

Campaign Spending and Its Effect during the 2013 and 2016 Elections in the Province of Cebu

Patrick P. Boniao

School of Law and Governance, University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines

Author Email: boniaopatrick14@gmail.com

Date received: April 14, 2024

Date revised: May 8, 2024

Date accepted: May 14, 2024

Originality: 95%

Grammarly Score: 90%

Similarity: 5%

Recommended citation:

Boniao, P. (2024). Campaign spending and its effect during the 2013 and 2016 elections in the Province of Cebu. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(7), 87-98. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0132>

Abstract. Elections play a crucial role in legitimizing authority in democratic societies, yet the impact of campaign spending necessitates further investigation. This research delves into the influence of campaign expenditures on election outcomes in Cebu province between 2013 and 2016. Analysis of the Statement of Contributions and Expenditures (SOCE), this study explores how candidates make decisions regarding the allocation of campaign funds. Employing a mixed-method research approach, quantitative techniques like regression analysis are utilized to examine the relationship between spending and election results, while qualitative methods including scrutinizing SOCE documents and conducting interviews with candidates and COMELEC officials shed light on spending patterns and offer recommendations for policy enhancements. Cebu Provincial data elections spanning 2013 and 2016 reveal a strong positive correlation between election spending and votes. Travel expenses, compensating campaigners, and communication demonstrate statistically insignificant correlations with voting outcomes (p-values of 0.842, 0.771, and 0.811, respectively). Similarly, printed materials and the employment of watchers' expenditures display slightly positive correlations but lack statistical significance (p-values of 0.239 and 0.984). Moreover, campaign headquarters, meetings, and rallies show no significant correlations (p-values of 0.841 and 0.458). Advertising expenses emerged as the sole statistically significant factor in 2013 ($p = 0.000$), indicating a substantial 22.6 increase in votes for every 55,895 pesos spent. In the 2013 elections, only campaign paraphernalia and media spending correlated with votes; conversely, media spending was the sole positive correlation in 2016. Findings suggest that wealth played a significant role in the 2013 election, undermining the democratic principle of meritocracy where the most deserving candidate should prevail. Proposed policy changes include criminalizing campaign malpractices, ensuring candidate qualifications are rigorously vetted, and enhancing voter education programs spearheaded by academia. These measures are essential to mitigate the undue influence of money in politics and uphold the integrity of our electoral system.

Keywords: Campaign spending; Electoral outcome; Pattern of campaign spending; Philippine election.

1.0 Introduction

Electoral studies were vital to political science and provided the first layer to understanding the dynamics of democracies (Rokkan, 2009). In the Philippines, where elections were the heart of democracy, much literature emphasized voter behaviour and candidate strategies (Holmes, 2016). Nevertheless, the effect of campaign spending on electoral outcomes needs to be studied more. The role of campaign spending elicited attention across the globe as analysts and stakeholders warned of potential unfair democratic influence. The argument was based on the potential for campaign spending to bias the electoral outcome while creating an unequal playing ground for contenders. Concerns had been raised over the potential for spending to favour wealthier candidates, granting them a better chance of winning while diminishing the candidacy of non-money owners Sobari (2017).

Additionally, using money in politics has raised ethical concerns over the policy implications of undermining the voices of the seemingly marginalized population. For these reasons, understanding the relationship between

campaign spending and electoral outcomes was vital in promoting fairness and inclusivity. Understanding the dynamics of elections had always been pleasant for a political science student since it revealed the most critical aspect of democracy. Citizens needed to understand how spending affected outcomes so that they were well-informed and not influenced to vote outside their interests. Understanding such dynamics would neutralize the advantage acquired by wealthy candidates. Such a study promoted fair and structured election processes in which qualified candidates did not need to be rich to offer quality leadership Besley (2005).

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study used a mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques. Quantitatively, it employed a descriptive-correlational research design, analyzing the correlation between campaign spending and electoral outcomes. Statistical analyses, including correlation and regression, were conducted using SPSS to determine the relationship between campaign expenditures and vote counts. Qualitatively, interviews were conducted to gain insights into participants' views on the impact of campaign spending. By integrating quantitative analysis with qualitative interviews, the study aimed to offer a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between campaign spending and electoral outcomes.

2.2 Research Participants

The study's respondents were a representative sample of the COMELEC's officials, including the electoral candidates who won or lost the election for the Governor, Vice Governor, or District Representative positions in the province of Cebu. This offered a qualitative application of the study since their insights about the effects of campaign spending on electoral results and policy recommendations were also analyzed.

2.3 Research Instrument

This study employed predetermined interview questions.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

This study used Statement of Contributions and Expenditures (SOCE) before the Commission on Elections and interview responses from participants.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

This research study adhered to established ethical guidelines. The response involved obtaining informed consent from all participants, ensuring the confidentiality of data, and obtaining approval from the institutional review board (IRB) of the University of San Carlos, before commencement.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Expenditures and Total Votes

Gubernatorial Elections

Table 1. Distribution of expenditures and votes for gubernatorial elections

2013 Election	Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1. Davide, Hilario III	6,080,839	0.70	654,054	0.56
2. Garcia, Pablo	1,801,204	0.21	490,148	0.42
3. Cortez, Roliveth	845,000	0.10	25,735	0.02
4. Bulala, Hermilito	916	0.00	8,104	0.01
2016 Election				
1. Davide, Hilario III	4,667,053	0.56	616,381	0.48
2. Garcia, Winston	3,712,031	0.44	593,725	0.46
3. Cortez, Roliveth	0	0.00	46,703	0.04
4. Estinizo, Desiderio	No data	0.00	13,352	0.01
5. Patalinghug, Leandro	10,000	0.00	10,997	0.01
6. Magnanao, Nonito	0	0.00	8,518	0.01

In the 2013 election, Table 1 shows the expenditures and votes obtained by Gubernatorial candidates. Hilario Davide emerged as the winner, spending 6,080,836 pesos, which represented 69.67% of total expenses, and securing 654,054 votes, accounting for 55.52% of the total. His closest competitor, Pablo Garcia, spent 1,801,205

pesos (20.64% of total expenses) and received 490,148 votes (41.61% of the total). Roliveth Cortez and Hermilito Bulala ranked third and fourth, with Cortez spending 845,000 pesos (9.68% of total expenses) and Bulala spending 916 pesos (0.01% of total expenses). Davide notably funded 78% of his campaign expenses from contributions, with a significant portion dedicated to advertisements (58.55% of total expenses). In contrast, Garcia received 2,256,575 pesos in contributions, with a large portion also directed towards advertisements (71% of total expenses). During the 2016 election, Davide once again emerged victorious, surpassing his opponents by spending 4,667,053 pesos (55.63% of total expenses) and securing 616,381 votes (47.79% of the total). His closest rival, Winston Garcia, spent 3,712,031 pesos (44.25% of total expenses) and garnered 593,725 votes (46.04% of the total). Davide received contributions amounting to 65% of his campaign expenses, while Garcia financed his campaign entirely from personal funds. Both candidates allocated a significant portion of their budgets to advertisements (44% for Davide and 92% for Garcia). Similar to the 2013 election, Davide's success in 2016 was aided by the support of the Liberal Party and his incumbency as Governor. The substantial financial backing Davide received enabled his campaign efforts, unlike Garcia, who self-financed his campaign. Additionally, both candidates heavily invested in advertisements, which proved to be an effective method of voter communication.

Vice-Gubernatorial Elections

Table 2 shows that in the 2013 elections, Vice Gubernatorial candidates collectively spent Php6,373,591.72, with a total of 1,110,514 votes cast. Agnes Magpale, the eventual winner, spent only 42.93% of the total expenses, amounting to Php2,736,312. Magpale secured 49.39% of the total votes, significantly surpassing her opponent, Glen Anthony Soco, who spent 52.67% of the total candidate expenses. Despite Soco's higher spending, Magpale emerged victorious, aided by significant party support from the Liberal Party. In the 2016 elections, Magpale's spending accounted for 80.42% of the overall expenses, totaling Php1,044,054. She secured 57.99% of the total votes, outperforming her rivals by a large margin. Notably, Magpale's campaign was heavily supported by external contributors, with 99% of her expenses sourced from various contributors, sparing her from significant personal expenditure. Soco's high spending in 2013 did not translate into success, as his expenditure surpassed that of Magpale and Durano combined. Similarly, in 2016, the combined expenditures of the second and third runners-up were significantly lower than Magpale's, indicating the effectiveness of her campaign strategy and party affiliation. Magpale's victory can be attributed to her incumbency as Vice Governor and substantial backing from the Liberal Party. Her strategic allocation of resources, particularly towards advertisements, played a crucial role in her electoral success in both elections.

Table 2. Distribution of expenditures and votes for vice-gubernatorial elections

2013 Election	Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1. Magpale, Agnes	2,736,312	0.4	548,455	0.5
2. Soco, Glen Anthony	3,357,279	0.5	381,120	0.3
3. Durano, Ramon IV	280,000	0.0	180,939	0.2
2016 Election				
1. Magpale, Agnes A.	1,044,053	0.8	721,276	0.6
2. Ruiz, Nerissa	244,249	0.2	482,315	0.4
3. Montenegro, Juanito M.	10,000	0.0	40,274	0.0

First District Representative Elections

Table 3. Distribution of expenditures and votes for first district representative elections

2013 Election	Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1. Gullas, Gerald Anthony	503,801	100%	176,632	Gullas, Gerald Anthony
2016 Election				
1. Gullas, Gerald Anthony	704,698	62%	186,091	65%
2. Canoy, Antonio Llanto	413,609	36%	92,589	32%
3. Nunez, Michael Espina	21,514	2%	6,612	2%

Table 3 displays the breakdown of campaign expenses for Gerald Anthony Gullas, the unopposed candidate for first district representative in the 2013 elections. Gullas, who spent 503,801 pesos, received 176,632 votes due to a lack of competitors, guaranteeing his victory. He self-funded his campaign, distributing 53% of the budget to printed materials, 20% to travel, and 16% to hiring watchers.

During the 2016 elections, the total expenditure by first district representative candidates amounted to Php1,139,821.64. Gullas contributed 61.83% of this total, amounting to 704,698 pesos. He accumulated 186,091 votes, surpassing his rival Antonio Llanto Canoy by 291,089 pesos. Canoy funded his campaign independently, spending 413,609 pesos and securing 92,589 votes. Michael Espina Nunez, who came in third, only spent Php21,514 and gained 6,612 votes. Gullas sourced 23% of his campaign funds from various outlets, allocating 15% to compensating campaigners, 12% to meetings and rallies, and 7% to travel. Canoy, on the other hand, divided his budget with 40% going to printed materials, 22% to meetings, and 21% to travel. Both candidates emphasized traditional campaign methods over advertising. In contrast to 2013, Gullas encountered more competition in 2016 when he ran with the Nacionalista Party. He possibly capitalized on his family's political heritage, inherited from his grandfather Eduardo Gullas, a former first district representative. Gullas, outspending all opponents combined, outshone them by 30.76% in popularity, indicating a lack of equally strong challengers. Canoy funded his campaign independently, allocating a significant portion to printed materials, meetings, and travel.

Second District Representative Elections

Table 4. Distribution of expenditures and votes for second district representative elections

2013 Election	Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1. Caminero, Wilfredo	808,652	44%	91,529	49%
2. Garcia, Pablo	600,000	32%	86,105	46%
3. Kintanar, Simeon	450,000	24%	10,137	5%
2016 Election				
1. Caminero, Wilfredo	217,458	41%	81,167	81%
2. Celes, Teresita	213,625	40%	11,893	12%
3. Kintanar, Cora-Lou	105,565	20%	7,453	7%

As shown in Table 4, the second successful campaign of Caminero took place in 2013 for the position of the second district representative. He spent 808,652 pesos 43.51% of the total expense and received 91,529 votes, which constituted 48.75%. The least number of votes was evident for Garci who spent 600,000 pesos 32.28% of the total and received 86,105 votes 45.86% of the total, which left Caminero behind only 5,424 votes 2.89%. The distribution of finances for their campaigns was: 48% for employment of the watchers, 21% for advertisements, and 18% for printed materials, with 13% and 9% left for other expenses, correspondingly for Caminero; and 30%, 30%, and 18% for travel, printed materials, and employment of watchers, mainly 13% and 9% for other expenses, correspondingly. Specifically, spending on printed materials and employment of watchers was the most remarkable dissimilarity. Although Garci identified as a Nationalist and was associated with politics through her family, the campaigner's choice of liberals and Caminero's successful implementation of resource mobilization determined the victory of the early candidate. In 2016, Caminero also won the elections spending 217,458 pesos 40.51% of the total and receiving 81,167 votes 80.75% of the total. Celes had spent 213,625 pesos 39.81% of the total and received 11,893 votes 11.83% of the total. The third candidate, Kintanar, spent 105.565 pesos 19.67% of the total, and received 7,453 votes 7.41% of the total. The expenditures were distributed differently: 60% and 40% were allocated to printed materials and travel expenses aspects, correspondingly. Celes spend money only on travel, salaries of campaigners and especially employment, which was paid 44%, 40%, and 9%. Therefore, Caminero's victory in 2016 was determined by incumbency, lack of experienced competencies, and available Liberal party colleagues. Hence, the political party did not play a significant role in the electoral process.

Third District Representative Elections

Table 5. Distribution of expenditures and votes for third district representative elections

2013 Election	Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1. Garcia, Gwendolyn	375,338	21%	105,424	50%
2. Yapha, Geraldine	1,410,856	79%	103,440	50%
2016 Election				
1. Garcia, Gwendolyn	841,895	67%	140,097	62%
2. Sanchez, Grecilda	420,013	33%	83,023	37%
3. Osorio, Teodoro	0	0%	2,206	1%

As shown in Table 5, despite experiencing relatively lower expenditures than her contender, with 375,338 pesos accounting for 21.01% of total costs, Gwendolyn Garcia won the election with 105,424 votes, representing 50.47%

of total votes. Conversely, although spending 1,410,856 pesos, which constitutes 78.99% of total expenditure, Geraldine Yapha lost with 103,449 votes, which represents 49.53% of total votes. Yapha's expenditure was three times that of Garcia, but she lost by 1,984 votes, accounting for 0.94% of total votes. However, in the 2016 elections, Garcia led with 884,907 pesos, which constitutes 66.72% of total expenditure and won with 140,097 votes, which is 62.18%. Her competitor, Grecilda Sanchez, spent 523,013 pesos, which constitutes 33.28% and garnered 83,023 votes, which is 36.95%. Garcia lost by 57,074 votes, which is 25.33%. Worth noting is Garcia funded her campaign from her pocket, and she spent 87% and 10%, and 3% of her expenditure went to physical materials and advertisements, respectively. Garcia won the election using her political experience and family interests, while Yapha relation's defeat despite her spending outlays the role of wealth and political history. Party alignment underscored by Garcia served under the United Nationalist Alliance, and Sanchez served as the Liberal Party was a factor in the election. Generally, Garcia won the elections showing the societal nature of family, wealth, and politics in Cebu's politics.

Fourth District Representative Elections

Table 6. Distribution of expenditures and votes for Fourth District Representative elections

2013 Election		Expenditure	Total Percentage of Expenses	Votes	Total Percentage of Votes
1.	Salimbangon, Benhur	379,271	55%	124,552	63%
2.	Martinez, Celistino III	307,492	45%	73,811	37%
2016 Election					
1.	Salimbangon, Benhur	173,478	26%	135,437	61%
2.	Martinez, Celestino	491,846	74%	86,836	39%

Table 6 presents the campaign expenses of candidates running for the position of fourth district representative in the 2013 elections, totaling Php686,762.83. Incumbent congressman Benhur Salimbangon emerged victorious after spending Php379,271 and securing 124,552 votes, defeating Celestino Martinez III by 50,741 votes. Martinez, who spent Php307,492, allocated less funds compared to Salimbangon. Salimbangon independently financed his campaign, distributing 38% to hiring watchers, 37% to printed materials, and 18% to travel. In contrast, Martinez, not receiving external contributions, allocated 45% to printed materials, 22% to travel, and 14% to delivery charges. Salimbangon represented the National Unity Party, while Martinez was associated with the Liberal Party. During the 2016 elections, fourth district representative candidates collectively spent Php665,323.45. Salimbangon, with expenditures amounting to Php173,478, clinched victory over Martinez, who spent Php491,896. Salimbangon directed 73% of his funds to hire council members, 18% to printed materials, and 9% to travel. Similarly, Martinez, who also self-financed his campaign, allocated 60% to advertisements and 20% to printed materials. Salimbangon's success, despite his lower spending, was ascribed to his incumbency and affiliation with the National Unity Party, whereas Martinez's ties to the Liberal Party distinguished him from the other candidates.

3.2 Relationship Between Election Expenditures and Total Votes

2013 Election

Table 7. Correlation analysis result

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.879 ^a	.773	.765	79923.991

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Expense

Table 7 determines the degree of correlation between campaign spending and total votes cast by the candidates in the 2013 Gubernatorial, Vice Gubernatorial, and District Representatives elections. The result shows a strong correlation between the total amount of expenditure (an independent variable) and the total votes cast (a dependent variable) for election year 2013. The value of "R" is 0.879, indicating a high positive correlation between the expenditures and votes cast. This means that there is a confidence level of 87.9% positive correlation. The result also shows that the values of the "R Square" and "Adjusted R Square" are considerably high. The value of the "Adjusted R Square" is 0.765 or 76.5% of the total votes cast vis-à-vis the total amount of expenditure.

Table 8 reports how well the regression equation fits the data. The results show that the value of "Sig." is 0.000, which is the perfect value to ascertain that the data happened not by chance. The regression model predicts the total votes cast significantly well. In other words, the data is 95% (level of significance used in the study), sure that

it did not happen by chance and that the expenses incurred in this election predict the total votes cast by each candidate.

Table 8. Regression analysis result

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	652527099527.681	1	652527099527.681	102.151	.000 ^b
Residual	191635331684.194	30	6387844389.473		
Total	844162431211.875	31			

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast
b. Predictors: (Constant), Total Expense

Table 9 provides the necessary information to predict the total votes cast from the total campaign expenditures. The value of "Sig." is 0.000, less than 0.05. This is considered the perfect value, suggesting that the data is 95% sure it did not happen by chance. The value of the "B" column under the "Unstandardized Coefficients" column is 0.119, which indicates an 11.9 increase in the number of votes for every 26,826 peso increase in expenditures. The regression equation can be presented as votes cast = 26,826 + .119 (expenses). In other words, for the Gubernatorial, Vice-Gubernatorial, and District representative elections, the number of votes garnered was increased by 11.9 when the candidates incurred more value/pesos in their campaign expenditures.

Table 9. Significance analysis result

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	26825.745	17094.437		1.569	.127	-8085.752	61737.243
Total Expense	.119	.012	.879	10.107	.000	.095	.143

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast

2016 Election

Table 10. Correlation analysis result

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.758 ^a	.574	.563	116833.059

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Expense

Table 10 shows a strong correlation between the total amount of expenditure (independent variable) and the total votes cast (dependent variable) for election year 2016. The value of "R" is 0.758, indicating a 75.8% positive correlation between the expenditures and votes cast. The value of the "Adjusted R Square" is .563. This means the total expenditure explains 56.3% of the votes cast.

Table 11. Regression analysis result

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	699848616864.394	1	699848616864.394	51.271	.000 ^b
Residual	518698619189.381	38	13649963662.878		
Total	1218547236053.774	39			

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast
b. Predictors: (Constant), Total Expense

Table 11 shows that the value of "Sig." is 0.000 which is less than 0.005. This value indicates that the regression model statistically and significantly predicts the outcome variable (votes cast). In other words, the data is 95% sure it did not happen by chance. However, it presents the statistical prediction that the total expenses greatly affected the electoral outcome during the 2016 elections.

Table 12. Significance analysis result

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	45560.385	20654.459		2.206	.034	3747.619	87373.151
Total Expense	.146	.020	.758	7.160	.000	.104	.187

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast

The value of "Sig." in Table 12 is 0.000, which is considered a perfect value. It is also less than 0.005, indicating that this data is 95% sure it did not happen by chance. The value of the "B" column under the "Unstandardized Coefficients" column is 0.146, indicating a 14.6 increase in the number of votes for every 45,560 pesos increase in

expenditures. The regression equation can be presented as votes cast = 45560 + .146 (expenses). In other words, for the 2016 Gubernatorial, Vice-Gubernatorial, and District Representatives elections, the number of votes garnered can be increased by 14.6 if the candidates incur more value/pesos in their campaign expenditures.

The election results from 2013 and 2016 highlight the significant impact of campaign expenditures on electoral outcomes. Candidates who invested more in their campaigns tended to achieve victories, demonstrating the sway of financial resources. In 2013, there was a strong correlation of 76.5% between campaign spending and votes, with each additional Php26,826 linked to 11.9 more votes. However, by the 2016 elections, this correlation had decreased to a moderate 56.3%, with each increment of Php45,560 resulting in only 14.6 additional votes. Consequently, candidates in 2016 spent approximately Php3,052.1 per vote, a significant increase compared to the Php2,254.29 in 2013, signaling rising campaign costs. While effective, the demand for significant financial backing poses challenges for candidates. The financial emphasis in elections may jeopardize the caliber of elected officials, prioritizing resources over qualifications. The game theory of spending elucidates the competitive nature of campaign expenditures, underscoring how surpassing opponents in spending can sway voter favor. Scholarly research supports the notion that higher campaign spending correlates with increased vote shares, emphasizing the crucial role of financial resources in electoral triumph. Nevertheless, while campaign spending impacts election results, victory is not assured, with other factors also playing crucial roles, necessitating thorough analyses of electoral dynamics. Nonetheless, campaign spending remains a key factor in shaping election results, underscoring its enduring importance in the electoral sphere.

3.3 Relationship Between Subcategories of Spending and Total Votes

The objective of this part of the study is to reveal the correlation of the subcategories [(i.e., travel expenses, compensation of campaigners, communication expenses, printed materials, employment of watchers, campaign headquarters, political meetings & rallies, and advertisements (media, etc.)) of campaign expenditures to the votes cast for the positions of Governor, Vice Governor, and District Representatives.

2013 Elections

Table 13. Correlation analysis result

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.941 ^a	.886	.846	64816.880
a. Predictors: (Constant), Advertisements, Communication Expenses, Compensation of Campaigners, Employment of Watchers, Campaign Headquarters, Printed Materials, Travel Expenses, Meetings & Rallies				

Table 13 determines the degree of correlation between campaign spending and total votes cast by the candidates in the 2013 Gubernatorial, Vice Gubernatorial, and District Representatives elections. As seen in the table above, there is a robust correlation between the total amount of expenditure (independent variables) and the total votes cast (dependent variable) for election year 2013. The value of "R" is 0.941, indicating a 94.1% positive correlation between the overall expenditures and votes cast. The value of the "Adjusted R Square" is 0.886 or 88.6% of the total votes cast, which is explained by the total amount of expenditure. This means that in the election year of 2013, for the positions of Governor, Vice-Governor, and District Representatives in the province of Cebu, there was an 88.6% degree of correlation between the total campaign expenditures and total votes cast.

Table 14. Regression analysis result

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	747534189041.340	8	93441773630.168	22.242	.000 ^b
	Residual	96628242170.535	23	4201227920.458		
	Total	844162431211.875	31			
a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Advertisements, Meetings & Rallies, Communication Expenses, Travel Expenses, Employment of Watchers, Printed Materials, Campaign Headquarters, Compensation of Campaigners						

Table 14 reports how well the regression equation fits the data. The table shows that the regression model predicts significantly well and with a high degree of the dependent variable (votes cast). In the "Regression" row and the "Sig." column, the value of "Sig." is 0.000, which is considered the highest value. Such indicates that overall, the

regression model statistically and significantly predicts the outcome variable (votes cast). In other words, the data is 95% sure that it did not happen by chance and that the expenses incurred in this election predict the total votes cast by each candidate.

Table 15. Significance analysis result

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	28912.604	17791.476		1.625	.118	-7891.867	65717.076
Travel Expense	.174	.199	.097	.874	.391	-.238	.586
Compensation of Campaigners	-.010	.236	-.008	-.043	.966	-.498	.478
Communication Expenses	-1.430	.616	-.188	-2.321	.029	-2.704	-.156
Printed Materials	.313	.090	.380	3.483	.002	.127	.499
Employment of Watchers	-.050	.110	-.053	-.451	.656	-.277	.178
Campaign Headquarters	-.677	1.160	-.096	-.584	.565	-3.076	1.722
Meetings & Rallies	.071	.201	.032	.351	.729	-.346	.487
Advertisements	.146	.025	.690	5.748	.000	.094	.199

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast

Table 15 reveals the necessary information to predict the total votes cast from the total campaign expenditures. The "Sig." column can only determine the significance level. The examination of campaign expenses for the 2013 Gubernatorial, Vice-Gubernatorial, and District Representative elections provides valuable insights into the correlation between spending and election results. Notably, only two types of expenditures – Advertisements and Printed Materials – emerged as statistically significant predictors of the number of votes received. Specifically, the statistical significance (Sig.) values indicate the importance of each expenditure category. Travel Expenses, Compensation of Campaigners, Communication Expenses, Employment of Watchers, Campaign Headquarters, Meetings, and Rallies all displayed Sig. values above 0.05, implying that the data collected for these categories may have occurred by chance. In contrast, Advertisements and Printed Materials stood out with Sig. values below 0.05, signifying that these expenses had a substantial impact on voter behavior. Particularly, Advertisements exhibited the highest level of significance, suggesting that with every 28,913 pesos increase in advertising expenditures, there was a corresponding decrease of 14.6 votes. Moreover, the "Unstandardized Coefficients" offer insight into the influence of each expenditure category on votes obtained. Printed Materials, for example, showed a coefficient of 0.313, implying a 31.3 vote increase for every 28,913 pesos spent on these materials. Although some categories showed no statistical significance, they still hold importance in conveying campaign messages. Therefore, candidates must strategically distribute their resources to maximize their impact. By focusing on media advertisements and printed campaign materials, candidates can more effectively influence voter behavior compared to traditional methods like meetings and rallies. In conclusion, the efficient allocation of campaign funds is vital for candidates to optimize spending and improve their electoral chances. By prioritizing expenditures with the most significant impact on voter behavior, candidates can make informed decisions to enhance their campaign effectiveness and increase the likelihood of success in elections.

2016 Elections

Table 16. Correlation analysis result

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.797 ^a	.635	.541	119699.208
a. Predictors: (Constant), Advertisements, Communication Expenses, Compensation of Campaigners, Employment of Watchers, Campaign Headquarters, Printed Materials, Travel Expenses, Meetings & Rallies				

Table 16 shows a robust correlation between the total types of expenditure (independent variables) and the total votes cast (dependent variable) for the 2016 elections. The "R" represents the simple correlation with a value of 0.797, which indicates a 79.7% positive correlation between the expenditures and votes cast. Although it has a much lesser positive correlation than the 2013 election, it can still be considered statistically significant. The result also shows that there is a very high degree of correlation. However, compared to the 2013 election, which had a

value of 0.941, the "Adjusted R Square" in 2016 was only 0.541. In other words, the total expenditure can explain 54.1% of the total votes cast.

Table 17. Regression analysis result

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	774382325122.673	8	96797790640.334	6.756	.000 ^b
	Residual	444164910931.102	31	14327900352.616		
	Total	1218547236053.774	39			
a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Advertisements, Meetings & Rallies, Communication Expenses, Travel Expenses, Employment of Watchers, Printed Materials, Campaign Headquarters, Compensation of Campaigners						

As shown in the Table 17, the regression model predicts with a very high degree the dependent variable (votes cast) statistically and significantly well, just like in the 2013 elections. In making sense of the "Regression" row and the "Sig." column, the value of "Sig." is 0.00. Such a figure is considered the highest value and is less than 0.005, indicating that the regression model statistically and significantly predicts the outcome variable (votes cast). In other words, the data is 95% (with a 5% margin of error), sure that it did not happen by chance and that the expenses incurred in this election predict the votes cast by the candidates.

Table 18. Significance analysis result

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	55895.953	25354.662		2.205	.035	4184.779	107607.126
Travel Expenses	.061	.305	.050	.201	.842	-.561	.684
Compensation of Campaigners	-.136	.462	-.037	-.293	.771	-1.078	.807
Communication Expenses	-2.746	11.376	-.028	-.241	.811	-25.946	20.455
Printed Materials	.146	.121	.219	1.200	.239	-.102	.393
Employment of Watchers	.012	.591	.002	.021	.984	-1.193	1.217
Campaign Headquarters	.117	.579	.024	.203	.841	-1.063	1.298
Meetings & Rallies	-.738	.982	-.211	-.752	.458	-2.741	1.265
Advertisements	.226	.049	.834	4.583	.000	.125	.326

a. Dependent Variable: Votes Cast

As shown in Table 18, among the various spending categories examined, only Advertisements were found to be both statistically significant and reliable in predicting the number of votes. For categories like Travel Expenses, Compensation of Campaigners, and Communication Expenses, the "Sig." values exceeded 0.005, indicating random correlations. Additionally, the "Unstandardized Coefficients" for these categories did not show significant impacts on voter behavior. In contrast, Advertisements demonstrated a high level of significance with a "Sig." value of 0.000. The "Unstandardized Coefficients" revealed a positive influence on votes, with a 22.6 increase for every 55,895 pesos rise in expenses. This emphasizes the importance of investing in modern campaign methods that offer convenience to candidates, despite their higher costs.

The study also identified a shift in campaign tactics, with candidates increasingly favoring digital platforms like social media for publicity over traditional methods such as campaign materials and rallies, especially in challenging locations with low attendance rates. Comparing these findings to the 2013 elections, candidates from that cycle seemed to allocate their funds more effectively, as shown by the stronger correlation between expenditure subcategories and votes. This underscores the significance of strategic budgeting to maximize the effectiveness of campaign expenditures. In conclusion, the changing landscape of campaign spending emphasizes the necessity for candidates to adapt and invest in strategies that efficiently communicate information to voters. Leveraging resources like social media can offer a cost-effective alternative to traditional advertising methods, leading to a more efficient utilization of campaign funds.

3.4 Insights and Policy Recommendations

The Necessity and Effect of Campaign Spending

The researcher believed that campaign expenditure is essential for any electoral ambition. Candidates who run for any position without funds (personal or donations) will experience disadvantages in competing with candidates with financial resources. All respondents also believed that campaign spending is necessary in an election. The most common purpose of campaign spending is used for logistics, where candidates will have to spend money on vehicles for travel, bringing campaign paraphernalia and people to a destination where the campaigning may happen; it can also be used by the supporters or campaigners to roam around the constituencies to put up posters or give leaflets to the public. For campaigning, each candidate must roam around the city or province where they are campaigning so that the people will personally see and hear from them through their platforms and convince them why they should vote for the candidate. An election officer states that *"Politics in the Philippines is not cheap. Candidates who need more money to run a campaign will have difficulty roaming around campaigning. They cannot visit each place for their campaign, and going around takes weeks to finish, so it is not that easy."*

The researcher surmised that the main reason why candidates spend during elections is to benefit from publicity for themselves. Politicians wanted to reach out to the people so they could promote themselves to the voting populace. Publicity can be done in various ways and requires considerable money. Reaching out to the masses is also a challenging task and, all the more, not cheap. Thinking about the number of people a candidate must bring and the number of places that they should pay a visit already costs money for transportation and food. Sometimes, a candidate can only visit some places, so they also have to spend money on printing campaign materials like tarpaulins and leaflets to be posted in the major public areas for the voters to see. These campaign paraphernalia are essential tools that any candidate will use, as they are the easiest and most convenient way to promote themselves or advertise themselves to the public. The most common paraphernalia used by most candidates were posters posted to public places; some of them were made from used sacks, manila papers, or Carolina, where candidates would write their names and the position they are running; some used bond papers with their printed names or pictures on it and some candidates nowadays use tarpaulins, which are more expensive but much larger and much more durable than any conventional posters. For wealthy or well-funded candidates, the media is also used for efficient and effective advertising, either by radio or television. Some candidates used these methods as the fastest, most convenient, yet most expensive way of campaigning because paying for the advertisements on TV or radio is expensive. Election candidates also share the same opinion that money fuels the effectiveness of one's campaign as it is necessary for practical campaign operations. In his statement, one mentioned that, *"To be honest, if you do not spend money on your candidacy, naturally, you do not have extensive publicity, like preparation and procurement of tarpaulins. That is very important so the public will know you are a candidate."*

Respondents generally concurred that financial resources can provide candidates with an edge, heightening their chances of triumphing in elections. Yet, it's crucial to emphasize that money is not the sole deciding factor in electoral results. While substantial campaign expenditures can sway outcomes, they are not the sole variable in the equation. Numerous victorious candidates hail from well-established political lineages, utilizing their family background to strengthen their candidacy. This hereditary legacy often bestows upon them a perceived advantage, surpassing even more seasoned rivals. Nevertheless, financial resources alone do not guarantee electoral victory. Qualities like integrity, experience, and distinct attributes also play pivotal roles in winning over voters. Even though candidates who solely rely on their platforms may encounter obstacles due to limited exposure, campaign spending does not assure success. Candidates lacking significant financial support can still secure victories if they possess other appealing traits, such as political dynastic ties or robust party endorsement. In the end, the impact of money has its constraints, as underscored by an election officer, *"Campaign spending has effects; it does not necessarily prevail since there were also some candidates who spent more money but were unable to win the election, so it is not the only factor as there are other bases for you to win."*

Nevertheless, this research proved that spending on the campaign is still the most critical action every candidate should take because, regardless of whether a candidate has other factors, they still have to spend to make these other factors effective. Five out of five of the respondents agreed with the research that campaign spending has a positive effect on the outcome of the election. They also thought that campaign spending was one of the main factors in winning since their most common explanation is that candidates must travel. Since campaigning is always about letting the people know about their candidacy. Most of the time, candidates must travel to different

places, incredibly far-flung areas, to reach the electorates and convince them to be present in the polling precincts and vote for them. This implies that candidates must have the financial capacity to promote their candidacy. No matter how unfair it may be for those who do not have such an amount, the current system only allows those who can spend during the campaign, whether from personal money or through donations from relatives, friends, and supporters. The election is a race based on platforms, familiarity, or publicity, and candidates have no choice but to spend money for them to reach their voters. Voters will most likely ignore candidates with insufficient publicity since they are unknown.

Questions on SOCE's Reliability

Money is essential in running an election, but the unexpected worth of it adds more pressure to ordinary people. Even rich politicians are outspent by their opponents in many ways, and they find it difficult to know. The respondents repeatedly mentioned the issue of undeclared expenses during the election. They believed that candidates, specifically the rich ones, spent more than what was declared in their SOCE. Though there are specific penalties for not saying campaign expenditures in the SOCE, the respondents still believed that there are candidates who go beyond the limit. An election officer mentioned, *"That is very simple. You cannot get a real outcome because it is not true that the candidates will declare their expenses; it is because they will estimate their spending to comply with the law."* Another added *"It is public knowledge that even if the COMELEC regulates or limits campaign spending, candidates still go beyond the limits. Filing SOCE is not that honest since many expenses are hidden just to satisfy the limits of the requirement provided."*

The stated campaign expenses of candidates in their SOCE were deemed to represent their actual expenditures. However, there are apprehensions about candidates exceeding legal limits, leading to a scenario where only the affluent can truly vie for positions, swaying voters through financial supremacy. This exclusivity could obstruct aspiring leaders from public service due to financial restrictions. Survey participants were doubtful about the accuracy of SOCE data and mentioned potential underreporting to conform to legal boundaries and unreported expenses linked to illicit activities like vote-buying. While these concerns merit scrutiny, the ultimate responsibility lies with the government, especially COMELEC, to enforce rules and sanctions against deceitful candidates. Neglecting thorough examination of SOCE submissions implies toleration of potential overspending as inconsequential, diminishing the credibility of elections and democracy itself. The impact of finance on elections is a shared concern necessitating proactive steps from all stakeholders to uphold democratic principles.

4.0 Conclusion

In this regression analysis, the variable "Advertisements" shows a significant positive coefficient (Beta = 0.834, $p < 0.05$), indicating that an increase in spending on advertisements is associated with a significant increase in the number of votes cast. Therefore, we can accept the hypothesis that spending on advertisements positively affects the number of votes cast. However, for the other variables such as "Travel Expenses," "Compensation of Campaigners," "Communication Expenses," "Printed Materials," "Employment of Watchers," "Campaign Headquarters," and "Meetings & Rallies," their coefficients are not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). This suggests that there is no significant relationship between spending on these campaign components and the number of votes cast. Therefore, we should reject the hypothesis that spending on these campaign components affects the number of votes cast. The hypothesis that money can affect the outcome of elections is supported by the findings of this research. However, this does not necessarily mean that the influence of money on elections is inherently negative. While it is true that excessive spending can lead to various problems and exploitations, such as corruption and the perpetuation of political dynasties, it is essential to recognize that the issue lies not with money itself but with how it is used in the electoral process. The potential for candidates to engage in corrupt practices in exchange for financial support is a legitimate concern. However, this does not mean that all candidates who spend large amounts of money engage in corruption. Effective regulation and oversight mechanisms can mitigate this risk, ensuring transparency and accountability in campaign finance. While it is true that financial resources can provide an advantage in elections, it is not an insurmountable barrier for qualified professionals without significant financial backing. Public financing mechanisms and grassroots organizing efforts can level the playing field, allowing candidates from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds to compete effectively. Money's influence on elections may undermine the democratic process, but it is not the sole determinant of electoral outcomes. Factors such as candidate qualifications, policy platforms, and grassroots mobilization also play significant roles in shaping election results. Moreover, the responsibility to uphold democratic values and promote the public good

ultimately lies with both voters and elected officials, regardless of their financial resources. While money's influence on elections can present challenges and negative consequences, it is not an inherent flaw in the electoral system. By implementing effective regulations, promoting transparency, and fostering civic engagement, societies can mitigate the negative impacts of money in politics and uphold the integrity of the democratic process.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The sole author initiated and completed this study.

6.0 Funding

This work is funded by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) through CHED K to 12 Transition Scholarship Program.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researcher would like to acknowledge the following people because this research paper was made with them: Mr. Rejene T. Lakibul, thesis adviser, who helped the researcher step by step in crafting this paper. To the Commission of Higher Education (CHED), which has funded the researcher throughout the entire Master's education. To the University of Southeastern Philippines (USEP), which has supported and endorsed the researcher to apply for a scholarship program. To the University of San Carlos (USC), which has moulded the researcher to become a better political science practitioner. To family and friends who have shown their undying support and guidance throughout this study.

9.0 References

- Bardwell, K. (2003). Campaign finance laws and the competition for spending in gubernatorial elections. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(4), 811–825.
- Bardwell, K. (2003). Not all money is equal: The differential effect of spending by incumbents and challengers in gubernatorial primaries. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 3(3), 294–308.
- Besley, T. (2005). Political selection. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(3), 43–60.
- Brady, H. E., Johnston, R., & Sides, J. (2006). Do political campaigns matter? Capturing campaign effects. Retrieved February 21, 2018, from <https://home.gwu.edu/~jsides/study.pdf>
- Bueza, M. (2016). Fast Facts: What you ought to know about Cebu and elections. Retrieved March 23, 2018, from Rappler: <https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/iq/126256-fast-facts-cebu-elections>
- Cage, J. (2018). Even in France, Money Rules Politics. Retrieved February 16, 2018, from Institute for New Economic Thinking: <https://www.ineteconomics.org/perspectives/blog/even-in-france-money-rules-politics>
- Chang, C. P., & Lee, C. C. (2009). Does candidates' advertising spending help them win? *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, 12(3), 201–218.
- Coates, D. (1999). The effects of campaign spending on electoral outcomes: A data envelopment analysis. *Public Choice*, 99(1–2), pp. 15–37.
- Donovan, T. (2007). Effects of Campaign Spending in Local Nonpartisan Elections. Retrieved on. Retrieved February 14, 2018, from http://www.faculty.wvu.edu/~donovat/wpsa07_spend.pdf
- Eagles, M. (1993). Money and votes in Canada: Campaign spending and parliamentary election outcomes, 1984 and 1988. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, 432–449.
- Eagles, M. (2004). The effectiveness of local campaign spending in Canada's 1993 and 1997 federal elections. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, 37(1), 117–136.
- Erikson, R. S., & Palfrey, T. R. (2000). Equilibria in campaign spending games: Theory and data. *American Political Science Review*, 94(3), 595–609.
- Facts and Figures. (2017). Retrieved March 4, 2018, from the Republic of the Philippines, Province of Cebu: <http://www.cebuph/about-cebu/facts-and-figures/>
- Figueiredo Filho, D. B. (2014). Is the effect of campaign spending higher in poorer electoral districts? Retrieved February 15, 2018, from https://ostromworkshop.indiana.edu/pdf/seriespapers/2014f_c/filhopaper.pdf
- Gius, M. (2009). The Effects of Campaign Expenditures on Congressional Elections. *American Review of Political Economy*, 7(1/2), 51.
- Hicken, A., Aspinall, E., & Weiss, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Electoral Dynamics in the Philippines: Money Politics, Patronage and Clientelism at the Grassroots*. NUS Press
- Hogan, R. E. (2013). Campaign spending and voter participation in state legislative elections. *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(3).
- Holmes, R. D. (2016). The dark side of electoralism: Opinion polls and voting in the 2016 Philippine presidential election. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 35(3), 15–38.
- Jacobson, G. C. (1990). The effects of campaign spending in House elections: New evidence for old arguments. *American Journal of Political Science*, pp. 334–362.
- Jacobson, G. C. (2015). How do campaigns matter? *Annual Review of Political Science*, pp. 18, 31–47.
- Loewen, P. J. (2005). How Do Local Candidates Spend Their Money? Moreover, Does it Matter? In Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Republic Act No. 7166.. (1991). An act providing for synchronized national and local elections and electoral reforms, authorizing appropriations therefor, http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra_7166_1991.html
- Orndorff III, H. (2017). Campaign Spending and the 2014 Florida's Gubernatorial Race: A Research Note. *Journal of Florida Studies*, Vol. 1 Issue 6, p1-13. 13p. .
- Put, G. J., Maddens, B., & Smulders, J. (2014). Are you buying local votes? Campaign spending effects in Belgian local elections. Retrieved February 16, 2018, from <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/464438/1/inlogov.pdf>
- Rekkas, M. (2007). The impact of campaign spending on votes in multiparty elections. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(3), 573–585.
- Rokkan, S. (2009). Citizens, elections, parties: Approaches to the comparative study of the processes of development. ECPR Press.
- Samuels, D. (2001). Incumbents and challengers on a level playing field: assessing the impact of campaign finance in Brazil. *Journal of Politics*, 63(2), 569–584.
- Sobari, W. (2017). *Patronage driven democracy: Emerging local politics in the Post-Soeharto Indonesia*. Airlangga University Press.
- Stratmann, T. (2006). Contribution limits and the effectiveness of campaign spending. *Public Choice*, 129(3–4), 461–474.
- Sudulich, M. L., & Wall, M. (2011). How do candidates spend their money? Objects of campaign spending and the effectiveness of diversification. *Electoral Studies*, 30(1), 91–101.
- SunStar, P. (2017, November 14). Cebu is the fifth most populous province, according to the census. Retrieved March 4, 201