



and charging P20 per head, another serves as a wet nurse to earn P4,000 a month, while a man catches lizards, worms, and cockroaches to sell to students who need specimens to dissect (GMA News Online, 2012).

Filipinos may recognize this as an effective use of *diskarte*. Within psychological research, *diskarte* has been loosely translated as "strategy" or "approach" (Yacat, 2005). It has been used in the context of courtship (Rillera-Astudillo, 2007), work and negotiation (Gaerlan, Cabrera, Samia, & Santoalla, 2011), and surviving problems, from using public transportation, to academics (Yacat, 2005). From the field of anthropology, Bonilla (2013) discusses *diskarte* in the light of brinkmanship, or the pursuit of a strategy to the edge of safety. It was conceptualized in this case as part of a set of skills needed to survive Manila's streets.

Unfortunately, despite *diskarte* being a central aspect of Filipino identity (Yacat, 2005), very little attention has so far been devoted to developing it as a psychological construct. Questions such as how it is utilized, who has *diskarte* and who does not, and what makes one's *diskarte* good remain unaddressed. Proposing answers to these questions can enrich theorizing on how individuals possessing certain personality traits and cognitive abilities respond to social constraints within their environment. Furthermore, analyzing *diskarte* as an individual difference variable will enable researchers to create psychometrically valid and reliable instruments to measure it to help in assessment, training, and development of this characteristic. This review aims to jumpstart theorizing about *diskarte* by 1) reviewing definitions proposed in studies that have mentioned *diskarte*, 2) analyzing how the construct may be similar to or different from constructs such as intelligence and creativity, and what this implies for creating a working definition of *diskarte*, 3) proposing possible personality and cognitive process correlates that contribute to being *ma-diskarte*, and 4) examining the role of social constraints in one's *diskarte*. From these insights, a tentative conceptual framework and future directions for fleshing out the *diskarte* construct will be proposed.



deployment of attention in order to solve novel problems that cannot be solved by depending exclusively on previously learned knowledge or scripts (Schneider & McGrew, 2012). It 54y6e06437 030( )--(23(e

creativity were assessed (Runco & Albert, 1986). A more recent meta-analysis showed very little relationship between IQ and creativity after controlling for possible extraneous variables (Kim, 2005). On the other hand, other researchers have suggested that intelligence is a necessary, but not sufficient, requirement for creativity (e.g., Karwowski et al., 2016). Given these results, it may then be useful to assume that creativity is separate from intelligence, but both are needed in creative problem-solving.

Researchers have also framed *diskarte* as practical intelligence (Antonio, Benavidez, Ochoa, & Malaki, 2006). Sternberg defines this construct as one's ability to be successful in one's natural environment in such a way that it moves an individual closer to his or her goal (as cited in Ciancolo, Grigorenko, Jarvin, Gil, & Sternberg, 2006). In Sternberg's theory of successful intelligence (1999), he argues that certain skills, such as running a successful street stall, cannot be translated to succeeding at paper-and-pen tests. He thus argues that intelligence has three distinct aspects: analytical, practical, and creative, and prioritizing the development of one over the other may depend on one's environment. For instance, analytical intelligence may take the backseat to practical intelligence if one comes from challenging environments. These aspects have been operationalized in Sternberg's Triarchic Abilities Test (STAT) as follows: The measure for analytical intelligence involves analyzing, judging, and evaluating information, as typically seen in academic settings; the test for creative intelligence measures how well an individual adapts to novel situations; and the test for practical intelligence utilizes situations that arise in everyday life and determines how





Table 1. Similarities and differences of *diskarte* from related constructs

Construct



Construct	Definition	Similarities	Differences
Practical intelligence	Ability to be successful in one's natural environment in such a way that it moves an individual closer to his or her goal (Sternberg, 1999)	Involves reacting and adapting to situational limitations	May not necessarily involve creative ideation
Everyday creativity	Use of creativity to adapt to life's circumstances (Richards, 2007)	Used to adapt to situational limitations  Involves crafting original and effective solutions to everyday problems  Involves process, perspective, and one's style of doing things	Proactive and spontaneous rather than reactive and adaptive  More general than <i>diskarte</i> in that it involves self-expression in addition to problem-solving



contents of one's working memory in order to replace outdated information with more relevant ones) and inhibiting (controlling dominant, automatic responses) predict creativity (Benedek, Jauk, Sommer, Arendasy, & Neubauer, 2014). These studies serve to illustrate that flexibility of cognitive control is necessary for the effective and timely use of the complementary processes of divergent (i.e. unconventional) and convergent (i.e. conservative) cognitive operations.

Similarly, *diskarte* appears to involve effective switching

to explain creative cognition, the Genevieve model can be used as a template to understand how individuals decide on their *diskarte*.

### *Personality traits*

Rothenberg states that one quality that creative individuals appear to possess is the ability to integrate two seemingly opposite characteristics at the same time (as cited in Runco, 2007a). Other examples of fluctuating between two opposite extremes include having both destructive and constructive attitudes (Haller and Courvoisier, 2010) and shifting from altruism to self-centeredness, as well as reality and fantasy (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009). This quality helps creative thinkers so that they are more capable of going beyond mental sets that are often conservative and unoriginal. As implied by the label "prosocial psychopaths" (Galang, 2010), creative individuals can also both accept and shun social norms.

In addition, the trait Openness to Experience (O) in the Five-Factor Model is most strongly associated with better performance in divergent thinking tasks (McCrae, 1987). Facets of this trait that may be relevant to *diskarte* include preference for variety and intellectual curiosity. Another trait that is popularly (and controversially) linked to creativity is psychoticism (Eysenck, 1993), with the following associated descriptors: being aggressive, cold, antisocial, egocentric, and impulsive. Although this link has been criticized (e.g. Runco, 1993), recent studies seem to support the relationship between creativity and antisocial behavior. Creativity was found to have a significant negative relationship with Honesty-Humility, a factor that looks at modesty, sincerity, fairness, and avoidance of greed (Silvia, Kaufman, Reiter-Palmon, and Wigert, 2011). Creative individuals are also more likely to cheat because they are hypothesized to be better able to maintain a positive self-image, despite their unethical behavior, as they are able to "tell stories" to rationalize their actions (Gino & Arieli, 2012). Narcissism, psychopathy, and psychopathic boldness were found to be positively correlated with creativity measures as well (Galang, Castelo, Santos, Perlas, & Angeles, 2016). The



position in a social situation. These, together with other circumstances, provide formidable situational constraints.

Exploring the unique environmental challenges that necessitate using one's *diskarte* can allow us to frame the construct as a strategy of the less powerful to temper the effects of unequal social positions and resource limitations. In fact, even playing up one's less-privileged position can become part of one's *diskarte*. In Rillera-

case of the woman who picked lice to earn money. Her *diskarte* emerged after recognizing that she belongs to a less privileged group (e.g. poor people) and that she wanted to be free of the limitations of belonging to this social category. Her *diskarte* benefits her alone rather than a larger group. In this sense, then, *diskarte* can be seen as a mechanism that falls within the individual mobility category, as it aims to achieve more personally relevant goals.

It should be noted, however, that the Filipino self may extend to include a few others. In Filipino psychology, Enriquez's concept of *kapwa* (shared identity) entails that other people within one's social sphere are cat

to make more money during trips is to disregard traffic rules (e.g. running a red light) in order to gain more passengers. Yet, this perception among others, especially those deemed as ITs, may pale in comparison to the prospect of achieving one's goals.

The conflict between assimilation and creative thinking was further examined by Ashton-James and Chartrand (2009), who found that behavioral mimicry during social interaction decreases divergent thinking because behavioral mimicry cues social acceptance or fitting in, which encourages convergent thought rather than divergent thought processes [Bahar & Hansel, Larey & Paulus (as cited in Ashton-James & Chartrand, 2009)]. Furthermore, divergent thinking and creative solutions are encouraged when there are limited opportunities for group assimilation (Arndt et al., 2005).

On a final note, culture as an omnipresent construct is important to consider in *diskarte* research as well. Culture drives what is recognized as being creative, and what is not. In Lubart's (2010) r



& Galinsky, 2009). The Philippines' history of being subjugated under various colonizers affords the unique opportunity of being exposed to diverse experiences without having to leave one's own soil. Researchers may thus be interested in exploring whether *diskarte* was developed as a cultural behavior, especially after recognizing the need to be creative within social constraints imposed by colonial rule, as these constraints remain relevant to the present day because of the persistent presence of social inequality.

In summary, *diskarte* as creative problem-solving emerges in the context of situational limitations, such as social constraints and inequality of power, in order to transcend these. It involves the use of creative thinking processes such as making remote associations, divergent and convergent thinking, and cognitive flexibility to produce original ideas. Personality traits such as psychoticism, low honesty-humility, and willingness to bend the rules can also contribute to being *ma-diskarte*.

Is it possible to measure *diskarte*? Some notes

Creativity research has benefited from a number of measures. Some of these include focusing on creative achievement, the most popular of which is the Creative Achievement Questionnaire (Carson, Peterson, & Higgins, 2005). Other measures focus on behaviors that indicate creativity, such as the Hocevar's Creative Behavior Inventory and Batey's Biographical Inventory of Creative Behaviors (see Silvia, Wigert, Reiter-

Other items may be generated after further research on what people qualify as *ma-diskarte* behavior. In addition, respondents may be asked about five situations in their lives in which they showed the most *diskarte*, similar to Jauk, Benedek, and Neubauer's (2014) technique in their Inventory of Creative Activities and Achievements.

A more ambitious *diskarte* measure is that which can assess the creative ideation behind crafting solutions. In creativity research, the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT; Torrance, in Kim, 2006) is one of the most established ways of measuring divergent thinking. The TTCT measures one's fluency (number of relevant ideas), originality (number of statistically infrequent responses to a question), elaboration (number of ideas added), abstractness, and resistance to premature closure, or the degree of psychological openness of an individual (Kim, 2006). The Unusual Uses task in particular may be helpful in illuminating an individual's capacity to conceive as many solutions as possible to a problem. This task involves generating uses for a common, everyday object, such as a fork.

If this technique is to be appropriated for measuring *diskarte*, questions should involve commonly-encountered situations at home, work, school, or in interpersonal relationships, such as finding one's way home while having limited finances. However, freely eliciting these responses would still require solving the problem of how to evaluate these strategies. If *diskarte*, like creativity, is a construct that is easily recognizable, perhaps it can be assessed through the Consensual Assessment Technique (CAT; Amabile, 1982) wherein experts are asked to rate the product in terms of a set criteria. However, the use of CAT in evaluating one's *diskarte* poses an interesting question of whether society recognizes so-called "*diskarte* experts," the same way that museum creators and multi-awarded writers can be recognized as experts in their domain. This is an important question to consider because inter-rater reliability has been shown to suffer when non-experts were utilized (Kaufman, Baer, Cole, & Sexton, 2008).

The criteria to be used for evaluation present another problem. Assessing creative products often revolve around the key criteria of novelty and appropriateness. In fact, Amabile (1982) criticized the lack of operational definitions when using these two criteria. While the novelty criterion is relatively easier to assess (i.e. whether the response is unexpected or unconventional), the criterion of appropriateness is less straightforward. In approaching *diskarte*, a key dimension of

SYNTHESIS:

Toward a holistic investigation of *diskarte*

This review has framed *diskarte* as creative problem-

can include goal achievement, as well as unintended but beneficial

There is still much work to be done to flesh out this construct. This article is an attempt to initiate such efforts by examining the scarce number of published studies that have sought to define *diskarte*. However, in the absence of further scholarly work, we must turn elsewhere for inspiration. Creativity as a construct has benefited from much research in the past 70 years. Because of its shared attributes with *diskarte*, it is deemed a fitting torch to illuminate the path of further *diskarte* research.

## REFERENCES

- Albert, J. R. G., Dumagan, J. C., & Martinez Jr., A. (2015). *Inequalities in Income, Labor, and Education: The Challenge of Inclusive Growth* (No. 2015-01). PIDS Discussion Paper Series. Retrieved from <http://dirp3.pids.gov.ph/webportal/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1501.pdf>.
- Amabile, T. M. (1982). Social psychology of creativity: A Consensual Assessment Technique. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, 43(5), 997-1013.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Antonio, A.D., Benavidez, R.D., Ochoa, D.P., & Malaki, M.W. (2006). *Diskarte: An exploration of the Filipino concept, development, and experience of street smarts of high school students*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines-Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.
- Arndt, J., Routledge, C., Greenberg, J., & Sheldon, K. M. (2005). Illuminating the dark side of creative expression: Assimilation needs and the consequences of creative action following mortality salience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1327-1339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205274690>
- Ashton-James, C. E., & Chartrand, T. L. (2009). Social cues for creativity: The impact of behavioral mimicry on convergent and divergent thinking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1036-1040.
- Benedek, M., Jauk, E., Sommer, M., Arendasy, M., & Neubauer, A. C. (2014). Intelligence, creativity, and cognitive control: The common and differential involvement of executive functions in intelligence and creativity. *Intelligence*, 46, 73-83.

- Bonilla, C. M. (2013). Arenas of brinkmanship: A culture of pa-simplihan. *Diliman Review*, 60(1-4), 87-103.
- Brewer, M. B. (2004). Taking the social origins of human nature seriously: Toward a more imperialist social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(2), 107-113.
- Brody, N. (2003). Construct validation of the Sternberg Triarchic Abilities Test: Comment and reanalysis. *Intelligence*, 31, 319-329.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems, and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Carson, S. H., Peterson, J. C., & Higgins, D. M. (2005). Reliability, validity, and factor structure of the Creative Achievement Questionnaire. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(1), 37-50.
- Chooi, W.-





- McCrae, R. R. (1987). Creativity, divergent thinking, and openness to experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(6), 1258–1265. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.52.6.1258
- Pe-Pua, R., & Protacio-Marcelino, E. (2000). Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 49–71.
- Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). (2017). Employment situation in July 2016 (Final results). *Philippine Statistics Authority*. Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/content/employment-situation-july-2016-final-results>.
- Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). (2016). Poverty incidence among Filipinos registered at 26.3%, as of first semester of 2015 – PSA. *Philippine Statistics Authority*. Retrieved from <http://psa.gov.ph/content/poverty-incidence-among-filipinos-registered-263-first-semester-2015-psa>.
- Razumnikova, O. (2013). Divergent versus convergent thinking. In E. G. Carayannis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Creativity, Invention, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship* (pp. 546–552). New York: Springer New York.
- Resourcefulness (n.d.). In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resourcefulness>
- Richards, R. (2007). Everyday creativity: Our hidden potential. In R. Richards (Ed.), *Everyday Creativity and New Views of Human Nature: Psychological, Social, and Spiritual Perspectives* (pp. 25–53). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Richards, R. (2010). Everyday creativity: Process and way of life - four key issues. In J. C. Kaufman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity* (1st ed., pp. 189–215). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rillera-Astudillo, L. (2007). General self-presentational strategies used by college students in establishing romantic relationships and friendships. *Interpersona* 1(2), 117

