Electorates' preferences

Table 1.1A Voters' Preference for CDO Mayor
May 2016 Election (n=800)

Candidate	Percent	Rank
3 Emano, Dongkoy *PP*	31.75	1-3
4 Moreno, Oscar *LP*	30.50	1-3
5 Rodriguez, Rufus *CDPP*	25.75	1-3
6 Saarenas, Eric	0.13	4
Undecided	11.88	

The margin of error is ±3.2% at 95% confidence level. A triple tie exists for candidates 3,4 & 5.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 3, 4 & 5:
  Chi-Square Value = 5.47 not significant (df=2; alpha > 0.05)]

Table 1.1B Voters' Preference for CDO Mayor
May 2016 Election by District

Candidate	District 1 (n=378)		District 2 (n=422)	
	%	Rnk	%	Rank
3 Emano, Dongkoy *PP*	31.22	1-2	32.23	1-2
4 Moreno, Oscar *LP*	39.68	1-2	22.27	3
5 Rodriguez, Rufus *CDPP*	19.58	3	31.28	1-2
6 Saarenas, Eric	0.26	4	0.00	
Undecided	9.23		14.22	

For District 1:
   The margin of error is ±4.9% at 95% confidence level. A tie exists for candidates 3 & 4.
   [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 3, 4 & 5:
    Chi-Square Value = 25.54 highly significant (df=2; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

For District 2:
   The margin of error is ±4.5% at 95% confidence level. A tie exists for candidates 3 & 5
   [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 3, 4 & 5:
    Chi-Square Value = 8.91 significant (df=2; 0.01<alpha < 0.05)]

Table 1.2A Voters' Preference for CDO Vice Mayor
May 2016 Election (n=800)

Candidate	Percent	Rank
1 Abaday, Roger CDPP	17.00	3
2 Acenas, Ian PP	42.75	1
3 Uy, Kikang LP	27.25	2
Undecided	13.00	

The margin of error is ±3.1% at 95% confidence level. Candidate 2 ranks first with a significant lead.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1, 2 & 3:
Chi-Square Value = 92.72 highly significant (df=2; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

Table 1.2B Voters' Preference for CDO Vice Mayor
May 2016 Election, by District

Candidate	District 1 (n=378)		District 2 (n=422)	
	%	Rnk	%	Rank
1 Abaday, Roger CDPP	15.34	3	18.48	3
2 Acenas, Ian PP	39.95	1	45.26	1
3 Uy, Kikang LP	35.71	2	19.67	2
Undecided	9.00		16.59	

For District 1:
  The margin of error is ±4.9% at 95% confidence level. Candidate 2 ranks first with a significant lead.
  [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1, 2 & 3: Chi-Square Value = 43.12 highly significant (df=2; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

For District 2:
  The margin of error is ±3.8% at 95% confidence level. Candidate 2 ranks first with a significant lead.
  [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1, 2 & 3: Chi-Square Value = 69.48 highly significant (df=2; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

Table 1.3A. District 1 Voters' Preference for City Councilors CY 2016 (n=378)

1.3A1Possible Topnotchers for Councilors (ranked 1 to 17)

Candidate for City Councilors	Percent	Rank
26) Ocon, Zaldy LP	***5.42***	**1-2**
12) Daba, Annie UNA	***5.36***	**1-2**
21) Licayan, Simeon UNA	***3.74***	**3-17**
17) Goking, George LP	***3.70***	**3-17**
9) Calizo, Romeo LP	***3.67***	**3-17**
14) Dahino, Inday UNA	***3.54***	**3-17**
1) Abbu, Pepe UNA	***3.51***	**3-17**
8) Calingin, Alvin UNA	***3.51***	**3-17**
5) Balite, Pedro UNA	*3.31*	**3-17**
19) Lagumen, Marlyn LP	*3.27*	**3-17**
13) Daba, Reuben LP	*3.24*	**3-17**
29) Suan, Lordan UNA	*3.21*	**3-17**
28) Raagas, Roy CDPP	*3.01*	**3-17**
11) Carcosa, Alfredo LP	*2.88*	**3-17**
3) Allorin, Dondon LP	*2.71*	**3-17**
7) Banaag, Gil CDPP	*2.71*	**3-17**
27) Pascual, Jay LP	*2.31*	**3-17**

1.3A2 Possible to be out of the top 8 finish:

Candidate	Percent
20) Legaspi, Al *IND*	1.98
23) Marban, Roque *CDPP*	1.98
15) De La Rosa, Elmer *CDPP*	1.52
10) Canoy, Rhona *IND*	1.29
25) Navarro, Meneleo *CDPP*	1.29
2) Abellera, Alex CDPP	1.26
32) Waniwan, Ronie *UNA*	1.22
30) Tagayuna, Dures *CDPP*	1.09
31) Tan, Narcissus *CDPP*	0.69
18) Guilani, William *IND*	0.40
16) Elio, Nicolas *IND*	0.36
4) Baes, Jojo *IND*	0.17
22) Malinda, Benie *IND*	0.17
6) Bana, Astrid *IND*	0.10
24) Mora, Tito *IND*	0.10
Undecided	**27.28**

Note: Based on Multiple Response

A. First 2 are statistically tied, indicates that no one has a significant lead over the other one; any of the two can be in the first or second rank. The margin of error is ± 2.3 at 95% confidence level.
Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 & 2: Chi-Square Value = 0.01 not significant (df=1; alpha > 0.05)]

B. Next 3 to17 candidates are statistically tied, results indicate that none of them have a significant lead over the other/s in the group; any of them can be in any of the 3rd to the 17th position. The margin of error is ± 1.9 at 95% confidence level;.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 3 to 17: Chi-Square Value=23.26ns (df=14, alpha ≥ 0.05)]

Table 1.3B. District 2 Voters' Preference for City Councilors CY 2016 (n=422)

1.3B1 Possible Topnotchers **for Councilors (ranked 1 to 13)**

Candidate for City Councilors	Percent	Rank
1) Acenas, Jun PP	*4.65*	*1-5*
8) Emano, Nadya PP	*4.65*	*1-5*
19) Nacaya, Ian PP	*4.38*	*1-5*
10) Gan, Leon, Jr. PP	*3.76*	*1-5*
12) Judith, James II CDPP	*3.61*	*1-5*
14) Lao, Bong CDPP	*3.50*	*6-13*
27) Salcedo, Enrico CDPP	*3.14*	*6-13*
20) Neri, Aaron CDPP	*2.64*	*6-13*
13) Labuntog, Omar CDPP	*2.61*	*6-13*
16) Magtajas, Suzette PP	*2.58*	*6-13*
2) Agcopra, Joebert PP	*2.49*	*6-13*
15) Lim, Condrad PP	*2.49*	*6-13*
3) Amoguis, Philip CDPP	*2.31*	*6-13*

1.3B2 Possible to be out of the top 8 finish:

Candidate	Percent
28) Villazorda, Roger LP	*2.16*
11) Gumahad, Adonis CDPP	2.04
18) Musni, Oscar PP	1.95
5) Babiera, Noris LP	1.93
22) Paasa, Kit CDPP	1.90
9) Gaane, Malou LP	1.84
6) Bacal, Josefina LP	1.78
23) Pacana, Celing LP	1.78
24) Pimentel, Ermin LP	1.63
17) Mordeno, Dale LP	1.54
4) Baban, Richard LP	1.51
7) Beja, Marvin IND	0.95
29) Yacapin, Roldan IND	0.33
26) Roa, Monching IND	0.27
25) Ramos, Jenny IND	0.06
21) Omelig, Bert IND	0.00
Undecided	35.54

Note: Based on Multiple Response

A. First 5 are statistically tied, this indicates that no one has a significant lead over the other/s in the group; any of them can be in the top 5 ranks. The margin of error is ± 2 at 95% confidence level.
   [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 & 2: Chi-Square Value= 7.81ns (df=4, alpha≥ 0.05)]

B. Next 6 to13 candidates are statistically tied, results indicate that none of them have a significant lead over the other/s in the group; any of them can be in any of the 6th to 13th rank. The margin of error is ± 2   at 95% confidence level.
   [Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 6 to 13: Chi-Square Value=13.57ns (df=7, alpha≥ 0.05)]

Table 1.4. Voters' Preference for Congressmen
May 2016 Election

1.4A. District 1 (n=378) Voters' Preference for Congressman

Candidate for Congressman	Percent	Rank
1) Darimbang, Candy	45.77	1-2
2) Uy, Rolando	48.94	1-2
UNDECIDED	5.29	

The margin of error is ±5% at 95% confidence level. A tie exists for candidates 1 & 2.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 & 2:
Chi-Square Value = 0.40 not significant (df=1; alpha > 0.05)]

1.4B. District 2 (n=422) Voters' Preference for Congressman

Candidate for Congressman	Percent	Rank
2) Cabanlas, Edgar	16.11	**3**
3) Carrasco, Vangie	1.18	**4**
4) Fernandez, Chito	0.47	**5**
5) Rodriguez, Maxie	35.80	**1-2**
6) Tabor, Ramon	36.02	**1-2**
UNDECIDED	10.43	

The margin of error is ±4.6% at 95% confidence level. Candidates 5 and 6 are tied at rank 1.5.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 5 & 6:
Chi-Square Value = 0.003 highly significant (df=1; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

Table 1.5. Voters' Preference for Congressmen
May 2016 Election

1.5A. District 1 (n=378) Voters' Preference for Congressman

Candidate for Congressman	Percent	Rank
1) Darimbang, Candy	45.77	1-2
2) Uy, Rolando	48.94	1-2
UNDECIDED	5.29	

The margin of error is ±5% at 95% confidence level. A tie exists for candidates 1 & 2.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 & 2:
Chi-Square Value = 0.40 not significant (df=1; alpha > 0.05)]

1.5B. District 2 (n=422) Voters' Preference for Congressman

Candidate for Congressman	Percent	Rank
2) Cabanlas, Edgar	16.11	**3**
3) Carrasco, Vangie	1.18	**4**
4) Fernandez, Chito	0.47	**5**
5) Rodriguez, Maxie	35.80	**1-2**
6) Tabor, Ramon	36.02	**1-2**
UNDECIDED	10.43	

The margin of error is ±4.6% at 95% confidence level. Candidates 5 and 6 are tied at rank 1.5.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 5 & 6:
Chi-Square Value = 0.003 highly significant (df=1; alpha ≤ 0.01)]

Table 1.6. CDO Voters' Preference for Vice President
May 2016 Election (n=800)

Vice Presidential Candidate	Percent	Rank
1) Cayetano, Peter	21.12	1-3
2) Escudero, Francis	21.00	1-3
3) Honasan, Gringo	5.62	6
4) Marcos, Ferdinand, Jr.	21.12	1-3
5) Robredo, Lenie	16.88	4
6) Trillanes, Antonio	7.00	5
Undecided	*7.25*	

The margin of error is ±3% at 95% confidence level. A triple tie exists for candidates 1, 2 & 4.
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 to 6:
Chi-Square Value = 292.03 highly significant (df=5; alpha < 0.01)]

Table 1.7. CDO Voters' Preference for President
May 2016 Election (n=800)

Presidential Candidate	Percent	Rank
1) Binay, Jejomar	16.38	2-3
2) Duterte, Rodrigo	47.50	1
3) Poe, Grace Llamanzares	19.13	2-3
4) Roxas, Mar	12.25	4
5) Santiago, Miriam Defensor	0.13	5
Undecided	*4.62*	

The margin of error is ±3.5% at 95% confidence level. Candidate 2 leads significantly compared to Candidates 1, 3, 4, & 5, (Chi-Square Value = 259.4 highly significant, alpha ≤ 0.01).
[Test on Hypothesized Probabilities for Candidates 1 & 3: Chi-Square Value = 1.70 not significant (df=1; alpha ≥ 0.05)]

Table 2. Barangay Issues/Problems In Cagayan de Oro City CY 2016 (n=800)

2A. Peace and Order

Barangay Issues and Problems	Percent	Rank (Top 3)
Illegal Drugs	**68.63**	**1**
Theft/Robbery	**24.88**	**2**
Traffic Jam	**13.88**	
Illegal Parking of Trucks, & other vehicles	**18.13**	**3**
Street Vendors	**6.13**	
Gangs/Frats	**4.75**	
Family vs Family	**2.63**	

2B. Basic Services

Barangay Issues and Problems	Percent	Rank (Top 3)
Infrastructure		
Roads	13.63	3
Drainage/Canals	33.13	1
Bridges	0.75	
Water/Electricity		
Water Supply	14.50	2
Electricity	3.50	
Rural Health Unit (RHU)		
Availability of RHU Services	1.75	
Medical Supplies of RHU	7.75	
Education		
Public Sch Facilities	1.50	
Day Care Center	0.88	
Housing		
Shelter	4.63	
Informal Settlers	3.88	

2C. Environment

Barangay Issues and Problems	Percent	Rank (Top 3)
Disaster Preparedness	3.12	
Sanitation	4.76	2
Toilets	4.00	3
Waste Management		
Garbage (basura)	13.88	1
Domestic Waste (bahug, kinilisan, winaswasan	0.62	
Mining/Quarrying		
Small-scale Mining	0.12	
Quarrying	1.62	
River/Coastal Condition		
Cleanliness	2.12	

2D. Economic Issues

Barangay Issues and Problems	Percent	Rank (Top 3)
Food Security (adequacy)	2.12	3
Employment/Jobs	24.62	1

Livelihood/Income Generating Project	17.75	2
Public Market	1.12	

2E. Local Governance

Barangay Issues and Problems	Percent	Rank (Top 3)
Corruption at the Barangay Level	7.38	1
Legislation at the Barangay Council	1.50	
Implementation of Barangay Ordinances	3.75	
Participation in Barangay Assembly	1.50	
Election Participation of Brngy Residents	1.25	
Corruption at the City Level	6.38	2
Legislation at the City Council	4.38	
Implementation of City Ordinances	4.75	3