangay officials.

Ho 2.   There is no domain of micropolitics that significantly influences the credibility of barangay officials.

Micropolitics

Micropolitics is a small-scale intervention used in leading the behavior of large populations of people. It helps form the citizens' judgment, belief, desire, and inclination. Micropolitics occurs in schools, private organizations, families, and churches. When used as a form of governance, specialized disciplines in the social sciences, such as criminology, sociology, and psychiatry, support micropolitical techniques (Scherer, 2020). In this 21st century of globalized and interconnected leadership dynamics, micropolitics becomes vital (Gleeson, 2017; Roy, Hauptmann & Van Durme, 2019). Even in other fields like education, teachers and school heads use micropolitics (Colegio, 2018). Fairchild (2019) declared the necessity of micropolitics in governance, great or small, as a form of control.

While micropolitics generally involves authority, power, and influence, this study used another aspect of micropolitics in networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence (Ferris et al., 2005). These are essential aspects of micropolitics, as they are skills always employed by leaders, politicians, or otherwise.

Networking ability is the ability to converse and exchange ideas and information with individuals and groups, especially those with similar interests. These people, then, become a network of contacts that can help augment their shared interests (Wolfe, 2019). In governance, networks happen within their class. For example, barangay officials have networks with other barangay officials. This move is crucial in sharing ideas about dealing with constituents and other essential ideas that would help effectively discharge duties. Without networking ability, leaders may encounter difficulties leading and eventually face leadership failure. Hassan, Prussia, Mahsud and Yukl (2018) made it clear that networking ability is dependent upon other factors, such as external monitoring and representation, to become influential and succeed as leaders.

Moreover, Sfârlog, Cucoș and Stănciulescu (2020) declared that the nature of leadership in whatever field is relational; meaning, leaders should be a part of a group for seamless interaction and collaboration while learning new network perspectives. Significantly, networking ability will help leaders and members thrive in their workplaces, even in challenges (Cullen, Gerbasi & Chrobot-Mason, 2018).

Similarly, leaders need *apparent sincerity*. Apparent sincerity is a neutral term that refers to sincere and insincere actions. Others misunderstood this for fake sincerity. However, if the person is sincere, people will see that sincerity in their words and actions. People can even hear sincerity in their voices (Barkacs, 2021). Research has proven that apparent sincerity could enhance interpersonal relationships between leaders and colleagues. In addition, apparent sincerity can give the impression of genuine care and support, releasing any

forms of pressure that the rule of man has generated, thus promoting understanding, respect and trust (Hasan, Hayek, Williams Jr, Pane-Haden, & Gelvez, 2020; Kim, LePine, & Chun, 2018; Xu, Yang, Guo, & Zhang, 2019).

That is to say, leaders should convey their apparent sincerity through genuine service to influence others to trust them (Kranefeld, Blickle, & Meurs, 2020; Program on Negotiation (PON) Staff, 2020). Constituents are good at differentiating authentic actions from pretenses (Barkacs, 2021). Therefore, leaders must be careful in interacting with members to earn their trust (Ma, Wu, Jiang, & Wei, 2019). Leaders may take a hint from this: employees or members become quiet if they feel that their leaders or employers are not sincere because they could not trust them (Hamstra, Schreurs, Jawahar, Laurijssen & Hünermund, 2021). This example is a good motivation for barangay officials to be sincere in their words and actions, especially those who are quick to give promises during campaigns to get elected into office. They have to watch out because people remember.

Similarly, barangay officials should have *social astuteness* because this provides an excellent link between leadership and public value that fosters powerful coalitions and alliances even around diverse and competing interests (Alramdhan & Sattar, 2021; Hartley, Sancino, Bennister, & Resodihardjo, 2019). Charismatic leaders exemplify this political skill (Brouer, Chiu & Wang, 2016). Moreover, leadership success would be difficult without social astuteness because leaders could not effectively carry out their mandates. On the contrary, social astuteness can achieve positive and very high satisfaction ratings (Kwon, 2020).

Socially astute leaders, like the barangay officials, always look after their constituents to assist the later in their needs. This behavior can work to their advantage because people will learn to trust them, resulting in a sustainable political career (Wang & Hall, 2019). In addition, people will talk about the officials they trust and may even volunteer to campaign for their election. Barkacs (2021) expressed that socially astute leaders can discern people's behavior and social exchanges, which constituents appreciate. This appreciation can turn into a vote during elections, as stakeholders and constituents favor ethical works that social astuteness brings into political leadership (Connors, 2021; Hartley, 2020).

Finally, *interpersonal influence* can build a good rapport between the leaders and members, the constituents, and the barangay officials. Constituents want to come near their barangay officials and openly speak about their concerns. In this way, both parties can have better engagements (Bostanci, 2020). Wall and Hall (2019) claimed that leaders with solid interpersonal influence enjoy a better social life because society accepts them. Expressed differently, barangay officials who established an excellent interpersonal influence with the stakeholders are socially accepted and enjoy a good social standing in their community. Deng, Guan, Wu, Erdogan, Bauer and Yao (2018) echoed that leaders with solid interpersonal influence gain social acceptance. Moreover, Jasni (2018) interjected that leaders with good interpersonal influence have better performance outcomes to stakeholders' satisfaction.

Credibility

Credibility is the quality of being believable. Theorists defined credibility as the consistent provision and presentation of accurate and valuable information and performance, persuading other people to believe and trust them (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; Sobel, 1985). Credibility involves integrity, intent, capabilities, and results.

Trust is the essence of credibility (Aguilar, 2017). For example, leaders should strive to build their integrity, show good intentions, demonstrate their capabilities, and exhibit their results to earn trust. Nowadays, satisfaction ratings have become a trend to measure whether public leaders gain the trust and support of the people (Petricone, 2020). Sinha (2020) observed that people judge credibility by linking leaders' words with their actions. In today's volatile and ambiguous environment, these measures are compulsory.

Leaders could use their integrity, intent, capabilities, and results to show stakeholders what they got. These are essential for successfully implementing public policies. Stakeholders follow the rules because of the quality of the leaders, notwithstanding the penalties in the policies; thus, implying authentic leadership and unquestionable reputation in the discharge of duties (Basaluddin, 2021; Valmonte, Manlulu, & Vargas, 2021). For instance, the war on drugs has stringent penalties, but it seems that drug pushers and drug addicts continue the trade because some of the implementers lack credibility (Alagabia Jr & Cawi, 2019). On the

other hand, stakeholders positively respond to government policies credibly implemented (Martinez, 2019; Paliszkiewicz, 2019; Seibel, 2019).

Integrity speaks of moral uprightness. It generates credibility and trust. For illustration, in business, customers have more purchase intentions in businesses that exhibit integrity in their products and services and performance in corporate social responsibility. The purchase intentions are even higher for integrity customers (Castro-González, Bande, & Fernández-Ferrín, 2021; Supian & Rashid, 2018).

With the internet of things and social media, people are wary of believing information, as some are fake news. Therefore, they try to scrutinize the integrity of information sources before sharing them with friends. They learn to classify and fact-check information, whether rumor, gossip, propaganda, conspiracy theories, hoaxes, or satire (Liu, Shi, & Xin, 2020; Sumpter & Ciampaglia, 2021).

In leadership, integrity is vital for leaders to establish credibility. Taking elections as an example, voters sometimes question the integrity of election returns, especially with the threats posed by technology and the internet. Some think that other people rigged the elections returns (Garnett & James, 2020; James, 2019; Karp, Nai & Norris, 2018; Norris, Garnett & Grömping, 2020). These doubts happen all the time, every time. Even in the Philippines, there were questions on election results. Some candidates cried fraud and cheating, asking for recounting of ballots. These things are evidence of integrity damage and institutional backlash (Cook, 2018; Frialde, 2008; Kuhonta & Truong, 2020).

The *intent* is also one indicator of credibility that makes a good leader. It means providing clarity of purpose to inspire and motivate others to do the work to achieve desired results (Craemer, 2019). In addition, intent-based leadership nurtures employees and makes them feel valued. Employees imbibe the leader's intent and share it with others, spreading positive energy in the organization. Then, those under an intent-based leadership appear motivated, inspired, and ready to take ownership of their actions (Craig, 2018).

In this study's context, barangay officials whose leadership is intent-based deliver clear purpose and direction to their constituents. As a result, people under these barangay officials feel inspired and motivated to support them because they feel positive leadership. Usually, political candidates declare this intent in their platforms during their campaigns, and they get elected for their political platforms and track record (Cruz, 2022).

The intent of leaders is pivotal in their leadership success. Therefore, barangay officials carry out their intent through a roadmap that shows a concrete direction. They convey this roadmap to the people through reliable information. People may receive or reject it depending on how the intent meets their needs. Consequently, the intent will help build good relationships between the leaders (barangay officials) and the people. Then, the transformation will happen because everybody will support the leaders' roadmap to benefit the whole community (Stark, Reif, & Schiebler, 2021).

Capabilities. People assessed credibility through capabilities. *Capability* is the competence to bring the best in people or something. In leadership, capability means leaders are capable of good communication and flexibility, unassuming, confident and self-aware (Dunn, 2017) and capable of sharing (Charteris & Smardon, 2020).

Incidentally, people measure capability based on a track record. So, for example, in choosing a public leader during elections, voters would look at a candidate's track record. As a result, President Duterte got elected to office because of his track record (Jenkins, 2016). Even if a candidate has an intent (platform), if, his capability of making this happen is doubtful because he has no track record to back it up, then the platform is good for nothing. Therefore, he will not get elected (Cruz, 2022).

The playing field now in governance leadership is who is capable (Seibel, 2019). For instance, in the Philippines, the president enjoyed a consistently high satisfaction rating until the last year of his term (Philippine News Agency, 2022). Moreover, he demonstrated his leadership capabilities in many ways. For example, he ordered the cleanup of Manila Bay, which past leaders failed to do (McCarthy, 2019; Miguel, 2015). His brand of leadership seems to become a new barometer for governance leadership.

Notably, leadership capability is vital as it builds credibility. This capability is not just about giving services; it is also about bridging the great divide among a country's people, whether socio-economic or moral. A leader should be capable of developing a common and mutual ground towards change (Miller, 2021; Solinger, Jansen, & Cornelissen, 2020).

The final assessment of credibility is *results*. Even if the leader has integrity, intent, and capability but cannot deliver results, he is not a credible leader. Although results are polar (positive and negative consequences), this study proposed positive results. Delivering results is a universal challenge for all leaders to succeed (Gambill, 2021).

Interestingly, James Zenger surveyed more than sixty thousand people to see which of these two characteristics would make a good leader, a 'results-focus' or a 'people-focus' leadership. He found that the two characteristics, when taken singly, would not make a good leader. For example, people see results-focus leaders as great leaders by up to 15% of the time, while they see people-focus leaders as great leaders by 12%. However, when leaders could balance their leadership focus, they got a rating of 72% of the time as great leaders (Bradberry, 2016; Gambill, 2021). This hints to leaders of the importance of a roadmap. Going back to the earlier discussion, the leaders' intent represented by a roadmap or a platform will give them direction: results-focus? people-focus? Or both?

To sum up, whether leaders are results-focus and people-focus still left a margin of 28% to become credible and great leaders. This study purported that the combination of integrity, intent, capabilities, and results would make credible leaders. Authors have pointed out that credible leaders are great leaders. Therefore, they must have all these four credibility indicators, balancing each to achieve their desired results.

Theoretical Framework

This paper has its foundations from the Micropolitics Model of Anderson and Kennedy (2012) and the Source Credibility Theory of Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953).

The micropolitics model claimed that in the micro context of groups, individuals who want to attain a status would convince their group that they are the right persons for the job because they have the skills and abilities to take charge. Anderson and Kennedy likened these individuals to political candidates who must convince voters that they are the right people to vote for because they are what they need to accomplish the job (Anderson & Kennedy, 2012).

On the other hand, the source credibility claimed that people are more likely to be persuaded when the source presents itself as credible. When people find the source credible, they trust them, thus developing the source's credibility (Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953).

As applied in the context of this study, micropolitics can come as the source of credibility. So, as barangay officials present themselves to the people as having the skill and abilities to handle the job, such as networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence, people are persuaded to believe they are credible and are the right persons for the job. Moreover, people would gauge their micropolitical skills (networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence) against the indicators of credibility (integrity, intent, capabilities, and results) to prove that they are credible people and the right people for the job.

Thus, Haslam (2021) concluded that micropolitics could define credibility depending on how members perceive them. Likewise, Gorgijevski (2021) declared that micropolitics and credibility are tandems, suggesting a significant and positive relationship.

Significance of the Study

This research generally has a social value, considering that it deals with governance and leadership. People looking for credible leaders may find the discussion rich and affirming, enough basis for selecting or electing leaders. Moreover, leaders who want to persuade people that they are the right people for the job may find this study as their basis for personal branding. The Local Government Units may find the findings of this study helpful in introducing new leadership strategies among themselves to establish sustainable positioning. Furthermore, the findings of this study can add to the knowledge of public administration and even bridge the research gap in topics of micropolitics and credibility with barangay officials as the points of analysis. Finally, this study is significant for future researchers as these can serve as a foundation for a research project that tackles micropolitics and credibility. They may find the data, conclusion, and recommendations good groundwork for a new research project.

Method

This research is a descriptive correlational study. It was also quantitative non-experimental research that utilized a survey tool to gather data. Descriptive research allows the researcher to study the facts about the respondents, such as their characteristics, behaviors, and experiences (Apuke, 2017). In a descriptive correlational study, the researcher does not seek a causal connection between variables but only describes their relationships (Atmowardoyo, 2018; Quaranta, 2017; Siedlecki, 2020). Moreover, non-experimental research does not require variable manipulation. The researcher only measures the variables occurring naturally (Price, Jhangiani, Chiang, Leighton, & Cuttler, n.d.).

This study was descriptive correlational because it intended to describe the micropolitics and credibility of barangay officials. It also intended to determine the relationship between the variables and ascertain the influence that micropolitics has on the credibility of barangay officials. Moreover, this study was non-experimental because the researcher only measured the variables and did not manipulate them.

The population for this study were the voting population of IGACOS. There were 46,211 registered voters in total. The Slovin's formula yielded 381 respondents as samples. Researchers use Slovin's formula to get an accurate sample size from a vast population, especially if the researcher knows nothing about the characteristics of the population (Ellen, 2020).

The researcher divided the sample population into three because IGACOS has three districts: Babak, Samal, and Kaputian. Therefore, each district has 127 sample populations. Due to the challenge in gathering data from the islands, the researchers decided to distribute the survey forms to the constituents having transactions at Babak, Samal (Peñaplata), and Kaputian. These three are the centers of each district; therefore, constituents often go to these centers for government transactions. Therefore, the selection of samples was through stratified sampling approach.

In stratified sampling, the researcher divide subjects into subgroups called strata based on characteristics that they share (e.g., race, gender, educational attainment). Once divided, each subgroup is randomly sampled using another probability sampling method.

The researcher derived the items for the survey questionnaire from Shlanger (2009) for the independent variable and Covey (2013) for the dependent variable. Validators scrutinized the questionnaire based on the validation tool. As a result, they rated the instrument for 4.07, which is an excellent validity index.

The instrument has two parts. Part 1 included the items on micropolitics composed of 18 items, divided among the four domains: networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence. These items were under political skills, but the researcher decided to use them because these were also applicable in his study concerning micropolitics. In addition, he wanted to investigate how local government leaders apply these skills in the discharge of their duties. Hence, the survey asked the respondents to express their agreement or disagreement with each item by circling the corresponding number in the box: 5, strongly agree; 4, agree; 3, neutral; 2, disagree; and 1, strongly disagree.

Cronbach alpha reliability score of both instruments as well as the content validation of panel members were .970 and .928 respectively, which suggests that all items have relatively high internal consistency.

The data collection started with the drafting of the letter to conduct the study addressed to IGACOS City Mayor, with the signature for endorsement by the Dean of the Professional Schools. After this, the researcher submitted the downloaded questionnaires and their modified format to the experts for validation. First, the researcher looked for a questionnaire on micropolitics but could not find. So, he decided to use the political skills questionnaire by Shlanger (2009) because the items fit what he wanted to measure but retained the micropolitics in the title of his study. The validators approved the questionnaires and gave them a 4.07 rating. When the letters and the questionnaires were already in place, the researcher set out to gather data in the three districts of IGACOS, namely, Babak, Samal, and Kaputian. Data gathering commenced from January 2018 to April 30, 2018. He distributed 127 survey questionnaires to those with government transactions from each district. After collecting data, the researcher encoded the responses in MS Excel and submitted them for statistical analysis. Interpretation of results followed.

The following are the statistical tools utilized in processing the data based on the objectives of the study.

Mean and standard deviation were used to assess the level of micropolitics and credibility of the barangay officials.

Pearson r determined whether the relationship between micropolitics and credibility is significant.

Regression Analysis determined the indicator of micropolitics that has a significant influence on credibility and established the predictive capability of micropolitics in influencing the credibility of barangay officials.

Results And Discussion
Micropolitics of Barangay Officials

In Table 1 is presented the data on the micropolitics of barangay officials. Again, the overall mean score is high at 3.49, with a standard deviation of 0.51. The overall high result indicates that the respondents often observed their barangay officials' networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence. The standard deviation of 0.51 signifies the concentration of data around the mean. In other words, the respondents have almost the same response to each statement in the survey.

Looking at Table 1, three of the indicators have high mean scores. However, only apparent sincerity has an average mean score of 3.36, with a standard deviation of 0.66. The score signifies that of all the indicators of micropolitics, the respondents observed that barangay officials demonstrated the items on apparent sincerity sometimes only. Parenthetically, these statements are about apparent sincerity: The barangay officials are sincere in what they say and do. They show genuine interest in what they say and do. They are interested in people.

Table 1 : Level of Micropolitics among Barangay Officials

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Networking Ability	3.50	0.45	High
Interpersonal Influence	3.69	0.71	High
Social Astuteness	3.43	0.48	High
Apparent Sincerity	3.36	0.66	Moderate
Overall	**3.49**	**0.51**	**High**

As to *networking ability*, these are the statements: The barangay officials always have the time to network with other barangay officials, they have good connections with influential people, they use network connections to make things happen, they have developed an extensive network of support groups, they spend time creating connections with others and they build relationships with influential people.

These are also the statements for *social astuteness*: The barangay officials know the right things to say or do to influence others, they know how to present themselves to others, they can easily detect others' motives and intentions, they can interpret people's facial expressions and they can very well understand people in general.

As for *interpersonal influence*, these are the statements: The barangay officials have developed a good rapport with most people, they can make people feel comfortable around them, they can communicate effectively with others, and hey are good at getting people to like them.

The data assessment yielded an overall high level of the micropolitics of the barangay officials, revealing that barangay officials often demonstrate networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence. The result has leadership implications. The 21st century is the period of dynamic, interconnected and globalized leadership where these variables are vital (Gleeson, 2017; Roy, Hauptmann & Van Durme, 2019).

The high level of networking ability in this study means that barangay officials always have the time to network with other barangay officials. As a result, they have good connections with influential people. They use network connections to make things happen and develop an extensive network of support groups. They

spend time creating connections with others by building relationships with influential people. These behaviors are essential to succeed in leadership. For instance, Hassan et al. (2018) found that the networking ability of leaders does not happen alone but is dependent upon other factors like external monitoring and representation for them to become influential leaders. In another study, Sfârlog et al. (2020) pointed out that leadership is relational and interactive, even in the military, moving towards a network perspective, capitalizing on network relationships. This kind of relationship results in a seamless collaboration with other organizations, positively impacting the organizations.

In the same vein, barangay officials need to demonstrate apparent sincerity in performing their work. Apparent sincerity requires the conveyance of genuine service while influencing others (Kranefeld et al., 2020). This claim of Kranefeld et al. is valid in this study is that the results found a high level of apparent sincerity of the barangay officials, denoting sincerity in what they say and do and showing genuine interest in people. Moreover, leaders' apparent sincerity is vital in earning members' trust. For example, members interact more with leaders they perceive to be highly sincere (Ma et al., 2019).

In contrast, employees become quiet and opt not to talk if they feel that their leader has no apparent sincerity because they do not trust them (Hamstra et al., 2021). In other words, constituents will not trust barangay officials who do not convey or demonstrate apparent sincerity, which may even have repercussions on their political careers.

Similarly, this study found that barangay officials have a high social astuteness level, which means they know the right things to do to influence others. They know how to present themselves to others. They can easily detect others' motives and intentions. They can interpret people's facial expressions and can understand people in general. These attributes are vital for leadership to prosper. Usually, socially astute leaders are charismatic (Brouer et al., 2016). Socially astute public leaders effectively carry out their mandates because they can quickly identify the needs of others and help with their needs. Moreover, these leaders will likely achieve positive ratings because people will like them (Kwon, 2020).

In other words, socially astute barangay officials look into their constituents' situations and readily assist them in time of need. This manner of helping can even work towards their advantage because they could become famous and perpetuate their political careers (Wang & Hall, 2019). In his study, Barkacs (2021), when leaders have social astuteness, they discern other peoples' behaviors and social exchanges, including their own. This behavior is very appreciable for barangay officials because they can understand the situation of their constituents beneath the surface.

Finally, this study found a substantial interpersonal influence of the barangay officials. The high level of interpersonal influence means that the barangay officials have a good rapport with most people and are comfortable with them. Therefore, they can communicate effectively with others and get people to like them. This result affirms the findings of Wang and Hall (2019) that people with a high-level interpersonal influence have a better quality of social life. So, they become more engaged in their responsibilities (Bostanci, 2020).

Furthermore, leaders with solid interpersonal influence perform well at work and gain social acceptance (Deng et al., 2018). Finally, stakeholders become satisfied with their performance outcomes (Jasni, 2018). Leaders could use micropolitics to meet the expectations of the members. Some leaders find it hard to manage large populations, putting satisfaction at stake. So, micropolitics could help them create moderate and small-scale interventions to govern a large population (Scherer, 2020).

Credibility of the Barangay Officials
In Table 2 is displayed the data on the credibility of barangay officials. Unlike the result in micropolitics, Table 2 has an overall moderate level of credibility, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.26, with a standard deviation of 0.69. This standard deviation revealed data concentration around the mean. In addition, the overall moderate result denotes that the respondents sometimes observed the statements stipulated in the survey.

However, the data in Table 2 showed varied individual results. For instance, the intent has a high mean score of 3.44 with a standard deviation of 0.63. On the other hand, capabilities, integrity, and results have average scores of 3.28, 3.19, and 3.12, respectively. The high result for intent means that the respondents often

observed these qualities manifested by the barangay officials: fairness in dealing with constituents, having good intentions in what they do, putting people's concerns first before theirs, earning respect because of their excellent intentions and fair sharing of resources and opportunities.

Moreover, the moderate findings in capabilities, integrity, and results mean that the respondents have sometimes observed the following qualities manifested by the barangay officials. These are the items for capabilities: capable of doing their job, knowledgeable about their job, taking time to improve their work and life skills, focused on improving their weak points, and knowing how to build trust.

Table 2 : Level of Credibility of the Barangay Officials

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Intent	3.44	.063	High
Capabilities	3.28	0.68	Moderate
Integrity	3.19	0.61	Moderate
Results	3.12	0.84	Moderate
Overall	**3.26**	**0.69**	**Moderate**

In terms of integrity, these are the statements: The barangay officials are truthful people, they do what they say, they stand firmly on what they believe is the truth, they maintained an open mind in everything and knew how to set priorities. As for results, these are also the gist of the statements: they have an outstanding track record, are output-oriented, are humble with their track record and they always finish what they have started and are always concerned about results.

The study's findings revealed a moderate credibility level of barangay officials, which means a problem with their integrity, intent, capabilities, and results. Significantly, leadership is evolving, making it hard to keep pace with its demands. To stay on track with good leadership (e.g., at the barangay level), barangay officials have to build credibility to keep their constituents on their side, or their political career will end. Trust is crucial in building credibility (Aguilar, 2017).

The essentiality of leadership credibility cannot be underrated because it builds trust and engagement that impacts the reputation and profitability of the organization, both public and private sectors. Sinha (2020) declared that people judge credibility by linking the leaders' words with their actions in this volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous environment. For example, constituents observe and measure up their leaders according to their words, actions, and accomplishments in the public sector. In private organizations, the employees are the ones who size up their leaders for their credibility. In addition, Petricone (2020) commented that credible leadership reflects constituents' satisfaction and trust in the government

Incidentally, leaders' credibility is essential for successfully implementing policies in public leadership. Therefore, constituents will look at the capabilities of their leaders in discharging their functions. Thus, even with how stern the penalties are, people may not fear them because the credibility of the implementers is questionable (Basaluddin, 2021; Valmonte et al., 2021).

For instance, despite the severe penalties and stern warnings in the anti-drug war campaign, many still indulge in illegal drug use because of the lack of credibility of the implementers (Alagabia Jr, & Cawi, 2019). Stakeholders will respond positively to government programs and policies, especially well-thought-out ones founded on ethical standards (Martinez, 2019; Paliszkiewicz, 2019; Seibel, 2019).

Relationship between Micropolitics and Credibility of the Barangay Officials

In Table 3 is displayed the correlation test data between micropolitics and credibility. The study set the level of significance at 0.05. The overall relationship is positive, extensive, and significant, as shown by the .795 coefficient of correlation, with a p-value of .000. The result means that as micropolitics increases, credibility tends to increase with it.

In scrutinizing the pairwise correlation data, apparent sincerity (r=.992), social astuteness (r=.606), and interpersonal influence (r=.738) have significant relationships with credibility. All their correlation coefficient have a p-value of .000. On the other hand, networking ability is not significantly correlated with

credibility, as shown by its correlation coefficient of .032 and a p-value of .586. The not significant relationship between networking ability and credibility means no association between these variables. Therefore, credibility is not affected by the movement in the networking ability.

However, this study purported the combined relationship of all the indicators of micropolitics with credibility. Hence, even with the not significant relationship between networking ability and credibility, the result showed that micropolitics (with all indicators combined) has a significant relationship with credibility.

Table 3 : Relationship between Micropolitics and Credibility of Barangay Officials

Micropolitics	Credibility				
	Integrity	Intent	Capabilities	Results	Overall
Networking Ability	.108 (.066)	-.033 (.571)	-.014 (.808)	.051 (.382)	**.032 (.586)**
Apparent Sincerity	.725** (.000)	.739** (.000)	.696** (.000)	.659** (.000)	**.792** (.000)**
Social Astuteness	.598** (.000)	.636** (.000)	.482** (.000)	.462** (.000)	**.606** (.000)**
Interpersonal Influence	.788** (.000)	.850** (.000)	.693** (.000)	.376** (.000)	**.738** (.000)**
Overall	**.785** (.000)**	**.821** (.000)**	**.694** (.000)**	**.564** (.000)**	**.795** (.000)**

This study's result revealed a significant relationship between micropolitics and the credibility of barangay officials. Essentially, leaders have power, authority, and influence. Therefore, how they convey, apply, and demonstrate micropolitics will increase their credibility, or they should prepare for the demise of their integrity (Gorgijevski, 2021).

This study confirms some findings that micropolitics and credibility have a significant relationship. For instance, micropolitics can define credibility (Gorgijevski, 2021; Haslam, 2021). Sometimes, the constituents did not have personal knowledge about their leaders; they did not meet their leaders. Their only knowledge about their leaders is through the media, and how mainstream media and social media portray the leaders can significantly affect their credibility (Heavey et al., 2020; Van Zuydam & Hendriks, 2018).

Moreover, leaders' networking ability, interpersonal influence, social astuteness, and apparent sincerity relate significantly to credibility (Bryan, 2019; Chapman, 2019; Mintrom, 2019). However, these are not the only variables that are associated with credibility. For instance, there is the involvement of stakeholders, culture, performance, professionalism (Cullerton et al., 2018; Lee, 2021), and character (Reid, 2019). In addition, there is a significant correlation between micropolitics and the legitimacy of conduct, which also signals credibility (Green, 2021). These proofs imply barangay officials' dealings with their constituents for sustainability positioning.

Influence of Micropolitics on Credibility of Barangay Officials
Considering that there are three domains under micropolitics that are significantly related to the credibility of barangay officials, multiple regression analysis was necessary to show the predictive capability of micropolitics on the credibility of the barangay officials. Shown in Table 4 is the regression data. Micropolitics is the explanatory variable, and credibility is the response or the regressed variable.

The regression of micropolitics produced an F-value of 159.061, with a p-value of 0.000. The data revealed a predictive capacity of micropolitics on the credibility of barangay officials. Moreover, the coefficient of

determination (R^2) is 0.689, which means that micropolitics influences the credibility of barangay officials by 68.9%. The result further revealed that other factors other than micropolitics explain the credibility of the barangay officials by 31.1 percent.

Furthermore, apparent sincerity and interpersonal influence have the exact p-value of 0.000, indicating the significant influence on the credibility of the barangay officials. However, apparent sincerity having the highest coefficient came as the best predictor of credibility. In other words, every one unit of change in apparent sincerity will change the credibility of barangay officials in the change by that same unit. The negative relationships of between credibility and networking ability showed that in every one increase of credibility, networking ability will decrease of .001. On the other hand, data showed that networking

Table 4 : Influence of Micropolitics on the Credibility of the Barangay Officials

Micropolitics (Indicators)	Credibility			
	B	β	*t*	*Sig.*
Networking Ability	-.001	-.001	-.029	.977
Apparent Sincerity	.498	.541	11.111	.000
Social Astuteness	.023	.018	.328	.743
Interpersonal Influence	.287	.336	5.279	.000
	R	.830		
	R^2	.689		
	F	159.061		
	ρ	.000		

ability and social astuteness could not significantly influence credibility, having higher p-values than 0.05.

There is a significant influence of micropolitics on credibility, around sixty-nine percent in this study, suggesting that other factors also influence credibility. Other research showed that leaders using their power, authority and influence could influence their credibility (Rogers et al., 2020). The barangay officials also use the same power, including networking ability, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and interpersonal influence. All these could influence the trust that constituents are willing to give them. People judge their leaders according to the integrity of their actions (Fairchild, 2019; Innes, 2021).

Incidentally, leaders' micropolitical strategies affect the credibility their followers hold for them (Olaisen & Jevnaker, 2021). In other words, constituents in the barangay watch the actions of their officials in discharging their duties, from a simple act of communicating with the constituents e more complex ones, like knowledge of barangay rules and procedures and project management (Bueno & Salapa, 2019; Libo-on, 2020; Viray & Wekke, 2021).

Conclusion

Micropolitics is everywhere. Whether people know it, they apply it in their dealings with other people, at the workplace, even in their home. Credibility is also as crucial as micropolitics. Micropolitics is the process, and credibility is the inevitable result. This study assessed the level of micropolitics and credibility of the barangay officials. It assumed that micropolitics and credibility have no significant relationship. It also assumed that micropolitics has no influence on the credibility of the barangay officials. This study found that barangay officials have a high level of micropolitics, falling short of the 'very high' that this study assigned as its standard, suggesting, therefore, that barangay officials lack micropolitics in dealing with their constituents. This lack of micropolitics led to the constituents' moderate perception of the credibility of the barangay officials.

On the other hand, the study debunked the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between micropolitics and credibility. The correlation analysis found a positive, solid, and significant relationship

between micropolitics and credibility, and the regression results strengthen such finding by proving that micropolitics has a 68.9% influencing capability on credibility. The essential finding is that apparent sincerity is the best predictor of credibility. Remarkably, the study upheld the source credibility theory (Hovland, Janis & Kelley, 1953), which is the anchor theory of the study. The theory asserted the likelihood of people being persuaded by how credible the source presents itself.

The inference, therefore, is that constituents want barangay officials to deal with them with apparent sincerity. But, of course, the barangay officials do not have to fake sincerity, as others have understood apparent sincerity. Nevertheless, constituents observe their barangay officials regarding the integrity of their transactions, intent of actions, capability for achievement, and the results of their pursuit. All these will establish their credibility.

Recommendations

Here are the recommendations based on the findings and conclusion reached in this study.

There is a need to disseminate the study's findings to the "Liga ng Mga Barangay" and the locale of this study for discussion. The findings may help them recalibrate their methods of dealing with their constituents and how they function as barangay officials.

Each set of barangay officials may draw a roadmap of their functions, set their annual goals, and provide the means of monitoring and evaluation. The barangay officials may create a program like "A Day with the People," wherein they hold a program where they talk with their constituents to know their sentiments and the challenges they face. Talking to the people can help barangay officials create projects that directly respond to people's needs, thereby giving quality services to their constituents. These moves will result in the trust and confidence of the constituents and satisfaction ratings that could also raise the credibility of the barangay officials. Raising credibility may offer a bigger chance for sustainable positioning.

Finally, future researchers may replicate this study to other barangays to validate the result of this study: the more research, the better, reaching a broader population for establishing a research-based concrete response on a barangay level.

References

1. Aguilar, T. (2017, October 6). *Importance of Credibility | Brand Awareness, Trust|* https://aguilarpr.com/importance-of-credibility/
2. Alagabia Jr, W. D., & Cawi, R. D. (2019). The implementation of the anti-drug war campaign of the Philippine government. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 83-90.
3. Alramdhan, S. A., & Sattar, H. S. A. (2021). The Impact of Political Skills on Strategic Decision-Making for Senior Leaders-Directorates of Education. Review of International Geographical Education, 11(12), 1553- 1566.
4. Anderson, C., & Kennedy, J. A. (2012). Micropolitics: A new model of status hierarchies in teams. In *Looking back, moving forward: A review of group and team-based research*, 15, 49-80. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
5. Apuke, O. D. (2017). Quantitative Research Methods: A Synopsis Approach. Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 6(11), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.12816/0040336
6. Atmowardoyo, H. (2018). Research methods in TEFL studies: Descriptive research, case study, error analysis, and R & D. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(1), 197-204.
7. Barkacs, C. B. (2021, June 16). *4 Ways to improve your political skill on the path to power | Psychology Today*. Www.psychologytoday.com. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/power-and-influence/202106/4-ways-improve-your-political-skill-the-path-power
8. Basaluddin, K. A. (2021). The Administrative Capability of The Barangay Governments in The Municipality of Jolo, Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 323-335.
9. Batalla, E. V. C. (2020). Grand corruption scandals in the Philippines. *Public Administration and Policy*, 23(1), 73-86.

10. Bostanci, A. B. (2020). The relationship between teachers' political skills and work engagement. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 8(4), 53-63.

11. Bradberry, T. (2016, December 23). *Results or people: Where should a leader focus?* Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/travisbradberry/2016/12/23/results-or-people-which-deserves-a-leaders-attention/?sh=55309ca1626c

12. Brouer, R. L., Chiu, C. Y. C., & Wang, L. (2016). Political skill dimensions and transformational leadership in China. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 3(6), 1040-1056.

13. Bryan, T. K. (2019). Toward a contingency model for the relationship between capacity and effectiveness in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 48(4), 885-897.

14. Buan, L. (2021, June 30). *DOJ: Local governments, DPWH have most corruption complaints*. RAPPLER. https://www.rappler.com/nation/doj-report-corruption-complaints-lgus-government-agencies-2021/

15. Bueno, D. C., & Salapa, A. C. (2019). Capabilities of local community officials for devolution: A case towards Mandanas ruling-ready city. Institutional Multidisciplinary Research and Development Journal. ISSN 2619-7820

16. Castillo De Mesa, J., Gómez Jacinto, L., López Peláez, A., & Palma García, M. D. L. O. (2019). Building relationships on social networking sites from a social work approach. *Journal of social work practice*, 33(2), 201-215.

17. Castro-González, S., Bande, B., & Fernández-Ferrín, P. (2021). Influence of companies' credibility and trust in corporate social responsibility aspects of consumer food products: The moderating intervention of consumer integrity. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 28, 129-141.

18. Chanana, K. (2020). Women and leadership: Strategies of gender inclusion in institutions of higher education in India. In *Strategies for Supporting Inclusion and Diversity in the Academy* (pp. 141-162). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

19. Chapman, R. A. (2019). *Ethics in public service*. Edinburgh University Press.

20. Charteris, J., & Smardon, D. (2020). How Can You Foster Assessment Capable Leadership Across Your School?. *New Zealand Principal*, 35(1), 20-21

21. Colegio, L. (2018). *School micropolitics: Understanding and preparing for common micropolitical challenges novice principals encounter in K-12 schools* (Unpublished dissertation). Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas. https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/7865

22. Connors, A. (2021, September 21). *You won't build credibility in relationships without this*. NetWorkWise. https://www.networkwise.com/how-do-you-establish-credibility-aside-from-experience/

23. Cook, E. (2018, April 6). *Why the Philippines' vice-presidential election recount matters*. Thediplomat.com. https://thediplomat.com/2018/04/why-the-philippines-vice-presidential-election-recount-matters/

24. Covey, S. (2013). The 4 Cores of Credibility. Retrieved from https://fcw.com/Articles/2008/11/14/The-4-cores-of-credibility.aspx

25. Craemer, M. (2019, October 14). *Leading with intention*. Craemer Consulting. https://craemerconsulting.com/leading-with-intention/#:~:text=Leadership%20requires%20many%20behavioral%20attributes

26. Craig, W. (2018, June 5). *How leading with intention drives motivated employees*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/williamcraig/2018/06/05/how-leading-with-intention-drives-motivated-employees/?sh=7921b3283693

27. Cruz, K. (2022, January 26). *Analysts: Vote based on bets' platforms, record*. The Manila Times. https://www.manilatimes.net/2022/01/26/news/national/analysts-vote-based-on-bets-platforms-record/1830656

28. Cullen, K. L., Gerbasi, A., & Chrobot-Mason, D. (2018). Thriving in central network positions: The role of political skill. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 682-706.

29. Cullerton, K., Donnet, T., Lee, A., & Gallegos, D. (2018). Effective advocacy strategies for influencing government nutrition policy: a conceptual model. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *15*(1), 1-11.

30. Deng, H., Guan, Y., Wu, C. H., Erdogan, B., Bauer, T., & Yao, X. (2018). A relational model of perceived overqualification: The moderating role of interpersonal influence on social acceptance. *Journal of Management*, *44*(8), 3288-3310.

31. Dunn, D. F. (2017). *Characteristics of capable leaders*. Peer to Peer. The Quarterly Magazine. https://www.tecker.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DDunnLeadershipSummer2017.pdf

32. Ellen, S. (2020, December 14). *Slovin's Formula Sampling Techniques*. Sciencing. https://sciencing.com/slovins-formula-sampling-techniques-5475547.html

33. Fairchild, N. (2019). The micropolitics of posthuman early years leadership assemblages: Exploring more-than-human relationality. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *20*(1), 53-64.

34. Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management*, *31*(1), 126-152.

35. Fleming, E. (2021, June 1). *What are the main causes of corruption in the Philippines? – SidmartinBio*. Www.sidmartinbio.org. https://www.sidmartinbio.org/what-are-the-main-causes-of-corruption-in-the-philippines/

36. Frialde, M. (2008, February 20). *It's final: Loren loses election protest case vs Noli*. The Philippine Star. https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2008/02/20/45743/its-final-loren-loses-election-protest-case-vs-noli

37. Gambill, T. (2021, November 16). *How great leaders deliver results and build trusting relationships*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/tonygambill/2021/11/16/how-great-leaders-deliver-results-and-build-trusting-relationships/?sh=7c5b1b0f602f

38. Garnett, H. A., & James, T. S. (2020). Cyber elections in the digital age: Threats and opportunities of technology for electoral integrity. *Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy*, *19*(2), 111-126.

39. Gleeson, B. (2017, March 27). *The future of leadership and management in the 21st-century organization*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/brentgleeson/2017/03/27/the-future-of-leadership-and-management-in-the-21st-century-organization/?sh=5400d9ce218f

40. Gorgijevski, A. N. (2021). *Enter the Dragon: Toward a Micro-political View on Subsidiary Initiatives* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University).

41. Gorgijevski, A. N. (2021). *Enter the Dragon: Toward a Micro-political View on Subsidiary Initiatives* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University).

42. Green, R. J. (2021). Anti-establishment micropolitics in the response closure of political campaign debates. *Local Theories of Argument*.

43. Habibi, A., Mukminin, A., Riyanto, Y., Prasojo, L. D., Sulistiyo, U., Sofwan, M., & SAUDAGAR, F. (2018). Building an online community: Student teachers' perceptions on the advantages of using social networking services in a teacher education program. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *19*(1), 46-61.

44. Hamstra, M. R., Schreurs, B., Jawahar, I. M., Laurijssen, L. M., & Hünermund, P. (2021). Manager narcissism and employee silence: A socio-analytic theory perspective. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 94(1), 29-54.

45. Hartley, J. (2020). Leadership with Political Astuteness for Public Servants: And Why It Matters. *The Palgrave Handbook of the Public Servant*, 1-21.

46. Hartley, J., Sancino, A., Bennister, M., & Resodihardjo, S. L. (2019). Leadership for public value: Political astuteness as a conceptual link. *Public Administration*, *97*(2), 239-249.

47. Hasan, M. K., Hayek, M. J., Williams Jr, W. A., Pane-Haden, S., & Gelvez, M. P. M. (2020). Activist identity construction of Madam CJ Walker. *Journal of Management History*, *26*(3), 335-351.

48. Haslam, P. A. (2021). The micro-politics of corporate responsibility: How companies shape protest in communities affected by mining. *World Development*, *139*, 105322.

49. Hassan, S., Prussia, G., Mahsud, R., & Yukl, G. (2018). How leader networking, external monitoring, and representing are relevant for effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

50. Hayes, A. (2019). *Understanding linear relationships*. Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/l/linearrelationship.asp

51. Heavey, C., Simsek, Z., Kyprianou, C., & Risius, M. (2020). How do strategic leaders engage with social media? A theoretical framework for research and practice. *Strategic Management Journal*, *41*(8), 1490-1527.

52. Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., & Kelley, H.H. (1953). *Communication and Persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

53. Innes, M. (2021). The micro-politics of policy enactment in a multi-academy trust. *School Leadership & Management*, *41*(4-5), 334-351.

54. James, T. S. (2019). Better workers, better elections? Electoral management body workforces and electoral integrity worldwide. *International Political Science Review*, *40*(3), 370-390.

55. Jasni, A. A. (2018). The effect of political skill among employees towards stakeholders' satisfaction: A study on Iskandar Malaysia.

56. Jenkins, N. (2016, May 10). *How can the Philippines elect a guy like Rodrigo Duterte?* Time. https://time.com/4324073/rodrigo-duterte-philippines-president-why-elected/

57. Johnson, P., & Vaidya, D. (2021, April 23). *Linear relationship*. WallStreetMojo. https://www.wallstreetmojo.com/linear-relationship/

58. Karp, J. A., Nai, A., & Norris, P. (2018). Dial' F'for fraud: Explaining citizens suspicions about elections. *Electoral Studies*, *53*, 11-19.

59. Kim, J. K., LePine, J. A., & Chun, J. U. (2018). Stuck between a rock and a hard place: Contrasting upward and downward effects of leaders' ingratiation. *Personnel Psychology*, *71*(4), 495-518.

60. Kranefeld, I., Blickle, G., & Meurs, J. (2020). Political skill at work and in careers. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.747

61. Kuhonta, E. M., & Truong, N. (2020). The institutional roots of defective democracy in the Philippines. *Stateness and democracy in East Asia*, 153-179.

62. Kwon, H. W. (2020). Performance appraisal politics in the public sector: The effects of political skill and social similarity on performance rating. *Public Personnel Management*, *49*(2), 239-261.

63. Lee, C. (2021). Factors influencing the credibility of performance measurement in nonprofits. *International Review of public Administration*, *26*(2), 156-174.

64. Lewis, J. M., Ricard, L. M., & Klijn, E. H. (2018). How innovation drivers, networking and leadership shape public sector innovation capacity. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *84*(2), 288-307.

65. LGU IGACOS. (2015). *The Island Garden City of Samal (IGACOS)*. https://2015.samalcity.gov.ph/index.php/basic-information/basic-information

66. Libo-on, J. T. (2020). Predictors of Barangay Officials' Parliamentary Rules and Procedure Knowledge and Skills. *International Journal of Advance Study and Research Work, 3*(12), 20-30.

67. Liu, G. X., Shi, L. F., & Xin, D. J. (2020). Data integrity monitoring method of digital sensors for Internet-of-Things applications. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *7*(5), 4575-4584.

68. Ma, C., Wu, C. H., Jiang, X., & Wei, W. (2019). Why and when leader humility promotes constructive voice: a crossover of energy perspective. *Personnel Review*.

69. Martinez, V. V. (2019). Delivery of the services of the National Philippine Police: A community-based assessment. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 278-290.

70. McCarthy, J. (2019, March 25). *Plastic pollution cleanup effort in Manila Bay begins*. Global Citizen. https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/manila-bay-clean-up/

71. Miguel, M. (2015). *Manila Bay Clean Up Program*. Denr.gov.ph. https://www.denr.gov.ph/index.php?id=794&page=80&sort&filter&sea

72. Miller, E. (2021). Leadership During Turbulent Times. *Pain Management Nursing*, *22*(2), 101-102.

73. Mintrom, M. (2019). So you want to be a policy entrepreneur?. *Policy design and practice*, *2*(4), 307-323.

74. Norris, P., Garnett, H. A., & Grömping, M. (2020). The paranoid style of American elections: explaining perceptions of electoral integrity in an age of populism. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, *30*(1), 105-125.

75. Olaisen, J., & Jevnaker, B. H. (2021, September). Power and Micropolitics in Project Management. In *European Conference on Knowledge Management* (pp. 603-XX). Academic Conferences International Limited.

76. Padillo, M. M. (2021, October 3). *Samal-Davao bridge project still under loan negotiation with China, right-of-way proceedings*. BusinessWorld Online. https://www.bworldonline.com/samal-davao-bridge-project-still-under-loan-negotiation-with-china-right-of-way-proceedings/

77. Paliszkiewicz, J. (2019). Information security policy compliance: Leadership and trust. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *59*(3), 211-217.

78. Petricone, F. (2020). The importance of political credibility today. *Church, Communication and Culture*, *5*(2), 288–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/23753234.2020.1766364

79. Philippine News Agency. (2022, February 8). *Palace thanks public for PRRD's very good net satisfaction rating*. Philippines News. https://www.philippinesnews.net/news/272276975/palace-thanks-public-for-prrd-very-good-net-satisfaction-rating

80. Price, P. C., Jhangiani, R., Chiang, I-Chant. A., Leighton, D. C., & Cuttler, C. (n.d.). *6.1 Overview of Non-Experimental Research – Research Methods in Psychology*. Opentext.wsu.edu. Retrieved February 25, 2022, from https://opentext.wsu.edu/carriecuttler/chapter/overview-of-non-experimental-research/#:~:text=What%20Is%20Non%2DExperimental%20ResearchcheckSave

81. Program on Negotiation (PON) Staff. (2020, October 8). *Negotiation case study and sincerity's power in negotiation*. PON - Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. https://www.pon.harvard.edu/daily/conflict-resolution/the-importance-of-sincerity/

82. Quaranta, J. (2017). *Descriptive correlational research: asthma management by school nurses*. SAGE publications ltd.

83. Reid, J. E. (2019, March 1). *The Hillen credibility factors*. Reid.com. https://reid.com/resources/investigator-tips/the-hillen-credibility-factors

84. Rogers, L., De Brún, A., Birken, S. A., Davies, C., & McAuliffe, E. (2020). The micropolitics of implementation; a qualitative study exploring the impact of power, authority, and influence when implementing change in healthcare teams. *BMC health services research*, *20*(1), 1-13.

85. Roy, I., Hauptmann, M., & Van Durme, Y. (2019). *Leadership for the 21st century: The intersection of the traditional and the new*. Deloitte Insights. https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/focus/human-capital-trends/2019/21st-century-leadership-challenges-and-development.html

86. Scherer, M. (2020). Micropolitics | government | Britannica. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/micropolitics

87. Seibel, W. (2019). Professional Integrity and Leadership in Public Administration. In *The Blind Spots of Public Bureaucracy and the Politics of Non-Coordination* (pp. 71-86). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

88. Sfârlog, B., Cucoș, I., & Stănciulescu, R. (2020). Particularities of the Military Leadership in the Context of Social Networking. In *International conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION* (Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 346-349).

89. Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(1), 8-12.

90. Sinha, S. (2020, September 22). *Leadership credibility - why it matters & how to develop it*. Top Business Coaching Program | Soaring Eagles. https://soaringeagles.co/resources/leadership-credibility-why-it-matters-how-to-develop-it/#:~:text=Studies%20have%20shown%20that%20the

91. Shlanger, J. (2009). Explaining the link between leader political skill and workplace ProQuest Dissertations and Theses; 2009; ProQuest Central. Retrieved from http://www.proquest.com

92. Sobel, J. (1985). A theory of credibility. *The Review of Economic Studies*, *52*(4), 557-573.

93. Solinger, O. N., Jansen, P. G., & Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). The emergence of moral leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(3), 504-527.

94. Stark, J., Reif, J. A., & Schiebler, T. (2021). What leaders tell and employees hear–an intention-perception model of storytelling in leadership. *Organization Management Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-02-2021-1156

95. Suleik, M. B. (2022, February 15). *Wanted: Credible leadership*. Manila Bulletin. https://mb.com.ph/2022/02/15/wanted-credible-leadership/

96. Sumpter, M., & Ciampaglia, G. L. (2021). Preserving the Integrity and Credibility of the Online Information Ecosystem. *Data Engineering*, 4.

97. Supetran, B. L. (2018, June 30). *Samal: Island Garden City of the South | Bernard L. Supetran*. BusinessMirror. https://businessmirror.com.ph/2018/06/30/samal-island-garden-city-of-the-south/

98. Supian, K., & Ab Rashid, N. (2018). The role of supplier, top management and government in halal practices integrity of Malaysian food business. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *8*(8), 549-559.

99. Valmonte, C. L., Manlulu, M., & Vargas, D. (2021). Role of opinion leaders and attitude on solid waste segregation. *Available at SSRN 3794699*.

100. Van Zuydam, S., & Hendriks, F. (2018). Credibility enacted: Understanding the meaning of credible political leadership in the Dutch parliamentary election campaign of 2010. *Journal of Political Marketing*, *17*(3), 258-281.

101. Viray, M. C., & Wekke, I. S. (2021). Effective Operations and Advantages of Barangay Officials In The Philippines: The Case of Bayugan City, Agusan Del Sur. *JIRAN: Journal of Southeast Asia Studies*, *2*(3).

102. Wang, M. Z., & Hall, J. A. (2019). Political skill and outcomes in social life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *149*, 192-199.

103. Wolfe, L. (2019, August 20). *Two Valuable Networking Skills*. The Balance Careers. https://www.thebalancecareers.com/valuable-networking-skills-3515560

104. Xu, S., Yang, T., Guo, R., & Zhang, W. (2019). The antecedents and consequences of employees' followership behavior in social network organizational context: a longitudinal study. *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, *2019*(1), 1-14.