

## **MEDIA RELEASE**

(March 13, 2026)

**FROM: Ronald D. Holmes**  
**President**  
**Pulse Asia Research, Inc.**

**RE: Pulse Asia Research's 1st Quarter 2026 Nationwide Survey on the issue of banning political dynasties**

---

Pulse Asia Research, Inc. is pleased to share selected findings from the 1st Quarter 2026 *Ulat ng Bayan* national survey on the *issue of banning political dynasties*. We would appreciate your assistance in helping inform the public by disseminating this information.

The survey fieldwork was conducted from **February 27 to March 2, 2026** using face-to-face interviews. This nationwide survey is based on a sample of 1,200 representative adults 18 years old and above. It has a  $\pm 2.8\%$  error margin at the 95% confidence level. Subnational estimates for the geographic areas covered in the survey have the following error margins at 95% confidence level:  $\pm 5.7\%$  for Metro Manila, the rest of Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. Those interested in further technical details may refer to our website ([www.pulseasia.ph](http://www.pulseasia.ph))

The following are some of the critical developments that took place in the weeks leading up to and during the conduct of the interviews for the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2026 *Ulat ng Bayan* survey:

1. On 10 February 2026, the House of Representatives upheld the decision of its Committee on Justice to dismiss two (2) impeachment complaints against the President for insufficiency in substance, with a vote of 284-8 (and 4 abstentions). Meanwhile, on 02 March 2026, the same committee found 2 (out of 4) impeachment complaints against the Vice-President as sufficient in form. One of the complaints filed against the latter was set aside for violating the one-year ban on the conduct

of impeachment proceedings against the Vice-President while another one was withdrawn by its petitioners to expedite the deliberations on the other pending complaints.

2. Prior to the House deliberations on the impeachment complaints filed against her, the Vice-President announced her plan to run for president in May 2028. The latter also disclosed that she already has a running mate but refused to name the said individual. For his part, the President said he intends to endorse as his presidential candidate someone who is doing exceptional work in government and focused on improving the state of the country. Meanwhile, Senator Risa Hontiveros said the “united opposition” will make public its common candidates by the end of 2026.
3. The International Criminal Court (ICC) proceeded with the confirmation of charges hearing in the case against former President Rodrigo R. Duterte from 23-27 February 2026, with the latter waiving his right to appear before the court. In a separate hearing on 27 February 2026 regarding his detention at the ICC, the prosecutor and the victims’ lawyers urged the ICC not to release the ex-President from its custody.

In a related development, the ICC named eight (8) former and current government officials among the co-perpetrators of former President Duterte in the extrajudicial killings that took place during his administration’s “war on drugs”. Among these officials are incumbent Senators Ronald dela Rosa and Christopher Go. The former has been absent from the Senate since November 2025 when reports of his impending arrest in connection with the ICC case first surfaced while the latter disputed the allegations regarding his role in the campaign against illegal drugs and called them unfounded. Malacañang said the co-perpetrators of the ex-President should face the charges against them if they are indeed innocent.

At the House of Representatives, members of the Makabayan bloc filed House Resolution (HR) No. 809 urging the Philippine government to rejoin the ICC as a show of its commitment to its international treaty obligations. Former President Duterte continues to refuse to recognize the jurisdiction of the ICC over his case as he asserts that he was “kidnapped”, not arrested, on 11 March 2025.

4. Congressional deliberations were held regarding various proposals banning political dynasties in the country. The House Committee on Suffrage and Electoral Reforms worked to consolidate 24 legislative measures and after its deliberations and public consultations, Lanao del Sur Representative Zia Alonto Adiong, the committee chairperson, reported that there appears to be a consensus in support of a ban up to the second degree of affinity or consanguinity covering all elective positions in government, from the barangay level to the national level. At the Senate, 12 lawmakers have expressed support for a similar measure covering up

to second degree relations, which could affect about 30% of political dynasties, according to Senator Hontiveros, chairperson of the Senate Committee on Electoral Reforms and People's Participation.

5. The Department of Justice (DOJ) announced on 02 March 2026 that it has issued subpoenas to the Villars arising from the complaint for alleged market manipulation, insider trading, and misleading disclosures filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) against Villar Land Holdings Corp. on 30 January 2026. Former Senate President Manuel Villar Jr., one of the respondents, called the SEC's complaint as baseless and said their company fully cooperated with the SEC's investigators. Also among those subpoenaed by the DOJ are Senators Mark and Camille Villar as well as former Senator Cynthia Villar.
6. A petition was filed before the Supreme Court (SC) on 02 March 2026 to compel the Senate Blue Ribbon Committee to publicly release the contents of its draft report on the investigation it conducted into the flood control project scandal. The petitioners requested the issuance of a temporary restraining order (TRO) in order to preserve the original version of the draft report that recommended the filing of plunder and other criminal charges against Senators Francis Escudero, Jinggoy Estrada, and Joel Villanueva, former Senator Ramon Revilla Jr., and former Ako Bicol Party-List Representative Elizaldy Co.
7. Filipinos celebrated the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the EDSA People Power Revolution on 25 February 2026, with various groups holding separate events at the EDSA People Power Monument and EDSA Shrine, among other places. Some event organizers urged the administration to hold corrupt officials accountable while others called for the resignation of the President and the Vice-President as well as an end to political dynasties. Lingayen-Dagupan Archbishop Socrates Villegas also challenged the Filipino youth to revive the fading EDSA spirit and continue the fight for democracy in the country.
8. Reports of an impending change in the Senate's top leadership post in early February 2026, with Senator Loren Legarda supposedly replacing Senate President Vicente Sotto III. However, this did not materialize although Senator Zubiri said the Senate majority bloc is looking at the possibility of electing Senator Legarda to lead the legislative body by late 2027. Senate President Sotto has confirmed plans to make the latter his successor before the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress.
9. Catholics across the country ushered in the Lenten Season on Ash Wednesday, 18 February 2026, with the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) encouraging the faithful to observe "digital media fasting" during this time. Likewise, the CBCP called on politicians to "fast and abstain from stealing public

funds". And in a rare instance, the Muslim community also marked the start of the first full day of fasting for Ramadan on the same day.

10. The United States (US) and Israel launched airstrikes against Iran on 28 February 2026, killing its supreme leader. Iran has responded with its own attacks on neighboring countries allied with the US and Israel. In the immediate aftermath of this conflict, the Philippine government advised Filipinos in the Middle East to remain indoors and avoid unnecessary travel for their safety. The Department of Migrant Workers (DMW) and the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) are on standby should the need to repatriate Filipinos arise while the Department of Energy (DOE) met with independent oil firms to discuss the status of their supply and secure their commitment to measures aimed at cushioning the impact of the expected oil price hikes as a result of the airstrikes.

Pulse Asia Research's pool of academic fellows takes full responsibility for the design and conduct of the survey and for analyses it makes based on the survey data. In keeping with our academic nature, no religious, political, economic, or partisan group influenced any of these processes. Pulse Asia Research undertakes *Ulat ng Bayan* surveys independently without any party singularly commissioning the research effort.

For any clarification or questions, kindly contact Ana Maria Tabunda, Research Director of Pulse Asia Research at 09189436816 or Ronald D. Holmes, Pulse Asia Research President via Telegram or WhatsApp at +639189335497 or at [ronald.holmes@gmail.com](mailto:ronald.holmes@gmail.com) (via email).

Pulse Asia Research's 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2026 *Ulat ng Bayan* Survey:  
Media Release on the Issue of Banning Political Dynasties  
13 March 2026

**Most Filipino adults (64%) agree with the passage of a law against political dynasties in the country. Majority support for such a legislative measure cuts across levels of government and covers both simultaneous and consecutive holding of elective government positions**

Support for legislative proposals to ban political dynasties in the Philippine political arena is the predominant sentiment among Filipino adults, with 64% agreeing with the passage of such a bill. The rest of the adult population either disagrees with such a measure (17%) or expresses indecision on the matter (19%). Majority levels of agreement are posted in Metro Manila (69%), the rest of Luzon (74%), the Visayas (73%), Class ABC (70%), and Class D (66%). A three-way split may be observed in Mindanao (32% agreement, 29% indecision, and 39% disagreement) while almost the same percentages in Class E either agree or disagree with banning political dynasties in the country (36% and 41%, respectively). *(Please refer to Table 1.)*

**Table 1**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE PASSAGE OF A LAW**  
**THAT LIMITS OR PROHIBITS POLITICAL DYNASTIES**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Total Interviews, 100%								
INTRO: There are bills in Congress that seek to limit or prohibit so-called political dynasties in national and local governments. A political dynasty is a family with two or more of its members holding elective positions in government, simultaneously or in sequence. The following questions are about your views on these bills.								
Overall, do you agree or disagree with the passage of a law that limits or prohibits political dynasties?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
<b>AGREE</b>	64	69	74	73	32	70	66	36
Strongly agree	28	36	27	44	11	32	28	17
Somewhat agree	36	33	48	29	21	37	38	18
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE</b>	19	15	19	13	29	17	19	24
<b>DISAGREE</b>	17	16	7	14	39	13	15	41
Somewhat disagree	11	13	4	10	27	7	10	35
Strongly disagree	5	3	3	4	12	6	5	6

MAY MGA PANUKALANG BATAS SA KONGRESO NA NAGLALAYONG LIMITAHAN O IPAGBAWAL ANG TINATAWAG NA POLITICAL DYNASTIES SA PAMAHALAANG PAMBANSA AT LOKAL. ANG POLITICAL DYNASTY AY ISANG PAMILYA KUNG SAAN ANG DALAWA O HIGIT PANG MIYEMBRO NITO AY MAY HAWAK NA HALAL NA POSISYON SA PAMAHALAAN, MAGKASABAY MAN O MAGKASUNOD. ANG MGA SUMUSUNOD NA TANONG AY TUNGKOL SA INYONG PANANAW SA MGA PANUKALANG ITO.

Q60. Sa kabuuan, kayo po ba ay sang-ayon o hindi sang-ayon sa pagpasa ng batas na naglilimita o nagbabawal sa political dynasties?

Notes: (1) % Agree = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

A big majority of those who agree with or are undecided about a ban on political dynasties (76%) opine that such a ban should be implemented at both the national and local levels of government, with majority agreement figures being recorded in all geographic and socioeconomic subgroupings (72% to 77% and 74% to 85%, respectively). Meanwhile, 13% say a ban on political dynasties should cover only local government positions and 11% prefer that it be applicable only to elective positions at the national level.<sup>1</sup> (Please refer to Table 2.)

**Table 2**  
**LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT FOR POLITICAL DYNASTY BAN**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
If political dynasties are to be banned, which of the following is closest to your view as to what level of government this should be implemented?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
		In <b>NATIONAL</b> (president, vice-president, senator, representative) AND <b>LOCAL</b> (governor, mayor, councilor) POSITIONS	76	74	77	76	72	85
In <b>NATIONAL</b> POSITIONS only	11	10	12	9	11	11	11	11
In <b>LOCAL</b> POSITIONS only	13	16	11	14	18	4	15	16

Q62. Kung ipagbabawal ang political dynasties, alin po sa mga sumusunod ang pinakamalapit sa inyong pananaw kung hanggang anong antas ng pamahalaan ito dapat ipatupad?

Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

<sup>1</sup> All succeeding observations are based on this subgrouping composed of those who either support a ban on political dynasties or are undecided on the matter (83%).

Nearly seven (7) in 10 Filipino adults (69%) would like to prohibit relatives from holding the same local government post consecutively – a view echoed by sizeable to huge majorities across areas and classes (72% to 78% and 66% to 85%, respectively), with Mindanao being the exception (47%). Almost a quarter is ambivalent on the matter (23%) while practically a tenth is opposed to such a ban (8%). (*Please refer to Table 3.*)

**Table 3**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE PROHIBITION ON RELATIVES**  
**HOLDING THE SAME ELECTIVE POSITION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONSECUTIVELY**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
How much do you agree or disagree with the prohibition on relatives holding the same elective position in local government consecutively (e.g., a mayor being replaced by his/her spouse, child, or sibling)?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
<b>AGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>69</b>
Strongly agree to ban	27	41	23	37	13	31	26	22
Somewhat agree to ban	43	32	49	40	33	54	40	47
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
Somewhat disagree to ban	5	3	2	2	16	1	5	5
Strongly disagree to ban	3	2	1	9	3	1	4	2

Q63. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa pagbabawal na magkasunod na humawak ng iisang halal na posisyon sa pamahalaang lokal ang mga magkamag-anak (hal. mayor na pinalitan ng asawa, anak o kapatid)?

Notes: (1) % Agree to Ban = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree to Ban = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

Basically the same pattern of public opinion holds true when it comes to disallowing relatives from holding the same national government post consecutively. Agreement with this proposal is expressed by most adults at the national level (69%), most geographic areas (71% to 78%), and every socioeconomic class (66% to 86%). Again, it is only in Mindanao where a non-majority agreement figure is posted (47%). Indecision on the matter is more pronounced than disagreement (22% versus 9%). (Please refer to Table 4.)

**Table 4**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE PROHIBITION ON RELATIVES HOLDING THE SAME ELECTIVE POSITION IN THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT CONSECUTIVELY**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
How much do you agree or disagree with the prohibition on relatives holding the same elective position in the national government consecutively (e.g., a senator being replaced by a spouse, child, or sibling)?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
		<b>AGREE TO BAN</b>	69	76	71	78	47	86
Strongly agree to ban	26	40	23	40	10	30	25	33
Somewhat agree to ban	43	36	48	38	36	55	41	37
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	22	18	22	12	35	12	24	27
<b>DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	9	6	6	10	18	3	11	3
Somewhat disagree to ban	5	5	4	1	14	0	7	3
Strongly disagree to ban	4	1	2	9	4	2	4	0

Q64. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa pagbabawal na magkasunod na humawak ng iisang halal na posisyon sa pamahalaang pambansa ang mga magkamag-anak (hal. senador na pinalitan ng asawa, anak o kapatid)?

Notes: (1) % Agree to Ban = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree to Ban = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

As far as simultaneous holding of government positions is concerned, majorities agree with banning political dynasties in both national and local governments (70%). Such a ban has the support of considerable to huge majorities in nearly all areas and every class (73% to 77% and 65% to 85%, respectively). In Mindanao, essentially the same percentages either agree with this proposal or are undecided on the matter (40% versus 35%). At the national level, 20% are ambivalent on the matter while 10% oppose such a ban. (Please refer to Table 5.)

**Table 5**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE BAN ON RELATIVES HOLDING ELECTIVE POSITIONS IN NATIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SIMULTANEOUSLY**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

<i>Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%</i>								
<i>How much do you agree or disagree with the ban on relatives holding elective positions in national and local governments simultaneously?</i>	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
<b>AGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>65</b>
Strongly agree to ban	27	40	26	36	11	36	25	33
Somewhat agree to ban	43	36	51	37	29	49	42	32
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>
Somewhat disagree to ban	7	4	5	3	21	1	8	9
Strongly disagree to ban	3	3	1	11	4	3	4	0

Q65. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa pagbabawal na sabayang humawak ng mga halal na posisyon sa pamahalaang pambansa at lokal ang mga magkamag-anak?

Notes: (1) % Agree to Ban = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree to Ban = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

Most Filipino adults who agree with prohibiting political dynasties or are undecided on the matter support a ban on relatives holding local elective positions simultaneously (67%), with majority levels of agreement being registered in most areas and all classes (68% to 74% and 61% to 83%, respectively). Once more, Mindanao is the exception (49%). Ambivalence is expressed by 25% while 8% disagree with such a ban at the local level. (Please refer to Table 6.)

**Table 6**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE BAN ON RELATIVES**  
**HOLDING ELECTIVE POSITIONS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT SIMULTANEOUSLY**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
How much do you agree or disagree with the ban on relatives holding elective positions in local government at the same time?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
		<b>AGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>83</b>
Strongly agree to ban	27	39	24	34	16	29	26	23
Somewhat agree to ban	40	35	44	40	32	54	38	38
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
Somewhat disagree to ban	5	3	3	3	20	1	7	4
Strongly disagree to ban	3	2	1	11	2	1	4	0

Q66a. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa pagbabawal na sabayang humawak ng mga halal na posisyon sa pamahalaang lokal ang mga magkamaag-anak?

Notes: (1) % Agree to Ban = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree to Ban = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.  
(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

Around three-fourths of those supportive of or are ambivalent about a ban on political dynasties (72%) see the need for a ban on relatives holding national elective positions simultaneously. This opinion is shared by sizeable to big majorities in practically all areas and every class (75% to 80% and 63% to 85%, respectively). A non-majority agreement figure is recorded in Mindanao (49%). Indecision is recorded at 20% while less than a tenth (8%) disagrees with imposing such a ban. (Please refer to Table 7.)

**Table 7**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE BAN ON RELATIVES**  
**HOLDING ELECTIVE POSITIONS IN NATIONAL GOVERNMENT SIMULTANEOUSLY**  
February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
How much do you agree or disagree with the ban on relatives holding elective positions in national government at the same time?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
		<b>AGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>85</b>
Strongly agree to ban	27	39	24	35	14	32	26	23
Somewhat agree to ban	45	37	51	45	35	53	44	41
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>DISAGREE TO BAN</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
Somewhat disagree to ban	5	5	3	2	16	2	6	5
Strongly disagree to ban	3	2	1	8	7	1	4	0

Q66b. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa pagbabawal na sabayang humawak ng mga halal na posisyon sa pamahalaang pambansa ang mga magkamag-anak?

Notes: (1) % Agree to Ban = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree to Ban = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.

A proposal to limit the number of family members running in an election to only two (2), one for a national position and another for a local position, is supported by 70% of those who agree with banning political dynasties or are undecided on the matter. Majority levels of agreement with such a proposal are posted across geographic and socioeconomic subgroupings (53% to 81% and 62% to 83%, respectively). Disagreement is expressed by 9% while 21% cannot say if they agree or disagree with such a legislative measure. (Please refer to Table 8.)

**Table 8**  
**AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE PROPOSAL TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS RUNNING IN AN ELECTION TO TWO, ONE FOR A NATIONAL POSITION AND ANOTHER FOR A LOCAL POSITION**

February 27 - March 2, 2026 / Philippines  
(In Percent)

Base: Those who agree with or are undecided about a political dynasty ban, 83%								
How much do you agree or disagree with another proposal to limit the number of family members running in an election to two, one for a national position and another for a local position?	RP	LOCATION				CLASS		
		NCR	BL	VIS	MIN	ABC	D	E
		<b>AGREE</b>	70	72	71	81	53	83
Strongly agree	28	36	26	39	12	28	27	29
Somewhat agree	42	35	44	42	41	55	40	34
<b>CANNOT SAY IF AGREE OR DISAGREE</b>	21	20	24	10	27	8	23	33
<b>DISAGREE</b>	9	9	5	9	21	8	9	5
Somewhat disagree	6	5	5	1	18	7	6	5
Strongly disagree	3	3	1	8	2	2	3	0

Q67. Gaano kayo sumasang-ayon o hindi sumasang-ayon sa isa pang panukala na limitahan ang BILANG ng tumatakbong magkamag-anak SA ISANG ELEKSYON sa dalawa, isa para sa pambansang posisyon at isa sa lokal na posisyon?

Notes: (1) % Agree = % Strongly Agree plus % Somewhat Agree; % Disagree = % Somewhat Disagree plus % Strongly Disagree.

(2) Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding off.