Krystal Surveys (1996-1998)

Simeon R. Ventura[1]

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of KRYSTAL surveys conducted prior to the May 1998 presidential elections. The results presented are for President, Vice-President, Senator and some local/congressional candidates. A comparison of these results with actual counts shows that properly designed surveys can successfully predict the results of an election.

Keywords: Opinion polls; Personal interview; Statistical significance; Dichotomous population.

1. Introduction

This paper presents the results of KRYSTAL Periodic Surveys conducted from April 96 to 03 May 98, on the choice of the electorate for President. It also includes the results of surveys for Vice-President which were conducted on later dates and of spot surveys for some local and congressional candidates.

The results herein presented are summary results, i.e.; Metro-Manila, Rest of the Philippines and Nationwide, of the respondents' choice for President based on the long list of possible candidates. The list of candidates was determined by KRYSTAL without the knowledge of any of the candidates listed.

The complete report for each survey included, among others, detailed tabulation and analysis of how the respondents voted by Region, by demographic characteristics (sex, civil status, age group, occupation group) and by religion of the respondents; how the respondents voted in relation to various national issues arising during the period of the survey, e.g.; the alleged P800M pyramiding scam, the Berroya exposes, the alleged womanizing and gambling activities of presidential candidate Erap, the alleged politicking of Cardinal Sin, the citizenship issue against Mayor Alfredo Lim, the endorsement factor of President Fidel V. Ramos (PFVR), etc. and the quantified relationship of these issues to the respondents' choice for President.

This paper also attempts to present a comparison of the KRYSTAL Survey results with available actual election results. While Opinion Polls are conducted primarily to serve as a guide in planning and monitoring of the election campaign, surveys scientifically conducted and can successfully predict the results of an election depending on how close the survey is to the date of the elections and/or how solidly structured the opinion is of the electorate on a given candidate. The comparisons presented exemplify this principle.

2.Methodology

This section presents the methodology used for national candidates, i.e.; President, Vice-President & Senators.

Consultant of Krystal Research Assn., Inc.

2.1   Sample and Sample Sizes

    Samples used were probability samples generated from the COMELEC List of
Registered Voters as of 1995. Metro-Manila was allotted a fixed sample size of 500 while
sample size for the Rest of the Country varied from 1,500 to 2,500 depending on the funds
available and degree of precision/reliability of the estimate needed at the time. These were
allocated to the regions proportionate to the number of registered voters in each region.
Sample individuals were selected thru systematic sampling with a random start.

2.2   Method of Data Collection/Data Processing and Tabulation

    For Metro-Manila, data was collected thru Personal Interview while data for the Rest
of the Country was collected thru Mailed Questionnaire. On the mailed questionnaire, the
number of response tabulated varied from a low of 1,406 to a high of 2,521 (Table 1a). This
is about 10% of the number of questionnaires mailed. Data processing and tabulation was
computerized.

Table 1a Size of Samples per Nationwide Survey
Less Metro Manila

Survey Period	Sample Size
1996	
April	1,406
July	1,557
October	1,515
December	1,503
1997	
March	2,214
June	2,529
September	2,077
November	2,021
1998	
January	2,231
25 February-18 March	2,193
06 March-01 April	2,521
20 March-17 April	2,387

3.Summary of Survey Results for President

3.1   The Surveys for President are classified into two (2) periods.

    First period - From April 96 to March 97 where PFVR was included as a candidate
        for President, and

Second period - From June 97 to 03 May 98 where PFVR was not included as a candidate in view of the adverse ruling of the Supreme Court on the Peoples' Initiative for Reform Movement and Alliance (PIRMA) resolution to amend the Constitution and allow two (2) terms for the Office of the President.

3.2   The first two (2) surveys conducted covering the months of April 96 and July 96 showed the following results:

NATIONWIDE

April 96			July 96		
Rank	Candidate	% of Votes	Rank	Candidate	% of Votes
1	Miriam Defensor-Santiago	20%	1	Fidel V. Ramos	17%
2	Fidel V. Ramos	16%	2	Joseph "Erap" Estrada	17%
3	Joseph "Erap" Estrada	16%	3	Miriam Defensor-Santiago	17%
4	Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo	06%	4	Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo	11%
5	Edgardo Angara	06%	5	Edgardo Angara	05%
6	Ramon Magsaysay, Jr.	04%	6	Ramon Magsaysay, Jr.	04%
7	Richard "Dick" Gordon	02%	7	Richard "Dick" Gordon	04%
8	Raul Roco	02%	8	Raul Roco	03%
9	Alfredo Lim	02%	9	Alfredo Lim	02%
10	Lito Osmeña	01%	10	Sergio Osmeña III	01%
11	Juan Flavier	01%	11	Juan Flavier	01%
12	Ernesto Maceda	01%	12	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	01%
13	Sergio Osmeña III	01%	13	Lito Osmeña	01%
14	Oscar Orbos	01%	14	Renato de Villa	01%
15	Renato de Villa	01%	15	Vicente Sotto III	--
16	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	01%	16	Rafael M. Alunan III	--
17	Juan Ponce Enrile	--	17	Leticia Ramos-Shahani	--
18	Manuel "Manoling" Morato	--		Undecided	17%
19	Vicente Sotto III	--			
20	Leticia Ramos-Shahani	--		Total	100%
	Undecided	18%			
	Total	100%			

Some Analysis/Interpretation

The first survey (April 96) shows Miriam Santiago leading, with Fidel V. Ramos and Joseph Estrada tying as No. 2. The second survey (July 96) shows a tie among FVR, Estrada, and Santiago for No. 1 with Gloria Arroyo as No. 2

Noted is the large percentage of Undecided of 18% and 17%.

3.3   The following are the results of the three (3) succeeding surveys (Oct 96, Dec 96, and March 97), for the first nine (9) candidates:

October 96			December 1996			March 1997		
Rank	Candidate	% of Votes	Rank	Candidate	% of Votes	Rank	Candidate	%of Votes
1	Ramos	22%	1	Ramos	27%	1	Ramos	25%
2	Santiago	16%	2	Arroyo	20%	2	Estrada	21%
3	Estrada	15%	3	Estrada	17%	3	Arroyo	19%
4	Arroyo	15%	4	Santiago	15%	4	Santiago	13%
5	Angara	04%	5	Gordon	05%	5	Roco	05%
6	Roco	04%	6	Angara	04%	6	Angara	03%
7	Magsaysay, Jr	.04%	7	Orbos	01%	7	Gordon	03%
8	Gordon	02%	8	De Venecia	01%	8	De Villa	02%
9	Lim	02%	9	De Villa	01%	9	De Venecia	02%

The Krystal Survey Report on these surveys summarizes the results as "**if PFVR is allowed to run for re-election, he will win almost hands down**".

3.4 The second period (**PFVR is not a candidate**) covered from June 97 to 03 May 98 or about 11 months. Eight (8) independent surveys were conducted. In all the 8 surveys, Estrada led all the rest, by a wide margin, i.e.; **the popularity of Estrada was far from being threatened by any of the Presidentiables since June 97** (Table 1).

3.5 It is noted that Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo was a poor second to Estrada up to and including Jan 98 when she was still included as a candidate in the survey. It is also noted that the popularity of Arroyo gradually declined from 23% in June 97 to 16% in Jan 98.

3.6 With the exit of Arroyo, Jose DeVenecia took over as second to Estrada. The popularity of Jose DeVenecia was boosted from 05% in Nov 97 to 15% in Jan 98, obviously as a result of the endorsement of President Fidel V. Ramos on 08 Dec 97. As of the last survey, Jose DeVenecia remained as No. 2 with 14% as against Estrada's 34%, Nationwide.

3.7 Following is the result of the last KRYSTAL survey (1-3 May 98 for Metro-Manila; 20 March-17 April 98 for ROP), weighted Nationwide (Table 1).

Rank	Candidate	% of Votes
1	Joseph E. Estrada	34%
2	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	14%
3	Alfredo S. Lim	12%
4	Raul S. Roco	11%
5	Emilio R. Osmeña	10%
6	Miriam P. Defensor-Santiago	06%
7	Renato S. de Villa	06%
8	Imelda R. Marcos	03%
9	Juan P. Enrile	01%
10	Manuel L. Morato	--
11	Santiago F. Dumlao, Jr.	--
	Undecided	03%
	Total	100%

3.8 How well have the popularity votes of Estrada and the rest of the candidates been translated into votes in the elections? Following is the percentage of votes of each Presidential candidate derived from the NAMFREL Report as of 17 May 98 where the divisor is the total number of votes for President by Region and weighted by the percent distribution of registered voters by Region as of 1997 to arrive at a Nationwide estimate (Table 2).

Rank	Candidate	% of Votes
1	Joseph E. Estrada	40%
2	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	16%
3	Raul S. Roco	14%
4	Emilio R. Osmeña	13%
5	Alfredo S. Lim	09%
6	Renato S. de Villa	03%
7	Miriam P. Defensor-Santiago	03%
8	Juan P. Enrile	01%
9	Imelda R. Marcos	01%
10	Manuel L. Morato	--
11	Santiago F. Dumlao, Jr.	--
	Total	100%

3.9 While Estrada (to include Roco and Osmeña) is shown to have improved significantly over the KRYSTAL results, a precise percentage comparison is unwarranted at this point in time in view of the partial returns of NAMFREL. What is **conclusive, however, is that it is statistically improbable for Estrada to lose as President.**

4. Other Krystal Survey Results

4.1 For Vice-President

The first set of surveys for Vice-President started as early as April 96 and covered up to Nov 96 (Table 3). The Kristal Survey Report concluded *"It is shown that most of those who voted for Angara, Enrile, Estrada, Flavier, Gordon, Lim, Magsaysay, Orbos, Roco, Santiago, de Venecia, and de Villa for President voted for Gloria Arroyo for Vice-President. This is an indication that there is no such thing as party votes in the choice for Vice-President and President. On this observation, it is almost a certainty that Gloria Arroyo will win if she runs for Vice-President."*

The Vice-Presidential surveys were resumed after 7 Feb 98. Three (3) successive independent surveys were conducted covering the periods; 25 Feb-18 Mar 98, 6 Mar-1 April 98, and 20 Mar-17 April 98. In the **three successive surveys, Arroyo led by a wide margin with a ratio of more than 2 : 1 to Angara as the second best** (Table 4). Following is the last survey result (*20 March-17 April 98*), Nationwide, compared to the NAMFREL result (derived) as of 17 May 98 (Table 5).

Rank	Candidate	% of Votes	
		KRYSTAL	NAMFREL
1	Gloria M. Macapagal-Arroyo	44%	49%
2	Edgardo J. Angara	22%	22%
3	Sergio D. Osmeña III	16%	10%
4	Oscar M. Orbos	10%	12%
5	Francisco S. Tatad	03%	03%
6	Ismael D. Sueño	02%	02%
7	Irene M. Santiago	01%	01%
8	Reynaldo D. Pacheco	--	--
9	Camilo L. Sabio	--	--
	Undecided	02%	
	Total	100%	100%

4.2 For Senator

Following is a Nationwide comparison of the last survey result (*20 March-17 April 98* - Table 6), Vs. NAMFREL tabulation (*as of 17 May 98* - Table 7), for the first twenty five (25) candidates:

Candidates	NAMFREL		KRYSTAL	
	% of Votes	Rank	% of Votes	Rank
Loren B. Legarda-Leviste	51%	1	56%	3
Renato L. Cayetano	46%	2	58%	1
Vicente C. Sotto III	39%	3	50%	9
Aquilino Q. Pimentel, Jr.	36%	4	57%	2
Robert Z. Barbers	35%	5	50%	8
Rodolfo G. Biazon	34%	6	53%	5
John Henry R. Osmeña	33%	7	55%	4
Blas F. Ople	33%	8	52%	7
Robert S. Jaworski	31%	9	41%	12
Ramon B. Revilla	30%	10	47%	10
Teofisto T. Guingona, Jr.	26%	11	53%	6
Teresa Aquino-Oreta	25%	12	43%	11
Roberto M. Pagdanganan	24%	13	29%	16
Edcel C. Lagman	24%	14	23%	21
Ruben D. Torres	24%	15	29%	17
Santanina C. T. Rasul	24%	16	34%	13
Rolando R. Andaya	20%	17	26%	19
Roberto F. de Ocampo	20%	18	22%	22
Lisandro C. Abadia	19%	19	31%	14
Ricardo T. Gloria	16%	20	27%	18
Ramon S. Bagatsing, Jr.	16%	21	30%	15
Haydee B. Yorac	16%	22	24%	20
Freddie N. Webb	16%	23	22%	23
Hernando B. Perez	15%	24	15%	26
Reynante M. Langit	14%	25	21%	24

Remarks/Some Analysis/Interpretation

1. Eight (8) Senatorial surveys were conducted starting March 97 up to April 98. Loren Legarda was included as a candidate in the survey only on the last four (4) surveys, i.e.; after 2 Jan 98. Only the last survey results are presented.

2. KRYSTAL batting average for Senator has been 9 out of the first 12 due to the fact that the 10th, 11th, and 12th slots are closely contested by the number 13, 14, and 15 candidates in the survey.

3. As of the 17 May 98 NAMFREL tabulation, the first twelve (12) candidates are the same as KRYSTAL, although the rankings are different.

4.3 For **Congressman, 2nd District, Ilocos Norte**. Sample size 500. Period covered 6, 7 & 8 December 97. Data collected thru Personal Interview.

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	COMELEC No.	% of Votes
1	Imee Marcos	254	51%	65,733	64%
2	Simeon Valdez	230	46%	21,065	21%
3	Jesus Nalupta	N.A	N.A	15,909	15%
	Undecided	16	03%		
	Total	500	100%	102,707	100%

Some Analysis/Interpretation

Although the KRYSTAL and COMELEC results are not comparable (Nalupta not a candidate in KRYSTAL), the KRYSTAL results showed Imee Marcos significantly more popular than Valdez. Imee Marcos won by a wide margin over Simeon Valdez.

4.4 For **Governor, Pangasinan**

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	NAMFREL No.	% of Votes
1	Leticia Ramos-Shahani	270	49%	321,198	41%
2	Victor A. Agbayani	255	46%	421,649	54%
3	Cipriano Primicias, Jr.	14	03%	36,522	05%
	Undecided	9	02%		
	Total	548	100%	779,369	100%

4.5   For **Vice-Governor, Pangasinan**.

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL		NAMFREL	
		No.	% of Votes	No.	% of Votes
1	Oscar B. Lambino	217	40%	352,084	55%
2	Ramon N. Guico, Jr.	214	39%	195,101	30%
3	Roberto N. Ferrer	103	19%	92,841	15%
	Undecided	14	02%		
	Total	548	100%	640,026	100%

4.6   For **Congressman, 6th District, Pangasinan**.

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL		NAMFREL	
		No.	% of Votes	No.	% of Votes
1	Ranjit Ramos Shahani	75	86%	114,929	85%
2	Emiliano S. Micu	12	14%	20,006	15%
	Undecided	0	0%		
	Total	87	100%	134,935	100%

Remarks/Analysis/Interpretation

1. The sample was designed with a size of 550 from the List of Registered Voters as of 1995. The survey was conducted from 24-27 April 98, inclusive. Data was collected thru Personal Interview. Of the 550 sample respondents interviewed, 548 said they were able to register during the general registration in 1997, and two (2) were not able to register. Only the 548 who were able to register were considered in the choice of candidates.

2. Of the 548 sample individuals, 87 were from the 6th District of Pangasinan (proportionate to the number of registered voters). While this sample size is quite small for a precise/reliable district estimate for Congressman, it was not increased due to lack of funds.

3. The following results are presented:

   • For **Governor**, Leticia Shahani led by 03% over Agbayani as per KRYSTAL Survey (on a dichotomous population, this difference would be a statistical tie). As per election returns, Agbayani won by a wide margin (13%) over Shahani.

- For Vice-Governor, Lambino led by 01% over Guico as per KRYSTAL Survey (difference not significant on a dichotomous population). As per election returns, Lambino won by 15% over Guico

- For Congressman, Ranjit Shahani led by a highly significant margin of 72% over Micu. AS per election results, Ranjit won by 70% over Micu. It is noted that notwithstanding the small sample size of 87, the KRYSTAL Survey results are statistically the same as the election results.

4. It is informed that the choices for Governor, Vice-Governor and Congressman were all in one page in the Questionnaire. Further, it was the same team of interviewers who conducted the survey for Governor/Vice-Governor and Congressman

5. A $64 question that would need an answer is why Leticia Shahani (for Governor) lost by a wide margin while, on the other hand, Lambino won (for Vice-Governor) by a wide margin, both starting on a statistical tie. This is a good area of research for political scientists to determine.

4.7   For **Congressman, Parañaque.**

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	NAMFREL No.	% of Votes
1	Roilo S. Golez	180	60%	84,708	61%
2	Walfrido N. Ferrer	104	35%	50,159	36%
3	Sonia S. de Jesus	5	02%	2,140	02%
4	Pacifico C. Rosal	3	01%	1,416	01%
5	Ernesto L. Dacuycuy	2	01%	616	--
6	Evelyn Q. Langit	0	0%	593	--
	Undecided	4	01%		
	Total	298	100%	139,632	100%

4.8   For **Mayor, Parañaque.**

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	NAMFREL No.	% of Votes
1	Joey P. Marquez	180	61%	85,502	58%
2	Pablo R. Olivarez	76	26%	48,373	33%
3	Reynaldo C. Olivarez	16	05%	773	01%
4	Reginaldo D. Hernandez	12	04%	9,443	07%
5	Jim B. Ferrer	5	02%	2,008	01%
6	Benjamin Y. Lim	1	--	457	--
7	Bernardo P. Reyes	1	--	315	--

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	NAMFREL No.	% of Votes
8	Rezaura P. Jayme	0	0%	130	--
9	Fernando L. Salvador	0	0%	67	--
10	Ricardo V. Villaflor	0	0%	56	--
	Undecided	7	02%		
	Total	298	100%	147,124	100%

4.9   For **Vice-Mayor, Parañaque.**

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL No.	% of Votes	NAMFREL No.	% of Votes
1	Tomas T. Banaga, Jr.	126	42%	55,086	37%
2	Florencio M. Bernabe, Jr.	103	35%	57,500	38%
3	Maritess B. de Asis	32	11%	20,240	14%
4	Jaime N. delos Santos	28	09%	14,993	10%
5	Rodrigo Z. Velarde	3	01%	1,327	01%
6	Emilio G. Madrid	0	0%	200	--
	Undecided	6	02%		
	Total	298	100%	149,346	100%

Remarks/Analysis/Interpretation

1. The 298 sample size represents those who were able to register in 1997 out of the original sample of 300 who were registered voters as of 1995.

2. The survey was conducted from 17-19 April 98, inclusive, and data was collected thru Personal Interview.

3. Following results are shown:

- For Congressman, Golez won by a wide margin (15%) over Ferrer. Golez garnered 60% votes as per KRYSTAL Survey, a difference of 01% from the actual election results of 61%; Ferrer garnered 35% as per KRYSTAL survey or a 01% from the election results of 36%. Considering the sample size of 298, the differences between KRYSTAL and NAMFREL are not significant.

- For Mayor, Marquez won by a wide margin (25%) over Olivarez. Marquez garnered 61% as per KRYSTAL Survey, a difference of 03% more than the election results of 58%. Olivarez garnered 26% as per KRYSTAL Survey, a difference of 07% less than the election result of 33%.

- For Vice-Mayor, Banaga led by 07% over Bernabe as per KRYSTAL Survey but actually lost to Bernabe by 01%.

4. The KRYSTAL Survey came out almost exactly as the election results for Congressman and for Mayor but not for Vice-Mayor. However, on the assumption of a dichotomous population, a difference of less than 5.7% is not statistically significant at 5% level of significance. Thus, the difference of 05% in the case of Banaga and 03% in the case of Bernabe could be due to sampling fluctuations. On this basis, we may conclude that the choice of the electorate for Congressman, Mayor and Vice-Mayor as of the period of the survey was the same as that of 11 May 98, the day of the elections.

4.10 For **Mayor, City of Manila**.

Sample size 500. Period covered: 7-9 March 98, inclusive. Data collected thru Personal Interview.

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL		COMELEC	
		No.	% of Votes	No.	% of Votes
1	Jose "Lito" Atienza	198	40%	197,476	27%
2	Amado Bagatsing	138	28%	192,227	26%
3	Ernesto Maceda	98	20%	181,077	25%
4	Jaime "Jimmy" Lopez	49	10%	156,427	22%
	Undecided	17	03%		
	Total	500	100%	727,207	100%

Some Analysis/Interpretation

Maceda and Lopez improved significantly over the KRYSTAL survey results. The ranking of the candidates, as per COMELEC results however is the same as the KRYSTAL survey which was conducted two months before the elections with "Lito" Atienza leading in the KRYSTAL survey and eventually winning in the elections.

4.11 For **Congressman, 1st District, City of Makati**.

Sample size 492. Period covered: 17, 18 & 19 April 98. Data collected thru Personal interview.

Rank	Candidate	KRYSTAL		COMELEC	
		No.	% of Votes	No.	% of Votes
1	Joker P. Arroyo	339	69%	91,269	71%
2	Rosemarie B. Arenas	103	21%	34,807	27%
3	Alfonso Mike D. Policarpio	5	01%	1,246	01%
4	Perfecto M. Santos	2	--	1,156	01%
5	Adella J. Insauriga	1	--	184	--
	Undecided	42	09%		
	Total	492	100%	128,662	100%

Some Analysis/Interpretation

Rosemarie Arenas increased her votes significantly by 06% but not large enough to overcome the 48% lead of Joker Arroyo who actually won by a wide margin.

5.Concluding Remarks

The above certainly illustrates that Opinion Polls scientifically conducted in accordance with well-known statistical methods produce valid and reliable results useful for planning and decision making. And in cases where the opinion is solidly structured, as in the cases of Estrada, Gloria Macapagal, Ranjit Shahani, Golez, etc., Opinion Polls can predict the results even months before the elections. But how can one determine when opinion is solidly structured? Trending could be one approach as in the cases of Erap and Gloria Macapagal, in which case, a series of surveys has to be conducted. In the case of Mayor Lim, his popularity was unstable as his uptrend almost immediately receded on the citizenship issue. Similar cases of unstable popularity are shown in the cases of Leticia Shahani and Oscar Lambino for Governor & Vice-Governor of Pangasinan, respectively. However, there are statistical techniques used to measure solidity of opinion on a given issue. This normally is a joint effort of the social scientist and the statistician who should both be competent and knowledgeable on the subject matter field.

One of the Laws of Public Opinion that has to be considered in such an exercise and such other exercises in the formulation and interpretation of measures taken to mould public opinion (to favor/not favor a given candidate) is:

"Psychologically, opinion is basically determined by self-interest. Events, words, or any other stimuli affect opinion only in so far as their relationship to self-interest is apparent."

Table 1

Results of Periodic KRYSTAL Surveys for President
(2nd Period: June 97 to 03 May 98)

Rank	Candidate	1-5 May 98	17-19 Apr 98	27-29 Mar 98	14-16 Mar 98	16-18 Jan 98	21-23 Nov 97	27-29 Sept 97	21-22 Jun 97
	Metro-Manila (M/M)								
1	Joseph E. Estrada	33%	27%	36%	31%	21%	19%	17%	17%
	Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	10%	18%	24%	27%
2	Alfredo S. Lim	19%	21%	16%	23%	21%	16%	N.A.	N.A.
3	Raul S. Roco	19%	17%	18%	12%	04%	10%	10%	11%
4	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	15%	15%	13%	12%	12%	08%	09%	08%
5	Renato S. de Villa	06%	06%	05%	08%	07%	09%	07%	06%
6	Emilio R. Osmeña	03%	04%	02%	03%	04%	02%	03%	01%
7	Miriam P. Defensor-Santiago	02%	05%	05%	05%	04%	09%	11%	12%
8	Juan P. Enrile	02%	02%	02%	02%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
9	Imelda R. Marcos	01%	02%	01%	02%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
10	Santiago F. Dumlao, Jr.	--	--	--	--	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
11	Manuel L. Morato	--	--	--	01%	N.A.	N.A.	--	N.A.
	Undecided	--	01%	02%	01%	01%	01%	09%	02%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Rank	Candidate	20 Mar-17 Apr 98	6 Mar-1 Apr 98	25 Feb-18 Mar 98	2-26 Jan 98	Nov 97	Sept 97	Jun 97
	Rest of the Philippines (ROP)							
1	Joseph E. Estrada	34%	33%	29%	29%	25%	27%	29%
	Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	17%	19%	22%	23%
2	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	14%	13%	15%	15%	05%	05%	05%
3	Alfredo S. Lim	11%	14%	14%	11%	03%	N.A.	N.A.
4	Emilio R. Osmeña	11%	12%	12%	10%	11%	05%	04%
5	Raul S. Roco	10%	07%	09%	07%	06%	05%	05%
6	Miriam P. Defensor-Santiago	07%	07%	07%	07%	10%	11%	12%
7	Renato S. de Villa	06%	07%	05%	N.A.	08%	08%	05%
8	Imelda R. Marcos	03%	03%	05%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
9	Juan P. Enrile	01%	01%	01%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
10	Santiago F. Dumlao, Jr.	--	--	--	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
11	Manuel L. Morato	--	--	--	N.A.	N.A.	--	N.A.
	Undecided	03%	03%	03%	04%	06%	09%	10%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Rank	Candidate	May 98	20 Mar-17 Apr 98	6 Mar-1 Apr 98	25 Feb-18 Mar 98	2-25 Jan 98	Nov 97	Sept 97	Jun 97
	Nationwide (Weighted)								
1	Joseph E. Estrada	34%	33%	33%	29%	28%	24%	26%	28%
	Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	16%	19%	22%	23%
2	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	14%	14%	13%	15%	15%	05%	05%	05%
3	Alfredo S. Lim	12%	13%	14%	15%	12%	05%	N.A.	N.A.
4	Raul S. Roco	11%	11%	08%	09%	06%	07%	05%	06%
5	Emilio R. Osmeña	10%	10%	11%	11%	09%	10%	04%	03%
6	Miriam Defensor-Santiago	06%	06%	07%	07%	06%	10%	11%	12%
7	Renato S. de Villa	06%	06%	07%	05%	N.A.	08%	08%	05%
8	Imelda R. Marcos	03%	03%	03%	05%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
9	Juan P. Enrile	01%	01%	01%	01%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
10	Manuel L. Morato	--	--	--	--	N.A.	N.A.	--	N.A.
11	Santiago F. Dumlao, Jr.	--	--	--	--	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Undecided	03%	03%	03%	03%	04%	05%	08%	08%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Table 2

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT
Weighted by the No. of Registered Voters by Region
(Source of raw data - NAMFREL report as of May 17, 1998 10:43:18 AM)

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
No. of Precincts	119,164	17,970	1,743	1,617	8,019	5,321	13,532	11,492	8,010	9,353	7,258	7,775	6,089	7,936	9,098	3,951
Precinct %	69.01%	70.22%	57.63%	48.05%	90.20%	71.69%	73.86%	44.61%	82.47%	67.98%	55.62%	88.52%	88.47%	79.12%	73.20%	69.96%
Votes Cast	18,811,702	2,659,889	273,322	259,887	1,183,474	844,912	2,270,564	2,082,817	1,297,907	1,490,366	1,203,576	1,230,461	911,842	1,129,192	1,502,972	470,521

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Estrada	7,015,523	963,622	125,309	116,727	390,187	371,860	1,066,898	1,026,459	215,011	542,512	222,951	429,316	350,766	325,697	650,772	217,436
De Venecia	2,897,202	275,510	67,816	82,204	634,918	152,820	307,991	242,151	81,760	167,455	122,435	155,422	175,384	225,119	151,346	54,871
Roco	2,591,819	659,047	24,299	3,087	36,323	47,753	328,932	303,573	882,734	72,131	41,785	24,064	27,582	30,921	85,892	23,696
Osmeña, E.	2,287,245	90,056	2,116	2,861	4,040	3,500	23,286	31,612	30,706	154,276	640,929	293,294	202,639	347,781	372,996	87,153
Lim	1,585,004	420,873	20,444	7,153	25,620	34,591	278,430	185,035	15,391	162,608	69,784	100,712	79,372	82,770	74,687	27,534
De Villa	524,119	90,421	7,130	8,758	18,123	10,631	48,714	154,441	11,226	39,480	15,488	10,693	28,107	30,396	36,888	13,623
Santiago	485,089	60,098	2,788	2,093	4,552	4,230	24,691	27,387	2,384	304,205	5,878	3,505	5,846	6,959	19,595	10,878
Enrile	272,946	21,093	10,285	1,941	8,007	193,153	10,720	9,092	1,377	3,274	1,857	1,390	2,193	3,153	4,380	1,031
Marcos	208,293	28,046	4,860	1,035	24,837	9,914	17,676	19,787	2,202	3,474	4,059	9,976	7,747	25,946	36,444	12,290
Dumlao	24,909	3,524	532	617	761	2,033	2,852	2,121	456	1,326	5,045	623	1,111	1,067	1,927	914
Morato	20,175	4,212	240	524	498	784	1,595	1,965	428	1,504	2,033	797	1,681	916	2,595	403
Total	17,912,324	2,616,502	265,819	227,000	1,147,866	831,269	2,111,785	2,003,623	1,243,675	1,452,245	1,132,244	1,029,792	882,428	1,080,725	1,437,522	449,829
Percent	100.0%	14.6%	1.5%	1.3%	6.4%	4.6%	11.8%	11.2%	6.9%	8.1%	6.3%	5.7%	4.9%	6.0%	8.0%	2.5%
Total Votes/ Votes Cast %	95.2%	98.4%	97.3%	87.3%	97.0%	98.4%	93.0%	96.2%	95.8%	97.4%	94.1%	83.7%	96.8%	95.7%	95.6%	95.6%

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Weighted
Estrada	39.2%	36.8%	47.1%	51.4%	34.0%	44.7%	50.5%	51.2%	17.3%	37.4%	19.7%	41.7%	39.8%	30.1%	45.3%	48.3%	39.8%
De Venecia	16.2%	10.5%	25.5%	36.2%	55.3%	18.4%	14.6%	12.1%	6.6%	11.5%	10.8%	15.1%	19.9%	20.8%	10.5%	12.2%	16.0%
Roco	14.5%	25.2%	9.1%	1.4%	3.2%	5.7%	15.6%	15.2%	71.0%	5.0%	3.7%	2.3%	3.1%	2.9%	6.0%	5.3%	13.9%
Osmeña, E.	12.8%	3.4%	0.8%	1.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.1%	1.6%	2.5%	10.6%	56.6%	28.5%	23.0%	32.2%	25.9%	19.4%	12.7%
Lim	8.8%	16.1%	7.7%	3.2%	2.2%	4.2%	13.2%	9.2%	1.2%	11.2%	6.2%	9.8%	9.0%	7.7%	5.2%	6.1%	9.0%
De Villa	2.9%	3.5%	2.7%	3.9%	1.6%	1.3%	2.3%	7.7%	0.9%	2.7%	1.4%	1.0%	3.2%	2.8%	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%
Santiago	2.7%	2.3%	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.5%	1.2%	1.4%	0.2%	20.9%	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	1.4%	2.4%	2.8%
Enrile	1.5%	0.8%	3.9%	0.9%	0.7%	23.2%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	1.3%
Marcos	1.2%	1.1%	1.8%	0.5%	2.2%	1.2%	0.8%	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	1.0%	0.9%	2.4%	2.5%	2.7%	1.1%
Dumlao	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Morato	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Weight		15.1%	1.7%	2.9%	5.5%	3.4%	10.9%	14.8%	5.5%	8.1%	7.4%	4.6%	3.9%	5.7%	7.2%	3.3%	100.0%

Table 3

Results of Periodic KRYSTAL Surveys for Vice-President
(April to Oct 96)

	Nationwide *(Weighted)*			
Rank	Candidate	Oct 96	July 96	7-30 April 96
1	Gloria M. Macapagal-Arroyo	18%	17%	15%
2	Joseph "Erap" Estrada	12%	13%	16%
3	Miriam Defensor-Santiago	08%	08%	08%
4	Ramon Magsaysay, Jr.	08%	06%	06%
5	Vicente "Tito" Sotto III	07%	06%	05%
6	Alfredo Lim	05%	06%	04%
7	Raul Roco	05%	05%	05%
8	Juan Flavier	04%	03%	03%
9	Edgardo J. Angara	04%	03%	04%
10	Richard "Dick" Gordon	03%	04%	03%
11	Jose de Venecia, Jr.	03%	02%	01%
12	Robert "Bobby" Barbers	03%	N.A.	N.A.
13	Nur Misuari	02%	N.A.	N.A.
14	Renato de Villa	01%	01%	01%
15	Fidel V. Ramos	01%	--	--
16	Roberto de Ocampo	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Leticia Ramos-Shahani	N.A.	01%	01%
	Rafael Alunan III	N.A.	01%	N.A.
	Sergio Osmeña III	N.A.	03%	03%
	Lito Osmeña	N.A.	01%	01%
	Oscar Orbos	N.A.	N.A.	01%
	Juan Ponce Enrile	N.A.	N.A.	02%
	Ernesto Maceda	N.A.	N.A.	02%
	Manuel "Manoling" Morato	N.A.	N.A.	--
	Undecided	16%	20%	19%
	Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 4

Results of Periodic KRYSTAL Surveys for Vice-President

(March 98 to April 98)

Metro-Manila (M/M)			

Rank	Candidate	17-19 Apr 98	27-29 Mar 98	14-16 Mar 98
1	Gloria M. Macapagal-Arroyo	37%	39%	39%
2	Edgardo J. Angara	21%	26%	21%
3	Oscar M. Orbos	22%	17%	14%
4	Sergio D. Osmeña III	14%	14%	18%
5	Francisco S. Tatad	04%	03%	04%
6	Irene M. Santiago	01%	N.A.	01%
7	Ismael D. Sueño	--	N.A.	--
8	Reynaldo D. Pacheco	--	N.A.	01%
9	Camilo L. Sabio	--	N.A.	--
	Undecided 01%	01%	01%	
	Total 100%	100%	100%	

Rest of the Philippines (ROP)			

Rank	Candidate	20 Mar-17 Apr 98	6 Mar-1 Apr 98	25 Feb-18 Mar 98
1	Gloria M. Macapagal-Arroyo		46%	50%	50%
2	Edgardo J. Angara		22%	18%	16%
3	Sergio D. Osmeña III		16%	15%	18%
4	Oscar M. Orbos		08%	08%	07%
5	Francisco S. Tatad		03%	03%	03%
6	Ismael D. Sueño		02%	02%	02%
7	Irene M. Santiago		01%	01%	01%
8	Reynaldo D. Pacheco		--	--	--
9	Camilo L. Sabio		--	--	01%
	Undecided 02%		03%	02%
	Total 100%		100%	100%

Nationwide *(Weighted)*			

Rank	Candidate	20 Mar-17 Apr 98	6 Mar-1 Apr 98	25 Feb-18 Mar 98
1	Gloria M. Macapagal-Arroyo		44%	48%	48%
2	Edgardo J. Angara		22%	19%	17%
3	Sergio D. Osmeña III		16%	15%	18%
4	Oscar M. Orbos		10%	09%	08%
5	Francisco S. Tatad		03%	03%	03%
6	Ismael D. Sueño		02%	N.A.	02%
7	Irene M. Santiago		01%	N.A.	01%
8	Reynaldo D. Pacheco		--	N.A.	--
9	Camilo L. Sabio		--	N.A.	01%
	Undecided 02%		03%	02%
	Total 100%		100%	100%

Table 5

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES OF CANDIDATES FOR VICE-PRESIDENT
Weighted by the No. of Registered Voters by Region
(Source of raw data - NAMFREL report as of May 17, 1998 10:43:18 AM)

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
No. of Precincts	119,164	17,970	1,743	1,617	8,019	5,321	13,532	11,492	8,010	9,353	7,258	7,775	6,089	7,936	9,098	3,951
Precinct %	69.01%	70.22%	57.63%	48.05%	90.20%	71.69%	73.86%	44.61%	82.47%	67.98%	55.62%	88.52%	88.47%	79.12%	73.20%	69.96%
Votes Cast	18,811,702	2,659,889	273,322	259,887	1,183,474	844,912	2,270,564	2,082,817	1,297,907	1,490,366	1,203,576	1,230,461	911,842	1,129,192	1,502,972	470,521

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Macapagal	8,334,420	909,393	161,651	149,071	530,005	494,424	1,180,766	850,446	475,431	631,472	457,516	533,535	472,312	616,769	650,681	220,948
Angara	3,666,839	523,117	54,983	47,325	159,340	183,058	430,931	593,523	169,958	385,289	169,260	192,585	194,023	170,979	306,212	86,256
Orbos	2,110,677	721,817	30,840	5,380	400,064	64,491	288,260	279,020	52,870	56,793	32,071	21,094	28,649	48,286	65,133	15,909
Osmeña, S.	1,608,574	288,910	6,098	9,720	12,224	20,923	112,789	124,994	26,407	182,924	231,563	127,487	96,853	146,833	186,301	34,548
Tatad	520,041	76,301	1,409	404	3,661	4,349	16,031	30,090	306,378	51,848	6,990	3,460	2,151	5,325	9,370	2,274
Sueño	390,031	3,140	160	1,837	155	267	738	1,189	4,097	12,027	110,313	27,445	6,315	11,829	146,201	64,318
Santiago	171,504	22,225	1,018	960	1,455	2,551	8,347	11,513	83,567	7,737	4,695	2,049	3,359	3,437	16,525	2,066
Pacheco	19,253	2,578	178	501	360	386	2,427	1,590	490	1,400	3,649	1,018	900	1,530	1,673	573
Sabio	18,765	1,946	150	358	261	356	578	735	1,349	1,229	507	334	474	7,443	2,724	321
Total	16,840,104	2,549,427	256,487	215,556	1,107,525	770,805	2,040,867	1,893,100	1,120,547	1,330,719	1,016,564	909,007	805,036	1,012,431	1,384,820	427,213

	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Percent	100.0%	15.1%	1.5%	1.3%	6.6%	4.6%	12.1%	11.2%	6.7%	7.9%	6.0%	5.4%	4.8%	6.0%	8.2%	2.5%
Total Votes/ Votes Cast %	89.5%	95.8%	93.8%	82.9%	93.6%	91.2%	89.9%	90.9%	86.3%	89.3%	84.5%	73.9%	88.3%	89.7%	92.1%	90.8%

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Weighted
Macapagal	49.5%	35.7%	63.0%	69.2%	47.9%	64.1%	57.9%	44.9%	42.4%	47.5%	45.0%	58.7%	58.7%	60.9%	47.0%	51.7%	49.3%
Angara	21.8%	20.5%	21.4%	22.0%	14.4%	23.7%	21.1%	31.4%	15.2%	29.0%	16.7%	21.2%	24.1%	16.9%	22.1%	20.2%	22.2%
Orbos	12.5%	28.3%	12.0%	2.5%	36.1%	8.4%	14.1%	14.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.2%	2.3%	3.6%	4.8%	4.7%	3.7%	12.4%
Osmeña, S.	9.6%	11.3%	2.4%	4.5%	1.1%	2.7%	5.5%	6.6%	2.4%	13.7%	22.8%	14.0%	12.0%	14.5%	13.5%	8.1%	9.7%
Tatad	3.1%	3.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	1.6%	27.3%	3.9%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	2.8%
Sueño	2.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.9%	10.9%	3.0%	0.8%	1.2%	10.6%	15.1%	2.4%
Santiago	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	7.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%	0.9%
Pacheco	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Sabio	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Weight		15.1%	1.7%	2.9%	5.5%	3.4%	10.9%	14.8%	5.5%	8.1%	7.4%	4.6%	3.9%	5.7%	7.2%	3.3%	100.0%

Table 6

Result of KRYSTAL Survey for Senator
(20 March - 17 April 98)

	Nationwide *(Weighted)*	
Rank	Candidate	No.
1	CAYETANO, Renato L.	58%
2	PIMENTEL, Aquilino Jr. Q.	57%
3	LEGARDA-LEVISTE, Loren B.	56%
4	OSMEÑA, John Henry R.	55%
5	BIAZON, Rodolfo G.	53%
6	GUINGONA, Teofisto Jr. T.	53%
7	OPLE, Blas F.	52%
8	BARBERS, Robert Z.	50%
9	SOTTO, Vicente III C.	50%
10	REVILLA, Ramon B.	47%
11	AQUINO-ORETA, Teresa	43%
12	JAWORSKI, Robert S.	41%
13	RASUL, Santanina C. T.	34%
14	ABADIA, Lisandro, C.	31%
15	BAGATSING, Ramon Jr. S.	30%
16	PAGDANGANAN, Roberto M.	29%
17	TORRES, Ruben D.	29%
18	GLORIA, Ricardo T.	27%
19	ANDAYA, Rolando R.	26%
20	YORAC, Haydee B.	24%
21	LAGMAN, Edcel C.	23%
22	DE OCAMPO, Roberto F.	22%
23	WEBB, Freddie N.	22%
24	LANGIT, Reynante M.	21%
25	DAZA, Raul A.	17%
26	PEREZ, Hernando B.	15%
27	GARCIA, Renato B.	13%
28	ROMERO, Miguel Luis R.	12%
29	PLAZA, Charito B.	9%
30	CASTRO, David M.	8%
31	ABBAS-TAMANO, Zorayda	7%
32	GERONIMO, Adolfo R.	6%
33	VILLEGAS, Jose Jr. M.	6%
34	SEBASTIAN, Roberto S.	5%
35	BADOY, Ludovico D.	4%
36	LOZANO, Oliver O.	4%
37	SEÑERES, Roy V.	4%
38	IRIBANI, Abraham S.	3%
39	BONDOC, Eduardo D.	2%
40	MARALLAG, Fred Henry R.	1%
	TOTAL	100%

Table 7

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES OF CANDIDATES FOR SENATOR
Weighted by the No. of Registered Voters by Region
(Source of raw data - NAMFREL report as of May 17, 1998 10:43:18 AM)

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
No. of Precincts	119,164	17,970	1,743	1,617	8,019	5,321	13,532	11,492	8,010	9,353	7,258	7,775	6,089	7,936	9,098	3,951
Precinct %	69.01%	70.22%	57.63%	48.05%	90.20%	71.69%	73.86%	44.61%	82.47%	67.98%	55.62%	88.52%	88.47%	79.12%	73.20%	69.96%
Votes Cast	18,811,702	2,659,889	273,322	259,887	1,183,474	844,912	2,270,564	2,082,817	1,297,907	1,490,366	1,203,576	1,230,461	911,842	1,129,192	1,502,972	470,521
Fill-Up Rate	7.16	9.75	6.91	5.12	7.45	6.56	7.41	7.83	5.05	6.47	6.52	4.63	6.18	6.79	7.66	7.50

Region	NW	NCR	CAR	ARMM	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	Weighted
Legarda	50.8%	70.2%	37.3%	26.3%	60.5%	42.1%	57.6%	53.9%	37.1%	52.9%	42.4%	31.0%	33.2%	46.7%	52.1%	50.7%	51.3%
Cayetano	45.1%	65.1%	34.7%	18.7%	57.3%	40.4%	49.6%	53.7%	33.6%	36.4%	39.9%	27.4%	28.3%	38.9%	42.2%	45.4%	45.7%
Sotto	38.8%	52.1%	37.4%	22.6%	37.7%	37.4%	53.6%	46.0%	21.0%	35.2%	29.7%	23.5%	33.4%	29.4%	35.7%	40.0%	39.3%
Pimentel	35.6%	48.1%	32.0%	20.8%	30.4%	28.6%	32.6%	34.7%	19.9%	30.3%	32.0%	19.2%	34.6%	48.5%	52.7%	48.4%	36.0%
Barbers	34.3%	46.5%	37.3%	22.2%	41.2%	34.5%	31.4%	35.3%	17.1%	25.9%	34.5%	23.7%	30.3%	47.0%	36.5%	34.6%	34.7%
Biazon	32.9%	52.7%	34.9%	15.0%	34.3%	33.1%	36.5%	40.4%	17.4%	27.7%	26.6%	15.1%	23.6%	22.8%	36.2%	30.0%	33.7%
Osmeña	32.5%	37.6%	29.7%	16.9%	26.0%	29.6%	29.0%	32.0%	18.5%	34.7%	41.7%	21.9%	35.1%	37.8%	43.6%	38.8%	32.9%
Ople	32.5%	47.6%	35.2%	10.8%	33.6%	32.8%	40.2%	37.0%	19.0%	27.8%	28.0%	17.5%	24.6%	25.4%	33.8%	29.8%	32.9%
Jaworski	30.1%	46.6%	34.4%	22.6%	35.7%	30.6%	44.6%	43.0%	15.0%	20.7%	15.9%	13.1%	20.2%	16.1%	24.1%	20.2%	30.9%
Revilla	29.6%	28.4%	29.0%	38.0%	43.6%	33.2%	30.6%	34.3%	20.0%	23.6%	24.5%	22.4%	29.3%	25.0%	34.1%	37.3%	29.9%
Guingona	25.9%	29.8%	26.9%	12.3%	29.6%	26.4%	21.0%	24.7%	14.2%	26.6%	31.9%	18.9%	26.4%	32.1%	31.8%	30.2%	26.1%
Aquino-Oreta	25.2%	34.9%	23.9%	15.3%	16.9%	19.7%	30.8%	24.8%	22.4%	25.7%	26.0%	14.4%	24.5%	18.4%	27.6%	22.8%	25.4%
Pagdanganan	24.2%	34.1%	27.0%	12.6%	25.8%	25.8%	38.3%	25.2%	19.6%	18.4%	15.2%	14.6%	21.1%	18.1%	16.0%	21.5%	24.3%
Lagman	24.2%	39.2%	21.0%	9.5%	15.0%	19.5%	23.3%	26.9%	50.4%	20.3%	15.0%	11.7%	16.4%	14.2%	20.4%	19.1%	24.2%
Torres	24.1%	29.3%	23.5%	11.2%	25.6%	24.4%	25.8%	26.8%	16.0%	29.0%	23.3%	14.8%	18.4%	21.4%	25.7%	23.9%	24.4%
Rasul	23.6%	27.4%	23.8%	52.5%	26.1%	20.0%	17.5%	22.3%	14.3%	18.4%	22.7%	18.6%	31.9%	29.4%	28.2%	32.6%	24.2%
Andaya	20.3%	21.3%	23.3%	15.7%	24.6%	18.8%	14.5%	19.2%	49.9%	15.7%	18.8%	16.2%	16.8%	15.5%	16.5%	16.8%	19.9%
De Ocampo	19.7%	27.1%	20.9%	11.7%	23.6%	17.7%	18.7%	21.7%	10.2%	20.8%	18.7%	13.5%	17.7%	20.2%	18.9%	20.0%	20.1%
Abadia	19.3%	21.7%	21.6%	15.4%	25.6%	17.8%	13.7%	16.6%	10.2%	17.4%	29.9%	16.9%	20.7%	24.7%	20.7%	20.3%	19.4%
Gloria	16.1%	15.0%	18.3%	14.1%	20.5%	17.8%	10.9%	13.7%	8.5%	10.9%	20.0%	14.3%	21.4%	25.2%	22.1%	25.7%	16.1%
Bagatsing	16.0%	23.5%	18.7%	10.2%	13.5%	15.5%	12.3%	19.4%	9.2%	18.9%	14.5%	13.1%	14.8%	12.0%	16.2%	17.9%	16.4%
Yorac	15.7%	33.3%	15.2%	2.6%	11.8%	10.4%	14.6%	17.7%	8.2%	25.5%	13.4%	5.7%	5.0%	8.3%	12.2%	11.0%	16.3%
Webb	15.6%	19.8%	17.4%	10.2%	16.6%	16.3%	19.9%	18.9%	7.8%	14.1%	10.6%	9.5%	13.5%	11.0%	18.3%	14.2%	15.7%
Perez	14.7%	17.3%	13.1%	5.4%	21.3%	17.1%	12.6%	19.9%	14.4%	11.4%	13.1%	11.6%	13.9%	13.9%	11.6%	10.7%	14.8%
Langit	13.5%	30.0%	9.8%	3.8%	15.1%	9.3%	23.1%	22.2%	6.6%	5.7%	3.5%	4.7%	4.9%	3.6%	4.9%	6.3%	14.0%
Daza	11.0%	18.1%	8.8%	9.2%	5.6%	8.4%	8.2%	9.9%	5.7%	9.6%	9.8%	22.9%	7.5%	11.8%	9.0%	11.5%	11.0%
Romero	10.0%	12.2%	8.4%	4.6%	6.3%	7.1%	6.4%	9.5%	5.8%	15.7%	18.9%	6.5%	13.1%	10.2%	10.1%	7.4%	10.1%
Plaza	9.2%	10.5%	4.7%	6.9%	3.2%	4.2%	5.3%	7.1%	2.6%	5.7%	7.6%	10.3%	10.9%	26.1%	18.0%	15.3%	9.2%
Señeres	4.3%	7.2%	1.8%	4.1%	2.6%	1.8%	3.3%	7.4%	1.5%	7.8%	1.7%	1.0%	2.8%	3.9%	4.1%	6.0%	4.6%
Tamano	3.2%	3.1%	2.8%	21.1%	2.3%	1.8%	2.2%	2.2%	1.8%	2.7%	2.9%	1.2%	4.5%	3.8%	6.2%	5.9%	3.5%
Sebastian	3.1%	2.0%	1.9%	3.3%	1.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	0.9%	1.9%	3.3%	1.0%	2.7%	4.2%	15.7%	3.5%	3.1%
Geronimo	2.9%	9.2%	1.4%	2.0%	1.5%	1.6%	4.4%	4.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%	3.1%
Garcia	2.5%	1.6%	3.6%	5.7%	1.7%	2.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	5.7%	1.9%	2.8%	4.1%	5.4%	4.3%	2.6%
Villegas	2.3%	3.7%	2.0%	1.9%	1.7%	1.5%	1.5%	2.3%	1.2%	2.1%	2.0%	1.5%	2.5%	2.0%	4.1%	2.7%	2.4%
Castro	1.8%	1.8%	2.9%	4.1%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	1.6%	2.5%	1.2%	1.6%	2.2%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%
Lozano	1.4%	2.6%	2.3%	2.0%	2.4%	1.7%	1.1%	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%
Badoy	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%	9.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%	2.9%	18.9%	1.7%
Iribani	1.3%	1.4%	0.6%	16.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	5.0%	0.9%	1.4%	1.1%	1.5%
Bondoc	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	3.0%	0.5%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	1.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.9%
Marallag	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.6%	0.4%	1.9%	0.5%	2.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%
Votes Cast %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Weight		15.1%	1.7%	2.9%	5.5%	3.4%	10.9%	14.8%	5.5%	8.1%	7.4%	4.6%	3.9%	5.7%	7.2%	3.3%	100.0%