

***Massive Popularity
or Machine Politics:
Which will Make the
Next Philippine President?***

(April 30, 1992)

Speakers:

Dr. Mahar Mangahas
Social Weather Stations, Inc. (SWS)

Mr. Hilarion Henares
Philippine Daily Inquirer

Discussants:

Dr. Temario Rivera
Department of Political Science, UP Diliman

Dr. Emmanuel Lallana
Department of Political Science, UP Diliman

Prof. Alexander R. Magno (Acting Director, Third World Studies Center): Who will win in the coming presidential election is probably the most asked question these days. To answer this question, we have invited our speakers here today. Based on their findings and analysis, we hope to acquire an indication of the course and character of this elections which will give us an inkling as to who will be our next chief executive.

What would determine the choice of our people? Will voter preference reflect the voter's actual choice in the end? Or will party machineries rule election day? Will it be Miriam or Mitra? These and other questions we hope to confront in this forum.

Our first speaker is the president of one of the most, if not the most, prestigious survey institutions in the Philippines. May I present to you Dr. Mahar Mangahas of the Social Weather Stations, Inc. (SWS).

Dr. Mahar Mangahas: I have some data to pass on to you, information which had already been published in the newspapers. But for substantive points, I would like to comment on three things as a preliminary.

First, how does one evaluate the quality of data? Second, can we rely on sampling as a basis for learning about society? Third, can a society tolerate learning about itself? Right now, we in the SWS are in the thick of everything. I tell my staff that we cannot afford to make any mistake because this is for real, that what they do is no longer like taking a course in college just to get a passing grade.

For the first question: is the quality of our surveys dependable? My simple answer is that it is as reliable as academic standards require, that is all. Whatever criteria people would like to use to believe what comes out of the university and the faculty, use it on us. Our objective is to be rated well by our academic peers. That is the bottomline. Journalists are journalists. Let journalists judge other journalists as to whether they are good journalists. But let social scientists judge us whether our social science passes academic standards.

The second criticism against us says that the results reflect only a sample, that there are 30 million voters and thus, this sample cannot possibly reflect the sentiments of those 30 million.

Eighty to ninety percent of what we know in this world about social science is based on samples and not on complete counts. So if we allow critics to use this argument against surveys then we are going to deny so much other information of any basis. We are going to deny that Filipinos are against military coups since that finding was based on a survey. We are going to deny the data base that there was euphoria in the early days of the Aquino administration and that the people became disappointed later on.

We will deny that the dominant public view was for an extension of the stay of US military bases.

I can go on and on denying what we already know of our society if we give credit to this criticism against surveys. All over the world what we read in our books are all based on samples. Science cannot allow this criticism against sampling or else it will deny it its data base, not just for election voter preferences but for 90% of all that we know.

Election time is an important time for validating the sample. That is what is so nice about elections. Because if you do a sample survey at the end of the campaign when all voters had made their decision, the best way to validate that sample is by comparing it with the results of the election itself. Otherwise, the only way to validate a sample is through another sample. That is why the way to validate the trends in the popularity of a president is to have three or four surveys, with each validating each other.

And the third point which I think we should keep in mind while confronting the many criticisms aimed at us and our job is the question of whether society can tolerate knowing about itself. There are criticisms saying that we conduct surveys but must not reveal the results to the public since they affect or influence groups. Yes, survey results have an effect on voters, but so do many other things.

A lot of people get peeved with survey results. But the real question here, when there are survey results or any kind of data about public opinion, is "Is it bad for a community to know what its opinion is?" I think our critics are saying that we should not reveal the results, that the public should not know who is leading and who is losing. We maintain that it is not bad to know yourself any more than it is bad to know the result of your own medical examination when you go to the doctor. You may find something very bad or very good, but knowledge should not kill you. It may chasten you but you should in the long run get something better out of it.

The SWS is an academic group. In a nutshell, we are researchers who got tired of the excuse that social analysis cannot be done because there is no data. So we tried to find a system of getting such data. I think we are better than others in whatever requires new data, specially survey data. That is where I think we have a little advantage.

We publish the *SWS Bulletin*. I don't know why there are people who say that we keep what we do when this bulletin comes out twice a month. We are the only open survey institution in the country. We do not do any proprietary service, that is our difference from commercial groups. We are not a technical improvement over our colleagues in the survey industry as far as research methodology is concerned as there are many very good research companies. We are an institutional innovation.

We are non-partisan. We are part of the Philippine Social Science Council. We are a self-supporting research institute. There are such things as research projects and contracts and we can reveal who the sponsors are anytime. They may be special, adhoc or commissioned surveys but the regular SWS survey, the one that goes to press, is something that is financed by subscribers, institutions, and individuals. Of course they pay fees and we are not ashamed of that. They commission us in order to get advanced information about the survey results. If we do not accept fees we will quickly become bankrupt. But the subscribers have no control over the findings. They cannot tell us what to release to the public and what not to release.

Our business is like the newspaper business. We try to have a little local news, foreign news, sports, etc. so that there will be something for everybody. We are trying a little of everything specially if it is new and controversial. So how can we avoid elections and voter preferences? If we do not do it it would be like publishing a newspaper that does not talk about the elections. People would say "What kind of newspaper is this?" What kind of survey institution would we be if we do not do election surveys during the elections, at a time when everything that is being talked about and given attention to is the elections?

I call special attention to our membership in the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) because we are quite proud of this. The ISSP is the only international consortium for doing surveys on a cross-country basis. There are eighteen members in this consortium. There is only one Third World member and that is us. To be a member of this consortium, the most important criterion is to have data of the same quality as the other members so that it can be compared to the data coming from the other countries. The data are consolidated in an archive at the University of Cologne. Data are accessed there by academics from all over the world.

Our American counterpart in this consortium is the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. Our British counterpart is the Social and Community Planning Research of the University of London which publishes British social attitudes. We are not of the Gallup kind. Gallup is a commercial outfit.

Mr. George Gallup, by the way, made sampling respectable in the 30s by using his sampling on elections, showing that election results corroborated the samples thereby giving public support to the samples, on the bases of which his consumer research flourished.

And if you go back to the 30s you will find the most ignorant criticisms of sampling that you find today in our media. You will find American journalists saying "How could a sample of only one thousand represent the views of 100 million Americans?" Exactly the same thing. There were

petitions to the US Congress to ban surveys then the same way the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) is being asked to ban surveys now. That is just a phase in doing survey work. And Mr. Gallup just had to face those in the 30s. So if we are facing the same opposition today that is only history repeating itself.

And now I go to the main part of my discussion.

What are our voters like? We deliberately alternate male and female respondents. Location we do weigh according to the census weights. It says urban 51%, rural 49%. (See Table 1, Appendix.) Did you know that we are 51% urban and 49% rural? And how many columnists do you read saying that we are 60% rural? Well, there is a difference between the amateurs and the pros.

We do not structure age, we go and we sample randomly and it should come out even. And do not believe those who are saying that all the voters are young. Only about half are below 34. Even those in my age group count as far as votes are concerned.

But the most important variable is the class. There are class differences, market research classes. You have to make sure that you have a little middle class, a little lower class, and a little upper class. This is a validation. This is to show that this is a representative sample.

You cannot have respondents who are all college graduates. You should only have around 15% college graduates.

Not everybody is working. Some people are at home. You have to have some people who are working. If an interviewer goes to a house and selects a person and the person is not home, the interviewer comes back. Our technical shortcoming is that we have not found a way of interviewing those people who do not have homes.

I want to show something about surveys since one of the topics now is surveys themselves. In March 26 to April 10, 1992, we asked "Have you read or heard of surveys of the chance of presidential candidates to win the election?" The outreach is about one-third, two-thirds do not even know yet about surveys. Maybe in the future they will. But in the meantime only a minority know about them. "What do you think of them (surveys)?" Nine percent believe them all and nine percent do not believe any of them. And you have those who say it depends on what the surveys say.

In fact, we have some data in the past that would lead us to feel that people believe what happens to concur with their views. And I do not think that is wrong. They have their own view of the situation and if they see it

confirmed in the survey they would think it is correct because they believe their own opinion to be correct. So at this time the outreach of surveys is not so much as to be of concern to the congressmen.

We have another question here and it goes like this: "There are those who say that one should vote according to one's conscience, whether or not the candidate would win. There are others who say that votes for a losing candidate would be wasted, therefore, one should vote for a candidate one thinks would win. Will you vote according to your conscience or for the one you think will win?" This was asked in two surveys. The first survey was finished February 10, 1992. The second survey was finished April 10, 1992. That was only a few weeks ago. We got exactly the same results. Eighty-six to eighty-seven percent say they will vote according to their conscience regardless of the winnability of their candidate.

In fact, most people think that their candidate is ahead of the others. There is nothing wrong with that. I cannot see any evidence which says that the people will vote for who the leader is, even when the surveys show who the leader is. They will not pay attention to that and we do not want them to. So the surveys do not create a bandwagon effect.

American surveys also fail to find a bandwagon effect on the electorate. Where the bandwagon effect or its reverse might be found is in the candidate's inner circle. A candidate's allies, financiers, and volunteers may defect to the other side if they see that the candidate has no chance. This is because they are not only staking their votes, they are also staking all their work, effort, and money and they want something in return for them. But as to the voters, I would say there is no evidence that the voters will be affected.

Now for the survey results. We would admit different approaches at different times. In July and in November, we used the one-on-one approach, a very research-intensive approach. In the one-on-one approach, we asked our respondents "Who do you prefer, Laurel or Mitra, Laurel or Ramos, Laurel or Salonga?" So you have a whole matrix of pairs. It is like a round robin. In November, we used the same approach. In February, we started using sets because we wanted to narrow things down (see Table 2). And in April 1992, we already knew who the contenders are.

We use the standard sample size of 1,200 respondents. If you want a 1% error in the survey your sample size must be 10,000. That would be a very expensive sample. We are using the 1,200 sample size and the error margin there is 3%. So, you see, to reduce the margin of error from 3 to 1, you have to increase your sample size by nearly a factor of 10. That is not very practical. So if we see a difference between candidates not beyond that margin we call a tie. We cannot say somebody is ahead of somebody by a fraction. We do not ever use decimal points.

We have Ramos ahead, but declining from 25% of the votes to 18% in April 1992 (see Table 6). We have Miriam coming from somewhere in the middle position until she is tied for the lead. People originally thought of Salonga very highly but lost interest in him very quickly over time. We have Laurel with momentum in the first three rounds and then sputtering in the fourth round. We have Cojuangco coming in from the outside. Apparently, a lot of people are giving him the benefit of the doubt considering the numerous charges that have been put against him, and he is up at third place, even overtaking Mitra.

Having so many undecided voters is normal. We asked people how many days before voting day did they decide on their vote in the past elections. Twenty percent said they made their choice on the last day, and some a few days before. And if you add up those who said they made their decision seven days before or less, you have 60% who said they finalized their decision seven days or less before the election.

For vice-president, we see Erap Estrada leading, and by a bigger margin than shown in this survey because it so happened that Erap switched from running for president to vice-president on April 1, 1992 and at that time we were almost finished with the Metro Manila portion of our survey (see Table 9). This 18% reflects only his votes outside Metro Manila. We have not made any corrections for that. Therefore, his lead is much bigger than that.

So our projection is that we might have a president from one party -- because right now you have Miriam and Ramos leading -- and a vice-president from another party -- because Erap is not the runningmate of either Miriam or Ramos. We will also have a senate composed of people from a third party, the Laban ng Demokratikong Pilipino (Fight of the Democratic Filipino, LDP), which has running under its ticket many re-electionists who are leading the survey (see Table 10). So it looks like there is going to be a three-way division of power.

By the way, these data are for all the parties to use, but we do not mind saying that we have clients from many parties. So we are patronized by multiple groups. We can even tell you who they are but not now. By July we can disclose the names of the political personalities who are our clients so people can see if we beautify the results for them. Not at all. We have many interesting stories of people who changed their mind about running when they saw the surveys, and of some who hardheadedly said "Let us go on and fight." And some who said "It looks good, we must continue."

Mr. Hilarion Henares: Will my candidate win? No. You see I am a nationalist and if I vote according to principles, I will have to vote for Jovito Salonga and Aquilino Pimentel (Liberal Party-Partido Demokratiko ng Pilipinas-Lakas ng Bayan [Democratic Party of the Philippines - Strength of the Nation], LP-PDP-Laban National Coalition bets). I am glad we feel the

same way and perhaps there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth among us after the elections.

I would like to say that I was one of the doubting Thomases of surveys. Surveys, as Mahar said, could not be validated unless there is something like the elections which can definitively validate them. And these surveys that have been made by Mahar and all the others, we felt, represented certain groups. Mahar and I come from the same school, the Ateneo de Manila University, and I had the suspicion that he belonged, practically, to the Jesuit society, and that is perhaps the reason why I had doubts on my mind. And precisely, I brought up the same things that he said were the basic criticisms against surveys in general.

First, the formulation of questions. Questions are very important and I have never been privy to Mahar's methodology regarding questions. At one time we were mad at each other and I asked for a copy of survey results and he would not give it to me. So I presumed that perhaps they were not meant for my eyes. But you must understand how I felt because there are questions and "questions," it depends upon how they are put. For instance, the Dominicans asked the pope "Can we smoke while we are praying?" And the pope said "Of course not, you would go to the devil for that!" The Jesuits had a different approach. They asked "Can we pray while we are smoking," and the pope said "Oh, that is commendable, that is wonderful, you should do it all the time!"

Another thing is what is called the Heisenberg Principle which says that anything that is being observed is somehow changed by the very act of observation. And there is the bandwagon effect. Of course, since now I know the basis of Mahar's answer to that, I am now quite certain that there is no such thing. Why? Because as he has told us, only one-third of the people are really aware of surveys, so how can they be influenced by it? And secondly, 85% of those in the survey said they are going to vote for their candidate whether or not they are going to win.

I have said that a survey may only be good at a certain point of time and that it may change later, and it is very important for us to remember that because there is this dynamics shown to us regarding the momentum of the candidates. You must remember that now, in April, Mr. Ramos, who has been leading all the time, has stagnated. In another survey, Miriam has really gone up by approximately nine percentage points. Danding Cojuangco also has momentum and you may not know how far he may go. Mitra has also stagnated and so did Salonga.

So given these you may understand why I was a doubting Thomas. However, having seen him and others explain on television how they got their sample made me believe the validity of surveys as long as the methodology is explained.

And now about the candidates.

One reason why I will not vote for Ramon Mitra (LDP) is that he has all the faults of Cory without her virtues, and in my opinion he is more a clone of Cory than Eddie Ramos ever was. He has a wide tolerance for corrupt cronies. He commits scams. He has an inability to choose honest and competent men. He has a treasonous pro-American attitude and a colonial double allegiance. He has criminal incompetence and a lack of convictions specially in economic matters. And he has what I would call a poverty of the mind, a below average brain devoid of culture and the finer things in life, without interest in concerts and ballets, legitimate stage, and good books.

Now, if some people still look back in nostalgia to the Marcos years with delusions of economic progress and art appreciation as represented by Danding and Imelda, it is because of the wasted years and unfulfilled hopes of the Aquino administration, which has Mitra as its close collaborator.

Eduardo Cojuangco, Jr. (Nationalist People's Coalition, NPC), I think, is a clone of Ferdinand Marcos. Danding has all the faults of Marcos: an obsessive compulsion to be lord and master, ultimate dispenser of life and largesse. He has vast pretensions of being what he is not, with bogus claims of being an astute businessman and economic genius when most of his wealth was inherited and augmented by coco levy funds in the greatest scam of all times, as former Vice-President Emmanuel Pelaez has impressed. He believes in the cynical manipulation of his fellowmen on the assumption that they are all for sale. He has a penchant for vengeance and violence. I am told by my nieces and nephews that Danding and his henchmen cannot wait to settle scores with their enemies.

Imelda Marcos (Kilusang Bagong Lipunan - New Society Movement, KBL) the candidate is a caricature of Imelda Marcos the first lady. She spoils, is wilful, extravagant, and slow-witted with a bohesian mind full of holes in the sky and grand delusions.

Miriam Santiago (People's Reform Party, PRP) I secretly admire. Imagine, she said "If I get elected for president I would not have time for sex with my husband anymore and therefore I will donate him to all the pretty girls in the land." Then she paused a very pregnant pause and she said "That is why he is moving heaven and earth to get me elected." And she said, "All these guys are trying to kill me all the time, bumping my car and all that. But you know Larry, I don't want to die. I don't want to go to heaven, there is no sex there."

Miriam Santiago is the personification of all the Shakespearean heroines. She is the brilliant and talented Portia of *The Merchant of Venice*, the loving and trusting Juliet, the mischievous and outrageously witty Roselyn of *As You Like It*, the sharp-tongued and aggressively tempered Beatriz who, in *Much Ado about Nothing*, said "Oh God, if I were a man, I would eat his

heart in the marketplace." That is the type of girl who would have said "I would die to have those fungus-faced monkeys cut into bits and fed into Pinatubo and I am sure Pinatubo would spit them back." She is the proud, the vociferous, quarrelsome, termagant Kathy of *The Taming of the Shrew*; the proud and obstinate Cordelia in *King Lear*; the imperious, and ambitious and wilful Lady Macbeth who said "Screw your courage to the sticking place and you will not fail." She is the devoted Desdemonia of *Othello*, unable to understand and withstand the storm that busted upon her. And last but not the least, the tragic Ophelia of *Hamlet*, driven to madness and self-destruction. I think she is in that stage now.

Salvador Laurel (Nacionalista Party, NP) is an ersatz imitation of his father, Jose P. Laurel, who is a great nationalist. Doy, to put it mildly, is not a nationalist. He is a colonial wimp, in contrast to his brothers Pepe and Teroy Laurel.

And there is Fidel V. Ramos (Lakas EDSA-National Union of Christian Democrats - Strength of EDSA). If you do not want Danding to be president and you would like to pick a winner, you might as well consider Ramos. He is a clone of Dwight Eisenhower, a war hero thrust into national leadership, a military man with respect for civilian supremacy and democratic checks and balances. I ought to know this because I grew up with him. He is Marcos's cousin on the mother side. He never enriched himself or associated with Marcos cronies. Accused of being Marcos's hatchetman, he has been cleared and endorsed by the wife of the greatest victim of martial law, Pres. Corazon Aquino, and I think we should take her word for it.

I know for a fact that during the martial law years, he was being tempted by the CIA to lead an opposition against Marcos, and he felt at that time that what duty, honor, and country demanded was for him to be faithful. And so he refused to lead a military coup d' etat. And that, I believe, speaks well of the man, specially when you find out that of all the nineteen generals running for senator not a single one belongs to his ticket. It only means that either he does not like the military or the military does not like him. I think this is a good sign that he might be a good civilian president, as Eisenhower was.

Jovito Salonga is a clone of Claro M. Recto, not in his lovelife of course. I think in that respect Mr. Salonga is kaput. He is a clone of Recto in his crusading nationalism, free and inquiring mind, logic, and political philosophy. Jovy is not the universal genius that Recto was, unschooled as he is in classic Greece, Rome, and the Renaissance, but he is a topnotch lawyer. As a topnotch lawyer, he has the ego of Claro M. Recto. In his own house I remember asking him where the comfort room was and I got the impression that he said "You have come to the right person for I am the fountain of all wisdom." Then like Moses pointing the way to the promised land, he warned

me of all the dangers and temptations that lie ahead, and intoned with the voice of the Lord "The john is down the corridor, first door to the right."

Personally, I disliked the guy because he has got such an ego that I feel he has no debt of gratitude. But that is only because he thinks of himself all the time. When he was blown out in Plaza Miranda, and he was bleeding like the sea and they had to replace blood four times in order for him to live -- and he did miraculously -- I was assigned by Villareal, the father of Gabriel Villareal who defends Cojuangco, to take his place in the political stump. And he did not have money at that time and so I went around asking money from the Ayalas and the Sorianos and everybody else who would care to contribute. I was surprised I was able to raise for him more than I was able to raise for myself when I ran for the Senate in the elections before that. Jovy got number one and I said to myself "This guy should thank me." He never did.

I think it is a failure in character that might cause Jovy not to make it at all. And even if he did, but ran the government like the way he ran the Presidential Commission on Good Government, I think we will be in trouble. But the important thing to remember is that he has Alex (Magno) and Randy (David) behind him, and for that I will vote for him because these guys have a clear vision of what this country needs. Salonga is still a baby in the woods when it comes to economics.

As I have said, I would probably vote for Salonga, in principle. But as to who shall win, I had a discussion with my publisher, who vacillates, and says that Danding must not win and so maybe we should endorse somebody, and I told him "If you feel that way why don't you endorse Ramos?" But he said "I think Mitra is better, Mitra will win." And I asked why. He replied "Because he has the machinery." But consistently in all these surveys he is always at the bottom. So what will prevail, political machinery or voter preference? And I believe Mahar when he says that voter preference will somehow prevail. And I say that because a machine is only good in herding people. Maybe Miriam cannot do that but Ramos can because he has got a machinery and the government with him.

A political machinery can be used for cheating. But how can you cheat when you have seven poll watchers from seven different parties? I do not know who has a machinery that can really cheat. And Sen. Ernesto Maceda said -- and in a sudden I realized how true this is -- "Larry, if there is going to be a subversion of the people's will, only the government has the capacity to do it." It has been so historically because the government has the muscle and that is what you need to cheat.

And I would also go with the fact that during the 1961 elections, a lot of political pundits said that Carlos P. Garcia would win because he had an

organization, the government, and seventy seven congressmen against twenty seven of the Liberal Party of Diosdado Macapagal. And yet, all of those congressmen won but Macapagal won over Garcia. The reason for that, as we found out later, was that the local people are only concerned with themselves.

Firstly, they will only support a candidate who will support them and carry them, a winning candidate. If they think their candidate is not winnable, they will abandon him because the guy's unpopularity is going to drive them down. Secondly, they will go with any candidate who can give them the money, facilities, and resources. And I think the government has more resources than all the candidates combined, even bigger than that of Danding Cojuangco.

Danding Cojuangco has now resorted to giving out post-dated checks, and that is why they say "Danding, no funding." Mitra, I think, is running low on funds also because at this point the funding that they expected from the Chinese community is not forthcoming. The Chinese community that used to pool all their resources to be given to the winning candidate finally decided that the contest is too close and that it is impossible to say who is going to win. So the Chinese businessmen were told "You are on your own. Select your own candidates because we cannot put all our funds together since we cannot foresee who is going to win."

So that is the way I see it. And my publisher would say "But look at Raul Manglapus, he was more popular than anybody else but he lost, and look at Claro M. Recto, he was very popular and always topped the elections but he also lost." The reason for that is that they did not have the money and the muscle.

So as I have said my candidate will lose. But if there are those of you people who do not like to put the country in the hands of Danding Cojuangco, you have two choices. One is Mitra, whom I do not think much about, and the other is Ramos, who is still Mr. Clean and to me is not a military fascist as people would say he is. So if you feel that way then vote for Ramos. For vice-president, if you vote for Ramos for president, vote for Marcelo Fernan(LDP) or Eva Estrada Kalaw(NP). This is the second best tandem which is not as good as the Salonga-Pimentel ticket.

I hope I have enlightened you on why my candidate will probably lose.

Prof. Magno: We will now hear from our first discussant, Dr. Temario Rivera.

Dr. Temario Rivera: I have a quick reaction to the impassioned defense of Mahar on poll surveys. I think we should realize that even if we know the

strict methodological criteria of Mahar, there is one very important impact of surveys -- specially those coming from reputable institutions like the SWS -- on the voting public. And even though you would disagree with the opinion that they do make an impact as shown in your empirical findings, I think this cannot be taken very lightly, the way survey results are deliberately used to consolidate a particular trend. We may call it a bandwagon effect and I do not know if it has affected Larry when he has already prematurely conceded the Salonga-Pimentel ticket.

Mr. Henares: What I said was that the survey shows 63% are not aware of surveys and that means they are not affected by it. In other words, any bandwagon effect will be nullified by the fact that they are not aware of the survey. And secondly, those who know about surveys said they are going to vote for their candidates regardless of whether they are going to win or not.

Dr. Rivera: I hope it would really work that way because I think they will have some kind of effect. I have also talked with some individuals who would have initially voted for Salonga had the polls been held today but who, apparently after following up the various poll surveys, decided to think over their choice again even if on principle they have not abandoned their initial preference for Salonga. There was rethinking.

But I know your point would be that that portion of the population is so insignificant that it cannot affect the final results. That is another question. But more and more, poll surveys do have that kind of impact. But to what extent really can interest groups in our society deliberately make use of surveys precisely to consolidate a particular coalition, to strengthen a particular tendency, even if objectively, for instance, we can argue that that tendency happens to be something which we should resist? It brings up the basic and fundamental values.

Earlier, I also recall some opinion-makers have been bothered by Mahar's statement that he does not really care who wins. But I do not think it is as simple as that because poll surveys, by themselves, have significant social and political impact on the way the people will think about their preferences. Perhaps it may not be as important now but increasingly, as poll surveys become a permanent feature of our political and electoral life, they will definitely play a bigger part.

Dr. Mangahas: One has additional information when with survey results, one can rethink based on such, i.e., if one wants to change one's mind. That is up to the person concerned. In fact, I always say that people can change their minds. But what I would insist on is that fair scientific surveys cannot be deliberately touched to bring about a desired electoral choice. I argue that there is no danger in surveys themselves becoming a tool for manipulating the electorate to do what the electorate otherwise would not really do intelligently. I am more trying to defend the existence of a very

basic data-generating system because to begin with, we need it so badly for knowing about our society. So all the more do we have to defend the surveys.

Prof. Alex Magno: Shall we listen now to the second discussant, Dr. Emmanuel Lallana of the Department of Political Science?

Dr. Emmanuel Lallana: I have no problem with surveys. As a matter of fact, I think highly of the SWS surveys. My only problem is that they show that my candidate will not win, but that I have conceded long before. Even at the start of the campaign, it was clear that it would take a miracle for Salonga to win.

My other problem is why is it that the results with regard to the senatorial race are like that? There are five actors in the winning streak of the race for twenty-four senatorial slots. This means that if we look at the batting average of actors, they have the highest among all the senatorial candidates running. If we group all the actors together, all the lawyers together, and all the re-electionists together, surely the actors have the highest winning average. What happened to the principled votes? I had no illusions earlier about that. I was not thinking that they compose 50% of the voting population. But why is it still like that? So this I really want to ask Mahar because I know they have indicators on this question.

How does the Filipino really vote, at least as based on SWS data? For example, if we look at the senatorial race, there are two ways of looking at it. One is that since the leaders in the survey are mostly LDP candidates, we can credit their performance to their machinery. Yet, why is their presidential candidate at the bottom of the pack in that same survey? What kind of machinery is this that is able to carry its senatorial candidates but not its presidential candidate? It raises the question "Is there a machine?" Is it running the way it was expected to run? Or is it really individual popularity that matters?

The other way of looking at the performance of the LDP senatorial candidates is that they are high in name recognition or recall. As a matter of fact, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo already dropped the "Arroyo" in her name since the name Macapagal is associated with former Pres. Macapagal and therefore rates high in name recall. The question is are people voting on the basis of name recall or is there, at this point in time, a party machine delivering the votes?

Another question is what is the relation between people's professed principles and their actual choices? Does everyone who believe that a candidate should be faithful to his or her spouse actually vote for a candidate who is faithful to his or her spouse? So if we cross-tabulate people's professed principles and their actual choices, is there a correlation? Or is it the case

that while they believe in principles they still vote for a person other than the one who carries the principles they believe in?

The third question is where are the votes coming from? What is the determinant of actual choice? Can we use religion as an indicator? If you are a Catholic, does it mean that you are likely to vote for a particular kind of candidate? Is there a protestant vote? Of course we know about the Iglesia ni Cristo (Church of Christ, INC) bloc vote.

Then there is said to be the NGO-PO (non-governmental organization-people's organization) vote. There are groups who present voting blocs such as the peace vote, the earth vote, urban poor vote, peasant vote, and so on. How strong would their endorsement be and how could their machines carry this endorsement, if we could call their organizations machines? Do women vote as a bloc? And Mahar says that it is really socio-economic class more than anything else which predicts voting.

To sum up my questions: is it individual popularity or party machine which produces votes, is there a correlation between professed principles versus actual choice, and where do votes come from?

Dr. Mangahas: You have a lot of questions there but I might not have time to tackle them all, but I think the most important message I would like to dish out is that if it were not for the surveys, we cannot possibly get answers to these things because the kind of data we require is never included in the ballot. If you are to go on the basis of the actual election count, all you will know is where the vote was made. That is all. You might even be able to go back and find out if you can have the sex and the age of the voter. But that is where your data base will end. You will not be able to know the class of the voter, the religion, etc. You will not be able to know what the voter thinks about marital infidelity, NGOs, environmental issues, and so on. Your questions can only be answered using sample survey information.

For some of these questions we have clues because we have already included such factors. For the other questions that you have raised, let us get together and ask these questions in future surveys so we can find out what the connections are. Let us cooperate as academics to do that. Let us remember that if surveys as a whole are put in a bad light, you will never have answers to such questions.

Now, what clues do we have at the moment? First, when I was quoted saying "class is what counts," I meant class as compared to the other standard things that we tabulate -- gender, religion, age, etc. Gender does not matter so much. Location matters a bit when provinces or regions have favorite sons and daughters, like Miriam is from the Visayas so she is strong there. Age occasionally matters. And with class, let us consider Miriam. Miriam's clout is with the middle class then she gets weaker and weaker

among the lower classes. Joseph Estrada is the reverse. The lower the class you go, the stronger he gets. That is what I mean when I say that class is important.

Actually, there is no single factor that is very important as if when you point out a tab, you can say "This is it. This will take care of 25% of the problem." We will have to go to so much more sophisticated analysis. We have to go into multiple factor, and as we do this -- rushed as we are at the moment just to have another round -- we are sort of looking for the first pulse.

We must say that we fail to find any magic variable. We do not find a Catholic vote. We do not find a women's vote. We have looked into the marital infidelity business but as you said, it does not matter. Those who agree that the person suspected of marital infidelity should not be elected are many but nevertheless, we have Ramos -- being the one who is supposedly the object of this marital infidelity charge -- at 19%. In other words, it does not change the rankings at all. As we go item by item, the rankings remain the same. The only change is in the lower level, like sometimes Salonga is ahead of Imelda.

Cardinal Sin does not have a hold over the voters because if anybody has little influence it is Cory Aquino. Her hold is not what it used to be in the old days but it is positive. But it is also so small that if Ramos wins, I would say he did on his own steam. Cardinal Sin is a net negative vote producer. We have asked about bosses, relatives, baranggay captains, congressmen, mayors, Cardinal Sin, Imelda Marcos, and military and communist rebels. None of them are listened to. None of these groups got a net acceptance score.

The exposure is still extremely important and here are some data I found. The question in our survey was "In this current election campaign, which presidential candidates have you listened to so far in the radio, tv, and in person?" This is an indicator of the candidates' capacity to get exposed. Ramos and Mitra got 40%. But Mitra has not been converting votes for himself, unlike Ramos. They are closely followed by Miriam 37%, and she is very good in converting exposure into votes. Ramos is number one in the conversion factor. Danding is exposed to 36% of the populace, practically the same as Miriam, but he ranks middle in conversion. Imelda is exposed to 23%. Laurel is 16%. He is not going out there the way the others are. Salonga is 14%. Your man, Dr. Lallana, is not getting himself exposed.

Actually, Salonga is in third place as long as conversion is concerned. Conversion is the percentage of who will vote for a particular candidate after listening to him or her. He is a convincing man. He is convincing his audience. But he is exposed to only 14% of the public. And the others are exposed to 40%. So logistics here makes a very big difference between your candidate and the other candidates. If that aspect of machinery were more

equalized, then it would be a lot closer for your candidate, and he would not be so far behind.

Dr. Lallana: That gives me reason enough not to lament about how the people would vote because it seems – considering also your earlier comments about exposure, adding these two together (voter decision-making and exposure) – people might be properly skeptical about the SWS results. But voters are not being reached. What if Salonga is able to reach out to them and you put in the conversion factor – exposure equals votes – of Salonga, what will happen? What if Salonga is exposed as highly as Cojuangco?

Dr. Mangahas: He will be ahead of Cojuangco. He will be in number three.

Dr. Lallana: I was at an institute in Ateneo. They have this peace vote and earth vote. They have rated all the presidential candidates on the basis of performance, track record, and promises. They considered all that and positions regarding the environment, sustainable development, and so on. It was sort of a scientific summing-up and what came out is that if you are voting on the basis of principles and that these are your principles, you should vote for Salonga and Pimentel. And yet, when the surveys came out, why is it that it is Miriam and Ramos?

Dr. Mangahas: Probably because of the conversion rate.

Dr. Lallana: Either you say that the Filipinos are really stupid they could not see what is objectively good for them – which is a fairly dangerous thing to say – or that there really is no effective information machinery which informs them about what they should know. But in instances when information reaches the people, the conversion factor operates and is right.

Dr. Mangahas: That is if you go by conversion alone, and that the exposure is the same. Then the first would be Miriam at 33%, followed by Ramos at 30%, Salonga at 23%, Danding at 21%, and then Imelda at 11%, Laurel almost at 11%, and Mitra, 10%.

About other survey institutions. See if you can get a survey result from an institution itself to see if it is genuine and see whether you can look at it and evaluate it. Do not depend on newspapers. Asia Research Organization has a high reputation. At least some years after the fact they do publish a few papers that describe the results and I do appreciate that. Others do not pass academic standards.

Mr. Henares: What about the study of the US embassy?

Dr. Mangahas: I have no basis because I do not know what it is. I have asked the embassy about it and their spokesman said they do not know what it is.

Mr. Henares: When I was in the government, I asked the US embassy to give me a rundown of the amount of investments the Americans have in the economy and how many people they are employing. Whenever they gave me a set of figures, I thought they were fantastic. I have never seen anything like them. I asked them where they got these and they said "Well, we asked our members by questionnaires how much they put into a company and how many people they employ." I said "Why should you do a thing like that when you can get hard statistics from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)" where every financial statement will indicate exactly how much equity the Americans have in a particular subsidiary. And also you could go to the Bureau of Labor and find out exactly what the number of registered workers in a particular company is. But these guys are strictly amateurs.

When I asked about this particular election survey they said they would not say what it is. *Manila Standard* columnist Emil Jurado said it is an estimate of the relative strength of the party machinery and was probably taken from the survey of these political parties themselves, specially those coming from the congressmen. The Americans came out with very precise figures: Mitra, 33%; Danding, 26%; Ramos, 19%. So based on these very dubious sources in which every congressman would say "Well, 80% of my people are going to vote Mitra," the Americans came out with something that looks very precise but is not. That is why there are surveys and there are "surveys." It depends really whether they are scientifically designed to give an accurate representative sample or are there for a candidate's propaganda.

I speak about three times a week in forums like this and everywhere I speak I began to feel really the pulse of the nation, at least in Metro Manila. There is a pattern. If it is a civic group, a trade group or a professional group, it will come out for a Ramos-Fernan combination. If they are employees' organizations, they come out with Miriam-Magsaysay. The Ayala group of companies' employees are all for Miriam, and very heavily so. The management will probably go for Ramos and Fernan. When it comes to colleges like UP, Ateneo, and De La Salle, it is Salonga. But when you go down to schools like Adamson University, they go out for Miriam.

Mahar really has earned his purse. In spite of all the criticisms against him, he has really persevered and shown that there is some validity in surveys. But there are instances when we should ask him about certain discrepancies. Why is it that during the last senatorial elections he predicted something like ten out of twenty-four will be composed of oppositionists? And he has told me that his sampling was about three months before. That is where he stopped his sampling so it could not have been that accurate, and we should really judge him for that.

OPEN FORUM

Question: Are the undecided voters undecided because there is no financial or monetary incentive? What accounts for the decline of Mr. Ramos?

Dr. Mangahas: This is where the poll analysts have to come in and give their own interpretations. Surveys, on the surface, do not give you explanations right away. They tell you first what the standings are but they do not give you the explanations right then and there, unless you had anticipated already what the explanations would be. Then you obtain data on that immediately. It is really the case that to have answers, you raise questions, but to answer those new questions you probably have to go to the next level of questions.

All we know about the undecided now is that they are of older age. Young people are faster to make a decision. Older people take more time. The undecided are the poorer, the ones who have no education or only have elementary education. Maybe they even have not received any election literature or the mass media has not reached them yet. They are more distant from centers of communication.

We have done in our February survey about a dozen tabs of the undecided against other things with no real success in finding an explanatory factor. There are also people who are undecided about other things. There are people who do not know whether to be satisfied or not with a certain person whether it be Ramos, Miriam, or the others. They do not know where they stand. So our explorations have not led to some magic doors.

Why did Ramos's standing decline? Past events like the Zurich incident and exposure. I would not like to speculate on other things since I do not have any statistical corroboration for one versus another thing.

I do give high regard to events. I think that the public scores events. When something happens they react to it, specially when it is denied. I think there is a general pattern of a public that wants to be convinced, that is appropriately skeptical, that does not blindly follows, that does not want to be told what to do, that does not just want to listen to Cardinal Sin or baranggay captains, apart from the machineries he sees. There is no indication that a voter is easy to manipulate.

Question: How big is the chance that if the voter is given money by a candidate he will vote for that candidate?

Dr. Mangahas: The people say that they will get the money but vote according to their conscience. Our test question was "It is right to take

money as long as you vote according to your conscience." Our respondents agreed to the statement.

Question: How true is the rumor about journalists in the payroll of candidates?

Mr. Henares: We columnists have no impact on the voter unlike the people who prepare the front page. And I understand from many that the candidates give prices for any front page treatment of their sorties. If it is a good story and it is on the upper front page of the paper, then they get so much. And if it is at the lower portion, so much. And if it is negative, maybe not so much.

Prof. Magno: In terms of candidate exposure, the pressure now is more on the news section and news desk rather than on the commentators. Columnists are smug, they are hard to call, and they do not even go to the newspaper office, they only fax their columns. They probably are under the least influence of the publishers compared to the men who do the front page. Their leeway for making value judgments is more. So the pressure on media is on the news section of newspapers and TV, not on the commentary section. The commentators will only negate each other. Each commentator will have his own opinion and their contribution to candidate exposure is very minimal.

Carolina Malay-Ocampo: There are guidelines on who makes the news and what makes the news, so if something does not fall in this guideline, it is not considered newsworthy. That is why NGOs cannot figure in the news, they are of low priority in the news. So it is only icing on the cake that is given to reporters and deskmen who are doing their job as the establishment, through the publisher, want them to do their job. The problem is that in corruption, the publishers are not even mentioned.

Prof. Magno: The biggest pressure comes from the publisher.

Ms. Malay: Specially now it seems like there are only a few who are still professionals, the way Don Chino Roces was. Of course there are also businessmen who buy newspapers, radio and TV stations. But now this attitude is very generalized that if you have a vested interest, you establish a newspaper or control a radio station. This is what we should look into. We should not only look into the questionable activities of the small desk men but also those of the big publishers who escape from public scrutiny.

Prof. Magno: Let me tell you about the atmosphere in the newsrooms now, during election time. Except for those publicists who are already carrying a candidate, the general attitude is, on one side, cynical, they just receive and receive the news. On the other side, there is a clear idea that the

newspaper will have to survive these elections with some credibility intact. There is conscious effort for equal exposure to all candidates.

This is why if the media bureau of a candidate's camp is weak, that would not be cured in the newsroom. If no story arrives from one camp, there will be no story for that camp's candidate. For instance, apart from the low exposure of the Salonga-Pimentel ticket in terms of actual exposure in rallies or television, their media bureau is weak. The view from the newsroom is that nothing is coming from that candidate. So even if the editor is sympathetic, there is no story. The bigger parties have as much as sixty press releases a day. That is the average of the LDP media bureau. All of them have stories from Mitra down to the congressional candidates.

Question: The LP-PDP-Laban Koalisyon Pambansa is hinging its votes on the NGO-PO vote composed of the organized urban poor, peasantry, labor, and the youth. Do you think that this organized vote will influence the result of these elections? Is there such a thing as an NGO-PO vote?

Dr. Mangahas: We do not have a variable which says people are led to NGOs and POs easily. We have one asking people about NGOs which could tell us something about people's attitudes to NGOs. But offhand, we have no basis for measuring the NGO reach.

But I believe that groups which can increase the exposure of Mr. Salonga to the general public will be helping him because he is so far behind when it comes to simple exposure.

Cong. Chito Gascon (LP-PDP-Laban-Akbayan member): Dr. Mangahas, do you see that the primary reason why Salonga rates low in your readings is because of the exposure variable? If that is some way mitigated could his rating possibly go up?

Dr. Mangahas: Salonga is not far behind from the leaders in terms of conversion power. He is only slightly behind Ramos and Miriam. So he is also a convincing man.

Cong. Gascon: The problem is that he has low exposure. When you conducted this survey, this is when the issue about the lack of campaign funds came out. And then the two who are ahead in exposure sort of cheated by starting prematurely in their campaign.

When you conducted this survey, was this done before articles by Miriam relating to her own life and mental health came out in *The Philippine Daily Inquirer*? Let us consider the fact that our campaign in the past days is getting stronger. Let us also consider that the market of votes that Miriam gets is what we are getting and what we would get if Miriam is not running. With the spread of this news to the public about the unhealthy state of the no. 1

candidate, in case Miriam's popularity does go down, is there a possibility that this would translate into votes for Salonga?

Dr. Mangahas: My stand is to wait for the next survey.

Mr. Henares: There was a survey done by Asia Research asking a series of questions about the second choices of the people and -- I hate to say this -- it says that if Miriam is not running, most of her votes would go to Ramos. That is why they suggested that if Ramos wanted to do some cutting down, he do it to Miriam because her constituency is almost the same as his. The figure they gave was that 36% of the Miriam votes would go to Ramos. (See also Table 3.)

It is a matter of personality also. I tell you, this woman is so good on the stage. She knows and understands the psychology of the people she talks with. You also have to understand this in the context of what they call the "Cicciolina syndrome." This refers to the incident in Italy where they voted a prostitute because the message is "All you goddamn politicians are prostitutes!" The message of the people who would vote for Miriam is "All you politicians are crazy anyway, we might as well have one to lead us."

Comment: She has a message that she trusts the voter. She always tells them that she has no money, all she depends upon are the voters, that they are responsible and intelligent and know what to do. She says "I just depend on you. What you will do is right but of course I hope you will choose me." The voter likes to hear that. And as the surveys say, the voter is like that. He thinks of himself that way.

The other candidates who would boast that they have the machinery, I think, would get negative reaction from the voters. These candidates say that no matter who the people want, the machinery will fix it. The normal voter would feel insulted with that, as though he has not a choice anymore. It is so anti-democratic as though that no matter what the voters think, this machinery would still carry through by way of some form of manipulation.

Better appeal to voter psychology. And if you have the machine, just keep quiet about it.

Prof. Magno: Since we did not rent this hall for the whole day, we have to end this session. In the name of the TWSC, I would like to thank our speakers, Dr. Mangahas and Mr. Henares, and our reactors, Drs. Rivera and Lallana. We hope our discussion was educational. It seems that, in a general way, what will happen on May 11 is clear. And as it becomes clearer, it also becomes sadder.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Demographical Distribution of Voting-Age Adults (based on 1990 Census)

Socio-Economic Class		Location	
ABC	13	NCR	15
D	63	Bal. of Luzon	42
E	24	Urban	20
		Rural	22
Gender		Visayas	21
Male	50	Urban	8
Female	50	Rural	13
Age		Mindanao	22
18-24	21	Urban	9
25-34	25	Rural	13
35-44	23		
45 and above	31	TOTAL URBAN	51
		TOTAL RURAL	49

Table 2. Voter Preferences for President: Set A, B, C, D, and E
SWS February 1992 National Survey
Percent of Respondents.

Question: *If the following candidates were to run for President of the Philippines, who would you vote for if the elections were held today?*

Set A	RP	GMA
Fidel Ramos	19	19
Miriam Defensor-Santiago	12	26
Ramon Mitra	11	7
None	11	6
Corazon Aquino	10	4
Joseph Estrada	9	12
Eduardo Cojuangco	8	12
Imelda Marcos	6	6
Marcelo Fernan	4	2
Jovito Salonga	4	3
Salvador Laurel	3	1
Juan Ponce Enrile	1	1

Set B	RP	GMA
Fidel Ramos	26	28
None	18	15
Corazon Aquino	13	6
Eduardo Cojuangco	13	22
Ramon Mitra	13	12
Jovito Salonga	8	6
Marcelo Fernan	7	8

Excludes: Miriam Defensor-Santiago, Joseph Estrada, Imelda Marcos, Juan Ponce-Enrile

Set C	RP	GMA
Fidel Ramos	22	24
Miriam Defensor-Santiago	16	30
None	15	9
Corazon Aquino	12	4
Joseph Estrada	11	15
Ramon Mitra	11	8
Jovito Salonga	6	4
Salvador Laurel	5	3

Excludes: Eduardo Cojuangco, Imelda Marcos, Marcelo Fernan, Juan Ponce-Enrile

Set D	RP	GMA
Fidel Ramos	25	23
None	20	9
Miriam Defensor-Santiago	15	32
Ramon Mitra	12	10
Eduardo Cojuangco	11	17
Jovito Salonga	8	5
Salvador Laurel	7	3

Excludes: Corazon Aquino, Joseph Estrada, Imelda Marcos, Marcelo Fernan, Juan Ponce-Enrile

Set E	RP	GMA
None	21	15
Miriam Defensor-Santiago	18	34
Corazon Aquino	15	7
Ramon Mitra	14	10
Eduardo Cojuangco	12	18
Jovito Salonga	7	7
Imelda Marcos	6	6
Salvador Laurel	5	2

Excludes: Fidel Ramos, Joseph Estrada, Marcelo Fernan, Juan Ponce-Enrile

Table 3. Voter Preferences for President: Set A Cross-tabulated with Set D*
 SWS February 1992 National Survey
 (Row Percentage)

	Set D						
	Danding Cojuangco	Miriam Santiago	Salvador Laurel	Ramon Mitra	Fidel Ramos	Jovito Salonga	None
Set A							
Cory Aquino	12	11	9	7	20	10	12
Danding Cojuangco	81	5	2	1	3	2	3
Defensor-Santiago	2	86	1	2	7	2	0
Juan Ponce-Enrile	0	17	21	6	23	3	30
Joseph Estrada	19	9	10	5	17	11	29
Marcelo Fernan	5	16	4	15	28	10	22
Salvador Laurel	3	4	86	4	4	0	0
Imelda Marcos	18	10	10	14	14	11	22
Ramon Mitra	1	2	2	82	6	4	4
Fidel Ramos	2	1	3	2	88	3	1
Jovito Salonga	1	2	0	4	5	88	0

*Table shows to whom the voters go if their first-choice candidate is scratched off the list. It also shows how the change in line-up can induce voters to change their minds, even when their first-choice candidate stays in the running. For example, when Cory Aquino leaves the race, 32% of her voters become undecided as to whom to choose, while 20% turn to Ramos, 12% turn to Danding, 11% turn to Miriam, 10% to Salonga, 9% turn to Laurel, and 7% turn to Mitra.

Table 4. Set A Responses Crosstabulated by Location, Socio-Economic Class, Gender, and Age Group
 SWS February 1992 National Survey
 Percent of Respondents

	Ramos	Santiago	Mitra	None	Aquino	Estrada	Cojuangco	Marcos	Fernan	Salonga	Laurel	Enrile
RP	19	12	11	11	10	9	8	7	4	4	3	1
Location												
GMA	19	26	7	6	4	12	12	6	2	3	1	1
Bal. of Luzon												
Urban	29	15	9	11	5	7	12	5	1	3	1	0
Rural	20	11	15	9	7	12	5	7	1	1	6	3
Visayas												
Urban	20	19	11	6	4	3	8	4	16	5	1	1
Rural	12	9	7	15	21	7	8	5	10	3	0	1
Mindanao												
Urban	17	11	7	15	10	9	5	9	5	5	2	2
Rural	15	5	11	16	18	9	4	8	3	8	5	0
Socio-Econ. Class												
ABC	17	22	10	13	2	5	11	8	3	4	2	0
D	19	14	11	11	10	9	8	5	4	4	3	2
E	19	5	9	10	15	12	5	10	4	4	3	1
Gender												
Male	21	13	11	11	9	11	8	4	4	4	3	1
Female	16	12	11	12	12	8	8	10	4	3	3	7
Age Group												
18-24	22	12	14	4	9	13	7	10	3	2	1	3
25-34	18	17	12	6	7	9	8	7	5	6	2	2
35-44	18	12	11	11	12	12	6	6	4	4	2	1
45 & above	17	9	8	21	13	5	9	5	4	3	6	0

Table 5. Set D Responses Crosstabulated by Location, Socio-Economic Class, Gender, and Age Group
 SWS February 1992 National Survey
 Percent of Respondents

	Ramos	None	Defensor-Santiago	Mitra	Cojuangco	Salonga	Laurel	Don't Know
RP	25	20	15	12	11	8	7	1
Location								
GMA	23	9	32	10	17	5	3	2
Balance Luzon								
Urban	30	14	19	12	13	7	4	1
Rural	27	21	14	17	9	3	7	1
Visayas								
Urban	28	8	24	15	11	8	5	1
Rural	19	29	9	9	14	12	6	2
Mindanao								
Urban	30	20	9	11	13	9	7	1
Rural	23	26	6	9	7	17	12	0
Socio-Econ. Class								
ABC	22	14	29	11	14	6	3	2
D	25	19	16	12	12	8	7	1
E	26	24	10	13	8	9	8	1
Gender								
Male	28	17	16	13	11	9	6	2
Female	22	22	15	12	8	8	7	1
Age Group								
18-24	27	13	15	16	16	9	3	1
25-34	25	14	19	14	11	10	7	1
35-44	27	19	16	14	10	6	7	1
45&above	22	29	12	8	10	8	8	2

Table 6. Choice for President
(February* and April** 1992)

	Santiago		Ramos		Cojuango		Mitra		Salonga		Laurel	
	Feb92	Apr92	Feb92	Apr92	Feb92	Apr92	Feb92	Apr92	Feb92	Apr92	Feb92	Apr92
RP	15	18	25	18	11	12	12	6	8	6	7	4
ABC	29	24	22	21	14	11	11	3	6	7	3	3
D	16	19	25	17	12	13	12	6	8	6	7	4
E	10	14	27	18	8	7	13	9	9	7	8	5
Male	16	20	28	19	11	11	13	6	9	6	6	4
Female	15	16	22	17	12	12	12	6	8	6	7	3
18-24	15	26	27	22	16	11	16	7	9	7	3	4
25-34	19	19	25	19	11	14	14	4	10	7	7	3
35-45	16	17	27	17	10	12	15	6	6	4	7	2
45 & Over	12	13	23	16	10	9	8	7	8	6	8	6
GMA	32	30	23	14	17	15	10	4	5	6	3	2
Bal. of Luzon	16	14	28	17	10	13	16	5	4	5	6	4
Urban	19	18	30	23	13	8	12	4	7	3	4	1
Rural	14	11	12	12	9	16	17	6	3	7	7	7
Visayas	14	27	21	18	13	8	11	8	11	7	6	2
Urban	24	33	28	13	11	9	15	10	8	4	5	3
Rural	9	23	19	22	14	7	9	8	12	9	6	2
Mindanao	7	11	25	22	8	11	10	8	15	7	11	6
Urban	9	14	30	23	13	10	11	10	9	9	7	2
Rural	6	9	23	22	7	12	9	7	17	6	12	8
TOTAL URBAN	23	23	27	19	14	11	12	6	7	5	4	2
TOTAL RURAL	11	13	24	17	10	12	13	7	9	7	8	6

*Set D, Presidentialties

**Among those who intend to vote

**Table 7. Standing of Presidentialiables
SWS February 1992 Survey
Percentage of Respondents**

	Set A	JUDGMENT CALL		Set D
	Feb 92	w/ Estrada	w/o Estrada	Feb 92
Fidel Ramos	18.7	23	24 1/2	25.1
Defensor-Santiago	12.5	15	15 1/2	15.4
Ramon Mitra	10.7	12	12 1/2	12.4
Joseph Estrada	9.3	11		
Danding Cojuangco	7.5	7 1/2	10	11.4
Imelda Marcos	6.5	6 1/2	7	
Jovito Salonga	3.7	5	6	8.2
Salvador Laurel	3.0	3	5	6.7
UNDECIDED	12.1	17	19 1/2	20.8
Cory Aquino	10.4			
Marcelo Fernan	4.2			
Juan Ponce-Enrile	1.4			
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 8. Rankings of Presidential Contenders
SWS National Survey, July 1991-1992**

July 91		Nov 91		Feb 92		Apr 92	
1	Ramos	1	Ramos	1	Ramos	1-2	Santiago & Ramos
2	Salonga	2-3	Estrada & Santiago	2	Santiago	3	Cojuangco
3-4	Estrada & Santiago	4	Salonga	3-4	Mitra & Santiago	4-6	Mitra & Salonga & Marcos
5	Laurel	5	Mitra	5	Cojuangco	7	Laurel
6-7	Mitra & Pimentel	6	Laurel	6	Marcos		
8	Cojuangco	7-8	Fernan & Cojuangco	7	Salonga		
				8	Laurel		
					Undec: 17%		Undec: 26%

a. The Jul 91 and Nov 91 rankings are based on the one-on-one question format. The "Undecided" varies considerably, depending on who the pair of contenders are.

b. The "Undecided" of 17% in Feb 92 is an interpolation between Set A (11 candidates) and Set D (8 candidates), so as to include both Estrada and Marcos.

**Table 9. Choice for Vice-President
April 1992
(Base: Those who intend to Vote)**

	Estrada "Erap"	Fernan "Celeg"	Magsaysay "Jun"	Osmena "Lito"	Pimentel "Nene"	Magsaysay "Vic"	Kalaw "Eva"
RP	18	14	13	10	6	2	2
ABC	14	18	11	8	7	2	3
D	18	14	14	10	5	2	1
E	21	13	12	10	5	2	2
Male	17	14	12	10	6	2	1
Female	19	14	14	9	5	2	2
18-24	18	20	14	12	8	2	2
25-24	22	15	11	12	6	2	1
35-44	17	12	12	9	5	2	2
45 & Over	16	11	15	7	5	2	2
GMA	5	23	18	10	8	4	0
Bal. of Luzon	26	8	10	4	5	2	2
Urban	22	8	13	7	4	0	2
Rural	30	8	8	2	6	3	1
Visayas	8	23	17	15	4	2	2
Urban	8	34	15	12	2	1	1
Rural	8	16	19	16	6	2	2
Mindanao	20	11	11	14	7	2	2
Urban	19	18	10	11	9	2	1
Rural	20	7	12	16	6	1	3
TOTAL URBAN	14	18	14	10	6	2	1
TOTAL RURAL	22	10	12	10	6	2	2

**Table 10. Choices for Senators
April 1992**

Rank	Pol. Party	Candidate	Among Registered Respondents	Among those who intend to Vote
1	LDP	Vicente "Tito" Sotto III	30	31
2	NPC/NP-PP-KBL	Ernesto "Ernie" Maceda	21	21
3	LDP	Ramon Revilla	20	20
4	LDP	Edgardo "Ed" Angara	19	19
5	LDP	Ernesto "Boy" Herrera	18	19
6	LDP	Orlando "Orly" Mercado	17	18
7	LAKAS-NUCD	Leticia "Sha" Shahani	17	18
8	LDP	Heherson "Sonny" Alvarez	17	17
9	LAKAS-NUCD	Santanina "Nina" Rasul	16	16
10	LDP	Jose "Joey" Lina	16	16
11	LDP	Teofisto "Tito" Guingona	16	16
12	LDP	Agapito "Butz" Aquino	16	16
13	LDP	Freddie Webb	14	15
14	LDP	Alberto "Bert" Romulo	14	14
15	NPC/NP-PP-KBL	Arturo "Turing" Tolentino	13	13
16	LDP	Gloria "Glo" Macapagal	11	11
17	NPC/NP-PP-KBL	John "Sonny" Osmena	11	11
18	LP/PDP-LABAN	Victor "Vic" Ziga	11	11
19	LDP	Neptali "Tali" Gonzales	11	11
20	LDP	Blas "Ka Blas" Ople	11	11
21	NP	Eddie "Kuya Eddie" Ilarde	10	10
22	LDP	Rodolfo "Gen. Pong" Biazon	10	10
23	LP/PDP-LABAN	Wigberto "Bobby" Tanada	10	10
24	LDP	Carlos "Caloy" Padilla	9	10
25	LAKAS-NUCD	Alfredo "Alran" Bengzon	9	10
26	LDP	Jose "Joe" Concepcion, Jr.	9	9
27	NPC/NP-PP-KBL	Anna Dominique Coseteng	8	9
28	LDP	Mamintal "Mike" Tamano	8	8
29	NPC/NP-PP-KBL	Francisco "Kit" Tatad	8	8
30	LAKAS-NUCD	Francisco Chavez	8	8