

A CASE STUDY ON THE INFLUENCE OF KINSHIP ON VOTING PREFERENCE AMONG YOUTH VOTERS IN BARANGAY PASONG TAMO QUEZON CITY (2022)

* Dana Janelle B. Artes

** Trichelle Laye P. Garganta

*** Margarete Riva B. Meneses

**** Irah Jane M. Miguel

Paper Received: 17.02.2023 / **Paper Accepted:** 25.03.2023 / **Paper Published:** 26.03.2023

Corresponding Author: Dana Janelle B. Artes; doi:10.46360/cosmos.ahe.520231008

Abstract

Kinship is the foundation of society to teach the youth to see reality. Hence, kinship's influence affects the youth's decisions in their everyday lives, including political preferences. A generation gap between the older and younger members may signify the former's influence to be coercive or persuasive to the latter, especially in their decisions. Thus, it conveys the similarities and differences between kinship and youths' preferences on whom they will vote for during the elections. This study aimed to understand the perceived influence of kinship on the experiences of youth voters in their voting preferences in the 2022 Mayoral Elections in Quezon City. As the study was qualitative and phenomenological, the collected data analyzed the concrete experiences and responses from the bonafide twelve (12) youth voters from Barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City, using multiple sampling techniques such as the Criterion Sampling, Snowball Sampling, and Emergent Sampling. The data observed the point of saturation. The findings indicated an actual influence of kinship among the youth voters regarding their voting preferences in the 2022 Mayoral Election in Quezon City. It revealed that political activeness, preferences, and expectations from the mayoral candidate, and lastly, the effect of the influence of kinship encompasses the youth voters' free will and limitations to choose their preferred candidates. Furthermore, this study provided a basis for future researchers to improve and deeply understand the experiences of youth voters on the influence of kinship on their voting preferences for the mayoral candidate.

Keywords: Elections, Kinship Influence, Mayoral Candidacy, Voting Preferences, Youth Voters.

Introduction

Kinship is a social structure rooted in close relationships among its members. The ties of kinship are established by marriage, procreation, and adoption (Sahlin, 2013, as cited in Crossman, 2019). Kinship is also paradoxical and a premise of a symbolic discourse (Kuper, 2018; Sahlin, 2014; & Scheneider, 1968). Kuper (2018) argues that this is due to the elements of *mutual trust of being* and *reciprocity of being* towards its members. In the study of Sahlin (2011), as cited by Nolasco (2020), *mutual trust of being* refers to people who are members of the same family and are intimately involved in each other's lives. On the other hand, *reciprocity of being* signifies the mysterious efficiency of connectedness and kinship formation through social construction and procreation. However, it is also argued that kinship is not just about blood relations but can also be formed through shared values and norms, such as culture, language, rules, and even the decision-making process (Schneider 1968, as cited in Ottenheimer, 2007).

According to Cain (2016), "Parents affect folk's knowledge of politics, the principles they bring to politics, and their citizenship practices." As stated by the same author, judgments are recognized at various abstraction levels wherein, due to the family members' responsibilities, one family member may oversee relatively high choices. Meanwhile, the other is in order of lower-level decisions. For instance, in a patriarchal family system, the father, considered the head of the family, has the authority in every decision-making. In comparison, family members who can utilize lower-level decisions are the mother and their children. They have a small-scale influence in the household compared to the father. Nevertheless, regarding politics, parents also influence their children, particularly the first-time voters, on which candidate they must vote (Kinder, 2006). Youth's political interests may vary in a short period of time but, with their voter preferences influenced by their parents and several factors, they may have their own decisions on who to vote (Russo & Stattin, 2016). As the 2022 Mayoral elections in

*-**** Centro Escolar University - Manila, Philippines.

the Philippines are anticipated, the influence of kinship in the voter preference among the youth voters in the Philippines, particularly in the Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City, is worth examining to understand if how situations such as influencing their children on their voting preferences affect their overall decisions.

Background of the Study

Kinship equates to a structured system bound by one another by complex interlocking ties. It also refers to people's biological and quasi-biological relationship that establishes their respective rights and duties (Murdock, 1949, as cited in Passmore & Jordan, 2020). Moreover, *kinship* is also considered a relationship by blood in simple terms called family. The family is the primary building block of society and as Brown (2022) puts it, this stands at the center of social life as it provides support to each individual member, binding them into social groups, and participating outside the primary group. In the study of Ewherido (2020), there are two distinguished types of family: the *nuclear family* and the *extended family*. The *nuclear family* describes a family that consists of three to four members, including the parents and their children. On the other hand, the *extended family* signifies the relatives that live in the same household.

An enmeshed family system is more connected to the extended family than the nuclear family. Hence research has found that an enmeshed family system exists (Javier, et al., 2018). According to Khan (2018), situations in a family vary from similarities to the differences of each member. Since everyone understands each other members' businesses, some of the members are likely to interfere with other members in physiological, mental, and emotional aspects. For instance, parents or relatives put pressure on the younger members of the family resulting in the latter feeling discouraged and having their personal choices (Adcox, 2021). Khan (2018) stated that due to the complexities of life-changing decisions and perspectives of the children, parents and other family members should not interfere with each other and should not go beyond each other's boundaries. Moreover, it deals with a lack of limitations among the household members that even affects the personal decisions of its member (Lewis, 2020). Such may seem helpful but is likely uncontrollable and may result in unhealthy and unfavorable behaviors (Tian, 2018). These behaviors gradually affect the young members of the family as manifested by anxiety, fear of abandonment, reliance on approval to know their self-worth, and cannot easily decide and make choices by themselves. In some cases, children also resort to rebellion since their actions are repressed by their own family members (Martin, 2019). As cited by Montiel (2012), Filipino political culture is

systematically formed mentally and concretely but not limited to beliefs and norms shared by a huge group. Yet, it often happens that the younger members still decide based on how and what the majority thinks as a form of close interaction, particularly between the old and the younger members. Likewise, families still consider a perceived influence on their children's decision-making and preferences, wherein political views clash with the preferences of the older members of the young members of the generation (Kudrnáč & Lyons, 2017; Muddiman, 2019). Older generations are known as Generation X (born from 1965 to 1980) and Baby Boomers (born between 1946 to 1964). On the other hand, younger generations are called either *Millennials* (born between 1981 to 1996) and Generation Z (born between 1997 to 2012) (Beresford Research, 2022). The gap between the two generations in political views is stimulated by the advanced changes in society (Doherty, et.al., 2018). The younger generations are more diverse and can accept changes in the issues that need to be addressed by the government such as abortion, same-sex marriage, and the legal usage of marijuana. They are optimistic and keen to show how receptive they are compared to the older generation who remains conservative on their viewpoints on social and political issues (Parker, et.al, 2019).

The role of kinship is to fulfill the minds of youth to choose righteous and wise public servants of the country (Turan, 2017). In the Philippines, the older generations vocalized their stands on the youth voters' political views due to their prior knowledge and first-hand experiences of their times. The vocalized political viewpoints, knowledge, and experiences of the older generations are sometimes pushing the younger generations to have doubts and sometimes can lead to conformity (De Leon, 2021). However, in the United Kingdom's Serious Crime Act 2105, § 76 as of 2015, parents who control and coerce their children's behavior are frowned upon in society and will receive sanctions for disobeying the law. Contrary to this, no similar laws in the Philippines put sanctions on the parents who coerce and control their children's choices and decisions. Filipinos have solid and close kinship ties and live in a culture that pushes them to place their family first before anything else. For instance, when Filipinos have reached a certain age where they can fend for themselves, some still choose to live with their parents (Gavin, 2019). Therefore, political differences and political communication within the family may also play a role in influencing their children's young minds (Warner, et al., 2020). The same study states that it corresponds to witnessing the family vote as one of the family members grows and can develop their cognitive skills in recognizing the purpose of decision-making and voting.

However, Cowan & Baldassarri (2018) stated that there is a great tendency for it to become more personal and disrespectful if the parents and the children have varying political standpoints, thus, poses risks in family bonds when disagreements arise due to political talks. The study of Oliphant (2018) of the Pew Research Center, cited in Warner et al. (2020) during the 2016 US Elections, reported that only thirty-three (33%) of US citizens confirmed that none of their families shared their political views while forty percent (40%) avoided the topic in their family. Additionally, twenty-eight percent (28%) are willingly and openly discuss their political views within their family.

Partisanship and political party affiliation also influence the kinship towards the voting preference of the youth voters refers to the bias and selected candidate or political party. Now, with the connection of partisanship sentiments and political party affiliation in this study, families who discuss politicians and political activity with their children are more likely to influence them by their political preferences (Chen & Rohla, 2018). Political discussions between the kinship and the younger members play an essential role in better judgment. Discourse like such is likely to drive the further development of the younger members' in-depth understanding of controversial political issues and the significance of choosing the right candidates (Jennings et al., 2009, as cited in Levinsen & Yndigegn, 2015). There is a connection between partisanship and political affiliation to the attitude and behavior of the voter in choosing their selected candidates as influenced by their kinship (Gerber et al., 2010). It shapes the judgments and perceptions regarding the voters' voting preferences by seeking comparisons and similarities to a general or specific point of issue (Van-Bavel & Pereira, 2018). As given by the same authors, for instance, US Democrats and Republicans have different perceptions regarding economic issues after former US President Donald Trump won the 2016 US Presidential Election. Furthermore, they cited that US Democrats and Republicans have different perceptions regarding economic issues after former US President Donald Trump won the 2016 US Presidential Election. The Republicans, who favored Trump's success, showed more positive support and expectations than the Democrats. Following the relevance of partisanship and political affiliations among youth in the United States, there are stable and perennial effects that amplify their political concerns through demonstrations and identifying their political choices (Wray-Lake et al., 2019). In France, people convey their political inclinations to their children through right-left rather than party affiliation. Meanwhile, in the Netherlands, multiple parties with similar ideologies exist rather than competing on the platform of a single party. Even if

they do not vote for the same political party as their parents, children in the Netherlands are loyal to parties with similar ideologies. (Ventura, 2001, p.668). In the Philippines, voters focus more on the candidates' popularity instead of scrutinizing the credentials, platforms, and issues that candidates would like to address (Montiel, 2018; as cited in Arata, et al., 2020). For instance, in the study of Arata, et al. (2020), 16.6 million Filipino voters voted for current President Rodrigo Duterte due to his outlandish statements and unfiltered words when addressing the public that shows his bold attitude towards the pressing issues of the country. Therefore, as Singh and Thornton (2018) put it, elections make underlying partisan predispositions more prominent to capture voters' attention.

Understanding the importance of voting preference is vital since it identifies the factors that may influence the voters. Individual voting preferences are shaped by political interests, ideologies, selected candidates' qualifications, platforms, and popularity (Wauters, et al., 2020). Aligned with voting preferences are the voting patterns which are traditionally molded by parents' behaviors and patterns, especially in the Filipino household since they are family centered (Goyala, 2019; Kudrnáč & Lyons, 2017). It is developed at a young age when parents have a strong influence on their children's decisions (Bhatti & Hansen, 2012, as cited in Kudrnáč & Lyons, 2017). Even though family members' engagement and decision-making roles have received much attention, there has not been a uniform definition or usage of the term role in the research on household judgment. There is extensive awareness and a wide range of usage of *family*. Institutionally expectations regarding conduct connected with specific social positions or classifications are responsibilities (Nabel 1957, as cited in Thomas, 2017). The responsibility of expectations comes from the voter's political preference in which they may choose to act and decide not in favor of their kinship's preference (Sircar, 2015). However, Filipino voters are known to be inconsistent in their preferences and political beliefs, which, after each election, the results favor incompetent government officials (Tandoc-Juan et al., 2019, as cited in Anabo, 2021).

Rizal (1879) highlighted the importance of Filipino youth in society in his poem entitled *A la Juventud Filipina* when he wrote, "Ang kabataan ay ang pag-asa ng bayan." As España (2021) also puts it, the role of the youth is to be informed, aware, and politically involved in the issues addressed by the public to the government. Youth activism and youth empowerment are essential to identify the strong-minded young people to raise awareness and amplify the voices of the silent, vulnerable, and marginalized sectors (Rivera, 2021). As for Filipino

youth voters, Españo (2021) also mentioned in his study that nationalism and patriotism should be the character of every Filipino, specifically the youth since they will inherit the land in the future. However, Carlos Jr. (2018) argued in his journal that the youth have no space in politics since they still have feeble minds to choose the right candidate. Furthermore, youth are seen as less likely to participate and engage in politics, such as considering voting and volunteering to campaign for their candidates (Baumgartner & Morris, 2010 as cited in Stouffer, 2015). In addition, Quinteleir (2007), as cited in Weiss (2020), younger members are less concerned and knowledgeable regarding politics. In contrast, older members have gained experience and understood the effect of politics in their lives due to the generational cycle of cause and effect of politics.

The importance of youth political participation changes over time as new methods are considered as measures to drive the youth to be engaged politically. This includes the general knowledge of politics through various sources of information such as the internet, media, and voter's attitude (Stouffer, 2015). However, in this study, the reason for political participation is different as kinship directly influences the youth's political participation. Some families favor their children's preferences while others do not. Nonetheless, these situations are still a driving force for the youth to participate in political issues (Turan & Tiras, 2017). For the 2022 Elections in the Philippines, according to Jimenez (2021), there are over four million newly registered youth voters aged eighteen (18) to twenty-one (21) years old. Since the area of the study is the election in Quezon City, there is an estimated 1.4 million registered voters, and fifty-two percent (52%) are considered youth voters (CNN, 2021, as cited in Pajayon-Berse, 2022). The city has one of the highest youth voter turnouts, and Manila has an estimated 1.3 million registered voters. Therefore, the documented data of the COMELEC proves that today's youth are likely to dominate the turnouts of the next election (Patinio, 2019).

In relevance to the situation in the Philippines where the 2022 election is anticipated, Lalu of Philippine Inquirer (2022) affirms that taglines are essential to get the public's attention and vote during election campaigns. What is stated on the sea of placards is one of the numerous things that capture the public notice during campaign rallies. Among the presidential candidates, Calub (2022) indicated that for the current election period, some candidates have made it a habit to read the banners of their supporters during their campaign rallies, given the rise of the clever and amusing community organization. As shown in ABS-CBN news, Gutierrez (2022) mentioned that the campaign of presidential

candidate A is called the "People's campaign" due to the overall two million supporters gathered in different cities during their campaign rallies. He also noted that these supporters and volunteers are mostly youth, women, and senior citizens that share an overall twenty-four percent (24%) of the voter turnout as reported by the Pulse Asia Survey (2022). As mentioned by Ranada (2022), the thirteen percent (13%) increase turnout was coming from ages eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) -- all are considered youth voters and supporters of presidential candidate A. As stated in a similar article by Lalu (2022), supporters' typical taglines during the campaign rallies show their enthusiasm to vote for the presidential candidate. Some example taglines are "Kabataan Para kay Candidate A," "Anak ng Candidate B supporters for Candidate A," "Anak ng Enabler for Candidate C." Even creators and influencers on various social media sites, particularly on Twitter and TikTok, make contents that say, "In a house of apologists, there is one supporter of a different presidential candidate." These examples clearly show that the youth voters' preferences differ from their family's preferences in selecting a candidate for the election period on May 9, 2022. As for the 2022 Mayoral Election results in Quezon City, re-electionist candidate A won the position of City Mayor in the local office. According to Bernido (2022), current Mayor A secured the second term of the office as the Mayor of Quezon City the day after the election with partial votes of sixty percent against candidate B with only thirty-seven percent (37%) of votes. Furthermore, Mayor A gathered the trust and votes of the public by addressing social issues, particularly during the pandemic (CNN Philippines, 2022). According to Calalo (2022), the programs and responses they partake include the welfare of solo parents, senior citizens, tricycle operators, and the youth. Therefore, as mentioned by the same author, the action plans given by Mayor A drove the public to cast their vote for their second term in the local government as they brought the solutions to equally fund not just the city but more so the people.

Therefore, to address the research gap, since there are limited local research studies that focuses on the matters that coincides with influence of kinship in regards of voting in mayoral elections, the researchers will thus conduct this study to examine the influence of kinship on the voting preferences of the youth in the upcoming 2022 Mayoral Elections. Although the youth voters have the free will to decide and choose their selected candidates, there are still instances wherein their kinship influences their choices and decisions through persuasion, compulsory, or coercive influence. As mentioned by Goyala (2019), Filipinos are family-centered kin and act according to what their kinship tells them to do.

With this, study aims to analyze the in-depth grounds of experiences and influence of the kinship regarding if it is either compulsory, persuasive or coercive influence on the voting preferences of the youth voters residing in Barangay Pasing Tamo, District 6, Quezon City, in the 2022 Mayoral Quezon City Election. Now, for the study to be more comprehensive, the target area in the study is the chosen compounds in Barangay Pasing Tamo, in which according to the reports of the Department of Health (2021), the population is estimated to 110,738 as of 2020. Although the total number of family compounds is not listed, the researchers has spoken to several barangay staff, and they stated that there are more than ten (10) compounds in the barangay.

Related Literature

The Importance of Voting in the State

Voting is a form of civic responsibility of an individual. It is one of the few opportunities for the citizens to express one's preference on the government's direction (Clark, 2020). Electing politicians that will govern a municipality and nation is not just as simple as voting inside the classrooms at school. Voting also symbolizes the power of the citizens in a democratic country that even one vote can make a difference in the overall turnout of the elections. According to Romero (2019), through voting, the people elect a qualified individual who will represent the country. The people's participation in politics through exercising their inherent right to vote also increases social awareness in addressing the societal problems that need to be addressed by the elected candidates. However, the substantial weight of people's trust on the government, more so to their chosen candidates, will determine if they could uplift the economic standing and maintain the stability of the nation. Moreover, in the study of Del Mundo (2021), the 2022 Philippine election is the most crucial election in the country as the transition from pre-pandemic leaders to during-pandemic newly elected ones who will inherit a great responsibility of helping the economy and address the pandemic concerns. In addition, Romero also expressed his thoughts on the diplomatic behavior of the candidates, stating that if people aspire to have a better nation, people should vote critically and intelligently.

The Importance of Youth Voting in the State

Younger generations in contemporary European society have faced a contradiction when it comes to participating and engaging in politics. This perception is based upon elections, where the youth have the lowest rates, and these rates continue to decrease as the level of membership of the youth in political parties is decreasing (Kimberlee, 2002; Hooghe, et. al, 2004, as cited in Weiss, 2020). However, the study of Briggs (2017) illustrated that

the younger generations have a great deal to give and to gain from political involvement since they often bring new perspectives and visions, as well as approaches in politics. The author also mentioned that in order for the youth to have a real and meaningful participation in politics, the young people must be able to air their views and opinions and must be taken seriously since they are an important sector of society which does not only help to shape the past but also constitute the future.

In the young societies like the Philippines, they depend their political futures on the participation of the young generations. These young societies expect the youth to lead the political renewal by drawing on their fresh ideas, energy, and progress (Arguelles, 2020). Moreover, the author argued that the contemporary Filipino youth are the frontlines to reimagine Philippine politics that continue to influence the choices of their generations despite the economic and social shift in national and global environment.

In the 2022 Philippine Elections, the Filipino youth played a crucial role where they participated in campaign rallies and house-to-house campaigns of their preferred presidential candidates. (Elemia, 2022). Moreover, as the survey conducted by the Pulse Asia, seventy-two (72%) of the youth voters aged eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) years old prefer former Senator Ferdinand "Bongbong" Marcos Jr. to the twenty-three (23%) of youth voters who prefer Vice President Leni Robredo. However, according to Elemia (2022) that the youth who preferred former Senator Bongbong Marcos were not born yet during the reign of Ferdinand Marcos, the father of former Senator Marcos. this implied that their voting preferences have been influenced by the rampant feeds of misinformation and disinformation in social media sites. However in the same study, the youth also started a grounded campaign nationwide in order to push back the disinformation and fake news that is disseminated in social media since the youth generations today are aware of the truth and they are striving for good governance. Moreover, the youth movement have played a significant role in the history of the Philippines as they have been instrumental in the movement that have changed not only the social aspect but also the political aspect of the country as well. And also the youth also continuously prove to be more than willing to fight for what is right and are taught not to turn a blind eye to corruption and injustices (Jorge, 2022).

The Functions and Roles of City Mayors on their Constituents

City Mayors play a vital role in society. The Local Government Code of the Philippines in Chapter 3, Article 1 § 444 clearly states the importance, duties,

and responsibilities of the City Mayors, these city mayors are the chief executives of the city, and they shall exercise their powers to perform their duties, responsibilities, and functions to their constituents provided by the power vested on them by the Local Government Code as well as to other laws. The influence of the City Mayors is also necessary as they have direct contact with their constituents, and they have first-hand observation of their cities. Given such, these city Mayors have the potential to advocate changes in their cities, not only with the economic status but also in all other aspects such as environment and peace and order (Neiger, 2022). Furthermore, the City Mayors' duties are to oversee plans, programs, services, and projects of their local government. They also have the responsibility to carry out disaster risk and reduction programs for their cities in times of calamities.

The Psychology of Voting Behavior

In political voting or electoral voting, psychological concepts are evident. The term bandwagon effect in elections, according to Cherry (2020), there are situations in which the voters choose candidates that are perceived as winning candidates. Furthermore, individuals are greatly influenced by their peers. It is said that most often, individuals feel pressured into acting out and behaving differently than what they normally would because of these peer pressures. Aside from that, a constant need to feel 'belong' is also a principal factor why people can suddenly change due to the fear of being left out. The unfortunate effects of wanting to belong and not being left out have such a significant impact on political preferences. Graison (2020) said that people would change their voting preferences based on who seems to get higher votes and chances of winning. In general, the study shows that voters' awareness of their sovereign capacity to select political leaders through the exercise of their right to vote and of the significant repercussions of their choice has increased. At the same time, it highlights the Filipino voter's rising pessimism and very individualistic mindset. But the benefit element that took its place demonstrates a utilitarian view of elections. (Newman, 2001)

In the article *Philippine Elections and the Politics Behind it*, Wong (2022) points out that people look at *who* will govern rather than being prospective voters. Wong also discussed the realities in Philippine politics. First, the most observed attitudes among Filipino voters when electing candidates are based on the candidate's fame and family background and not based on the plans, programs, and platforms they offer. In this aspect, the voting behavior known as *Prospective Voting* is not evident. According to Khan Academy (2018), *prospective voting* is a behavior wherein people look at the future of a certain candidate

should they be elected to office. Second, Wong explained that political parties were not justified and said to be candidate-centered, and the political ideology that parties were ironically proposed does not show. Lastly, the triumph of the rational choice voting behavior of the voters, the rampant political patronage, and the unfortunate reality that there are Filipinos who admit to selling their votes in return of material benefits. According to the article entitled *Why Filipinos sell their votes, and for how much, vote-buying*, aside from being illegal is also morally and ethically wrong. Despite this, it is unfortunately not foreign for Filipinos. However, also according to an interview with the Ateneo School of Government Dean Ronald Mendoza, it was discussed that even though Filipinos recognize that it is an illegal practice to sell votes, but they still resort to it because some people do not trust democracy anymore and would rather save themselves and enjoy the benefits than think of the nation. It is also ideal if the candidates have a solidly favorable position in pre-election polls. Given that the electorate also includes non-youth voters, a candidate's stance or attitude on crucial national problems as well as their personal past are obviously relevant. While it is crucial to consider a candidate's party membership and standing in pre-election polls while casting a vote, these aspects do not mean a candidate will be able to win an election or be competent and capable of carrying out their duties and obligations. (Enrique, 2021)

Moreover, the *Padrino* system in the Philippines encompasses connections and influences rather than merits and qualifications regarding an individual's job. Commonly known in the Filipino culture, this system highlights the significance of the idea of *kinship*, particularly in political decision-making (Mercado, 2021). According to Adorador (2021), the *Padrino* system is a prevailing problem in the government since it relies on the influence of kinship to youth voters and represses the latter to have their own decisions and choices. Likewise, it affects political preferences for an undeserving political position due to the favors gained from close relationships (Francisco, 2018).

In addition, the principle of voting for the so-called *Lesser Evil* is still evil. As Gatdula (2021) stated that if there is evil there is also good, when argued out that a candidate without integrity should not be elected and have political power. Moreover, to have positive or legitimate good governance, politicians and aspiring politicians should stick to their principles. Additionally, Gatdula added that it is not enough to merely advocate for good governance within the available resources but must go beyond the limits of doing actual good for the benefit of all citizens regardless of the status quo. Furthermore, choosing the so-called lesser evil

is a fallacy. According to the definition by Merriam-Webster, this refers to the ability to suppress people to choose willfully regardless of if they agree or disagree with something. Gatdula concluded that if people desire positive change and justice in their country, they should vote for candidates with integrity.

Kinship, other Relations, and Influence as Factors in Voting Preference

Now, regarding kinship and other relations as a factor that influence the voting preferences of the individuals, Sarrouff (2020) stated the importance of family in voting, although they have different political views. Similarly, Sarouff's and the researchers' views on family or kinship shaping the nation are significantly the same. The author also believes that the foundation of government is families. Furthermore, he also pointed out that because the family is the foundation of government, the running candidates also appeal to the voter by being pro-family. Sarouff made a point by reminiscing the era wherein women were not granted the right to vote, and only men were allowed and allowed to elect representatives. Sarouff's article centered on the actual election date in the United States of America during the pandemic. They held their voting through mailing systems and stated that even though he has different political views from his parents, it was highlighted that there is no connection between his voting preferences as a youth to his family's voting choices.

On the other hand, an article by Portuondo (2020) raised a question of interest: "If people are granted democracy in choosing their candidates, why do their families breathe down their necks because of political differences?" Likewise, Luscombe (2021) states that family disagreements are inevitable in politics, but parents often tend to change the topic or sometimes withdraw; nevertheless, they are also the center of get-togethers. Moreover, as Luscombe interviewed people in Washington, there were split opinions regarding the influence of society on the voters. For instance, a professor of political science from Duke University stated that even though voting is done individually, people's choices remain highly influenced by their friends' and families' viewpoints. Another interview from a communication, psychology, and political science professor at Stanford University also agreed that there is an evident social conformity in voting often friends and family urge their members to vote for the same candidates.

Moreover, a survey that was conducted by Youth Leadership for Democracy (2021) reported that fifty-four (54%) of the respondents identified that voting preferences for both the National and Local Elections were resulted because of their families'

endorsement. The result only validates those relationships have always been a factor in political choices. Notably, it was also revealed that some youth voters heavily rely on their families when choosing political candidates during elections. Furthermore, sixty-two percent (62%) percent of the youth voters confirmed that they are yet to vote for the 2022 May elections, and out of one hundred percent (100%), eighty-six percent (86%) declared that their votes have the power to make a difference. The group also conducted a survey wherein they asked the respondents where they obtained information about electoral candidates. It revealed that 45% acquired them from the news on TV, forty-four percent (44%) from information shared through word of mouth, and thirty-five percent (35%) from social media. In an article entitled *Stronger Social Media Influence in the 2022 Philippine Elections*, it was stated that during the pandemic, social media played a great influence on the May 2022 elections (Arugay, 2022). Although the social media outlets such as Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, and Tiktok are not made for politics and political agenda, many people turn to these outlets to vocalize their political preferences and standpoints. Therefore, the outcome of the 2022 Philippine Elections is expected to be shaped by these social media platforms as people spend more time with their gadgets as restrictions remain in pose to counter the increase of COVID cases. Although the advancements in technology, particularly social media, offer numerous benefits, there are still disadvantages of utilizing them. As Arugay (2022) suggests, misinformation and disinformation are prevalent. For instance, if splice videos of a candidate presenting false information spread online are not thoroughly examined, people are likely to believe instantly. In addition, as it was proven and tested, social media spreads information rapidly, which means it is also easy to spread fake news. Arugay also pointed out the intensified toxicity of social media to the 2022 elections. The toxicity they were referring to is how people easily resort to branding certain personalities as *terrorists*, *communists*, or *enemies of the government* only based on distinct political perspectives without knowing the definition of those terminologies they use to brand people.

Related Studies

Political Activeness and Voting Behavior of the Youth

Youth is defined as a period of transition from childhood dependence to adulthood's independence and awareness of their interdependence as members of the community. The concept of youth varies from country to country, but the easiest way to define this group is age, particularly concerning education and employment (Ibezim, 2019). According to Tekindal (2017), *youth* is a period of change and seeking

knowledge in which they develop capabilities and social skills. They adopt a critical attitude towards morality, religion, and traditional and political principles that they learn from their parents. However, Tekindal also describes that youth is one of the most disadvantaged groups in society since they were alienated by the older generations, especially for those who are more faithful to traditional norms such as religion and authority.

In the study of Matthes (2022), *politically active* refers to the activities of the citizens that in some ways are directed toward influencing political outcomes in society. It can be voting and discussing politics that influence political decision-making processes and that urge people to express their preferences to achieve political and civic goals. Meanwhile in the study of Nissen (2021), political activeness has two categories namely, conventional and unconventional. Conventional is an act of political involvement which is directly or indirectly related to the electoral process. This includes the voting for a candidate, participating or taking an active role in political parties, and campaigning for a preferred candidate. On the other hand, unconventional is an act which is initiated by social movements or groups of citizens. This includes forming a protest, volunteering in communities, expressing political views in any social media sites, signing a petition, and donating online to any organizations.

However, the youth does not only discuss politics and vote during elections but also participate in any youth organizations or issue-based non-government organizations, debates on community issues, and joining political parties or events. Since the internet plays a prominent role in spreading new types of political action and expression, the youth also express and participate in online political discussions through writing blogs and creating a piece of art. They also seek information about their and people's rights, and the democracy of one country, through attending seminars (Keating & Melis, 2017). Despite the youth being the most disadvantaged group in society, their participation and involvement have empowered them to do something to help to achieve social and political change (Cabo, 2018).

According to Roskin, et al. (1997, as cited in Batara, et al., 2021), *voting preference* is one of the dimensions of voting behaviors which refers to what people prefer on a party or candidate over the other parties or candidate. It may be influenced by various factors such as candidates' forums and debates, their families, social media, news, environment, religion, and data posted by government offices (Alelaimat, 2019).

In local elections, the youth voters at Bulent Ecevit University in Turkey do not choose based on the candidates' origin such as their ethnicity or the party which they belong. Instead, the youth prefer analyzing the candidates' projects, educational background, and the feasibility of commitments. Additionally, the same author stated that the family and friends surrounding the Turkish youth voters have a positive influence on voting behavior but take less importance on the views of their family (Çavuşoğlu & Pekkaya 2016, as cited in Karabulut & Önder, 2017).

Locally, the voting behavior of the Filipino student voters in Manila, according to the studies of Collado, et al. (2020), appears to be the result of showing support to their selected candidates through the influence of their peers and family members rather than the influence of social media platforms and other online communities. In the same study, this behavior is called *elastic* wherein the voting commitment of these voters indicates a positive reason since they seek for political information among these public officials, and influence within the peers, family, and even religious groups. However, the authors also revealed that the results show the desire of some Filipino student voters to increase the quality of the campaigns of aspiring public officials. This is an example of a political conflict that needs to be resolved to make the quality of democratic practices of pre-election more stable and intelligent for the public and to make their possible choices well-informed. Another political conflict, as mentioned by Bernardo (2018), is the voting behaviors of the Filipino voters set by their contrasting values and norms to follow. The author also highlighted that this type of behavior among the Filipinos is caused by the contrasting ideas and perspectives among people on who to vote for during elections. Such can be understood and expressed as a sense of self-interest instead of for the best interest of all. Meanwhile, Abiera, et. al. (2022) identify the voting preferences of the Filipino youth voters. One of the candidate qualities that the youth prefers are: first, a good and effective leader of the society in which he/she performs well in his/her previous terms. Second, a leader should have a clean track record. Third, the leader should be mature, compassionate, and educated. He/she should also comprehend the feelings and visions of others. And lastly, the candidate's platforms since these will encompass the beliefs, policy choices, ambitions, and commitment for the city they're governing.

Functions and Roles of the City Mayor

According to Rydin (2011, as cited in Phan 2017), mayoral form of governance tends to have more legitimacy because it raises the involvement of local politics and puts the citizens in a position of personal accountability for local decisions. In essence, the

author emphasizes that the mayor can further enhance the quality of life of its local citizens if they exercise their local power deliberately and effectively. Due to globalization, however, cities are increasingly growing, and many people have migrated to cities where they become more socio-economically complex (Stren & Friendly, 2019). Despite the changes, the same author argued that the roles of the mayors remain static. The cities do not have the power to solve their problems or control the development, rather, cities have powers as mandated by the national government.

In the Philippines, one of the functions of a mayor is to enforce laws and ordinances in the city and implement programs, activities, and services that can improve the lives of the community and its citizens (Department of the Interior and Local Government, 2019). The programs, activities, and services include social welfare services where the mayor provides livelihood services for the poor, community-based rehabilitation, nutrition services, and family planning services.

The Kinship as an Influence on the Votes of the Youth

Parents are the source of direct modeling, instructions, cue giving, and reinforcement processes for the learning of political engagement of the youth. Through cultivating values and norms and acting as role models, parents can influence the voting preferences and behaviors of their children (Janmaat & Hoskins, 2021). Additionally, in the study of Qorri (2018) on *The Psychology behind Voting Behavior in Kosovo*, in the Republic of Kosovo, family is so important as shown on how people consider the decisions of their family members, especially the older generations with authoritative figures, resulting in the decision-making being collectivist.

Although *family* is the primary agent that shapes the voting preferences of the youth, they do not entirely have control over their offspring or the youth voter's political perspectives (Arrow, 1960, as cited in Peter, 2019). In connection with Levinsen and Yndigegn (2015, as cited in Scruggs & Schrodt, 2020), political discussions should be associated with feeling of closeness and satisfaction with the family. In most cases, youth are more comfortable to discuss politics if they share similar views with their parents and are fearful of expressing their views if perceived unpopular. The same author found that the youth who are more distant from their parents discuss politics less frequently in contrast with those who have a close relationship with their parents. In the study of Oliphant (2018) of the Pew Research Center as cited by Warner et al., (2020), during the 2016 US Elections, thirty percent (33%) of US citizens stated that none of their families

shares the same political views as theirs, forty percent (40%) avoids the topic in their family and twenty-eight percent (28%) willingly and openly discusses their political views within their family. This study concluded that there are parents and children who either discuss or do not discuss politics depending on how close their relationships are. However, in the study of Hong and Lin (2017) in Asian families such as Singapore, political discussion between the parents and the children is more frequent than the Western families, and the positive effects of these political discussions are evident. For instance, the youth join a political party because at least one of their parents is a member. Due to the influence of the Western culture on the Singaporean youth, the manifestation of major differences between the younger and older generation can be seen, where the political stance of the younger generation leans towards less authoritative.

Synthesis

The studies and works of literature from foreign and local sources have provided thorough insights into the study of *A Case Study on the Influence of Kinship on Voting Preference among Youth Voters in Barangay Pasong Tamo Quezon City (2022)*. Exercising the right to vote is a privilege where the individual expresses their preference on the government's direction (Clark, 2020). The youth generations in contemporary European society have faced a contradiction when it comes to participating and engaging in politics due to the lowest rates in elections (Kimberlee, 2002; Hooghe, et. al, 2004, as cited in Weiss, 2020). However, in the Philippines, the youth generations are the frontline to reimagine Philippine politics (Arguelles, 2020). This 2022 Philippine Elections, despite being one of the most disadvantaged groups in society according to Tekindal (2017), the youth are the key players in Philippine elections where they attended campaign rallies, participating in house-to-house campaigns for their preferred candidates as well as to fight the disinformation and fake news that is disseminated in social media (Elemia, 2022). With this, it is also discovered that many factors can affect the decision-making of voters towards voting preferences. These include their kinship, the candidates' debates, and fora, as well as their overall environment. As emphasized, there is psychology in voting where people select candidates that seemed to be on the winning side. In addition, the unfortunate effects of wanting to belong and not be left out takes such a significant toll on political elections. As Graison (2022) maintains, as people see the leading candidate at the polls, people are likely to change their voting preferences. Similarly, Mendoza (2019) mentions that instead of thinking for the benefit of all, people only tend to think solely of personal gains. Meanwhile, Abiera, et. al. (2022) identify the

voting preferences of the Filipino youth voters. One of the candidate qualities that the youth prefers are: first, a good and effective leader of the society. Second, a leader should have a clean track record. Third, the leader should be mature, compassionate, and educated. And lastly, the candidate's platforms that will encompass the beliefs, policy choices, ambitions, and commitment for the city they're governing.

Moreover, in an article entitled *Stronger Social Media Influence in the 2022 Philippine Elections*, it was stated that social media played a significant role in the 2022 elections (Arugay, 2022). Today, social media feeds not only communications on the latest updates and entertainment industry, but also become a platform for political discourses. Thus, the Internet has become one of the most influential factors in voting preference. However, the voting behavior of the Filipino student voters in Manila, according to the studies of Collado, et.al (2020), appears to be the result of showing support to their selected candidates through the influence of their peers and family members rather than the influence of social media platforms and other online communities.

In connection with Levinsen and Yndigeegn (2015, as cited in Scruggs & Schrod, 2020), youth, who are more distant from their parents, discuss politics less frequently than the ones who have a close relationship with their parents. However, Sarrouf's (2020) article stated that even though he has different political views from his parents, there is no connection between his voting preferences as a youth and his family's voting preferences. Contrary to Sarrouf, during the 2016 US Elections, data presented that only thirty-three percent (33%) of US citizens stated that none of their families shares the same political preferences as theirs, forty percent (40%) avoids the topic in their family, and twenty-eight percent (28%) willingly and openly discusses their political views within their family. In the Philippine context, according to the survey of Youth Leadership for Democracy (2021), the voting preferences of the youth for both national and local elections are greatly influenced by their family's endorsements. A total of fifty-four percent (54%) of the respondents agreed to this which suggests that deep relationships, especially within the family, truly influence the youth's voting preferences.

The related literature and studies helped the present study understand the pressing concerns surrounding the area of inquiry. Both facilitated the exploration of the different factors influencing the youth voters' voting preferences, particularly kinship and social media.

Theoretical Framework

The Social Choice Theory, coined by Kenneth Arrow, is a theoretical framework that explains the preferences, opinions, and interests to decide as a group (Arrow, 1951, as cited in Figueras, 2019). The Social Choice theory made a breakthrough three centuries after Nicholas de Condorcet pioneered it, and the person behind the 20th-century social choice theory is Kenneth Arrow. The researchers will utilize Arrow's version of the theory of social choice and not Condorcet's due to the different approaches of their versions. Condorcet's version focused on the majority of behavioral voting systems and sets aside the factors that can affect voting behavior (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2013). Arrow's social choice theory states that individuals' choices have broadened and are reflected by the influence of society and their environment, which aggregated their preferences over the available resources (Arrow, 1951, as cited in Figueras, 2019).

Furthermore, the Social Choice Theory can also be applied to political voting behaviors to understand how individuals and groups arrive at a particular decision and if peer pressure or conformity influences their decision-making, in this case, the influence of kinship on the voting preference of youth voters (Arrow, 1951, as cited in Maskin, 2017). Examining the current electoral landscape in the Philippines, the choice might be seen as being based on the candidate's allegiance with the government or the opposition. Additionally, pre-election polls affect the preferences of young voters. This appears related to the fact that the outcomes of pre-election polls are frequently made public, especially because they are widely covered in all media, particularly they have routinely been done and disseminated through social media during the campaign time. Thus they might potentially produce a wave of support for the voters. In general, the study's findings diverge from the current electoral landscape. tendency, as shown in the material now in use, where Filipino candidates personality-centered analysis explains voting preference factor. (Murcia and Bolo, 2016)

Therefore, upon various research on theories, Social Choice Theory (SCT) was selected as the best fit for the following reasons that are relevant to the study:

- A.) An individual will arrive at a decision based on the available choices. In 1966 Stephen Wasby, in his work entitled *The Impact of the Family on Politics: An Essay and Review of the Literature* as cited by Simpson (2018), gave a clear example of how the people in the group make final decisions and their choices. If there are three choices and five people in the group, each will list their best to the least options, and after they rank the choices, the option with the most votes is called 'Unanimity'.

In this aspect, the principle of ‘lesser evil’ sometimes can be observed, but if analyzed thoroughly, voting for the so-called ‘lesser evil’ is still evil. If presented with good candidates, it is only just to vote for the good and the good only (Gatdula, 2021).

- B.) Personal preference; In voting, individuals tend to vote for candidates with the same values as theirs, such as morals, ethics, beliefs, attitudes, and social values. A voter's personal preference depends on the polls, survey results, the candidate's forums and debates, plans, programs, and track records while in service (League of Women Voters Newton, 2021).
- C.) The other factors that can affect a voter's preference, such as their religion, family, and peers' opinions affect the quality of decisions an individual makes (Bruter & Harrison, 2020).

In conclusion, the researchers will utilize the theory of social choice in a manner of qualitative research to help further understand the in-depth complexities of the situation of the youth voters on the influence of their kinship on their voting preference in the Mayoral Elections. As mentioned above, three factors can influence the voting behavior and the preferences of the voters. One vote can drive significant change and impact the turnout of the elections. As of today, the Philippines has now over four million newly registered youth voters. According to Britannica, elections are a serious matter that will determine not only the people's future but also the future of the nation, which is why it is the responsibility of the registered voter citizens to be honorable and noble in evaluating and analyzing the candidates thoroughly.

Statement of the Problem

The researchers aim to understand the perceived influence of the kinship to the experiences of Youth Voters in their voting preference in the 2022 Mayoral Elections in Quezon City. Specifically, the study aims to answer the following central question and sub-questions:

Central Question:

How does kinship influence the voting preferences of the youth voters during the 2022 Mayoral Elections?

Sub-Questions:

1. *What roles do their family members play in the voting preference of the Youth Voters?*
2. *What personal expectations do the Youth Voters have for their future city Mayor?*

3. *What other factors influence the Youth Voters' voting preferences for their city Mayor?*

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of the study focuses on the Kinship and Voting Preference of Youth Voters in Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City. A qualitative case study, as defined by Turner (2019), is used to seek an in-depth understanding of complexities in situations that may arise to the influence of kinship in the voting preferences of the youth voters in Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City. The study will be guided by the Social Choice Theory's three factors that highlight the voting preferences: A) the individual's decisions based on the available choices which include choosing the ‘lesser evil.’ (Gatdula, 2021; Simpsons, 2018); B) Personal Preference (League of Women Voters Newton, 2021); C) Other factors that include kinship, religion, and peers (Bruter & Harrison, 2020). Therefore, the researchers will start the interview with ten youth voters in the Barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City wherein as of 2020, the said barangay has an approximate population of 110,738 people. The scope of the study will consider the respondents' ages of nineteen (19) to twenty-one (21) years old, if they are active registered voters, still live with their kinship who are biological relatives, whereas the profound understanding of the relationship is through *jus sanguini*, lives together in one household, from Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City, and are politically aware of the given 2022 Mayoral Election in Quezon City.

In contrast, the delimitations of the study are not to interview the respondents who are not registered voters falling into the criteria of being youth that are aged nineteen (19) to twenty-one (21) years old, resides outside Quezon City, registered youth voters but not registered in the precinct of Barangay Pasong Tamo, live independently as well as not entirely dependent to their families, and do not reside in Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City.

Methodology

● Research Design

The study is designed systematically with the use of a *qualitative case study*. The researchers will utilize this design since the study entitled *A Case Study on the Influence of Kinship on Voting Preference among Youth Voters in Barangay Pasong Tamo Quezon City (2022)* will be based on the in-depth understanding and analysis of the kinship's influence among the respondents regarding their voting preferences. In addition, the study is qualitative since it involves gathering data with the use of non-numerical measurements (Bhandari, 2022). The contrast of this design which is the quantitative research design will be unable to

concisely fill the gaps and collect the data since the researchers aim to gather an in-depth analysis and understanding from the respondents in a non-measurable approach. Meanwhile, a qualitative study interprets the results from the interview, which are composed of open-ended questions that determine the respondents' experiences subjectively. Moreover, the researchers will not utilize the questionnaires since the study is qualitative, instead they will utilize a semi-structured interview to understand and describe the situation. Aside from utilizing qualitative research, the researchers also specifically adapt a case study in conducting this research. According to Crowe et al. (2011), case studies describe, explain, and explore a certain situation, to generate hypotheses, and to validate a method. Hence, if this design is utilized, the research study will have a further systematic understanding to know and elaborate the voting preferences among the youth voters, regarding if there is an involvement of kinship influence. Also, a case study provides a concise procedure for the researchers to utilize the theoretical framework they intended to carry out to conduct the study.

Hence, the researchers will utilize this research type to conduct an in-depth understanding of the insights of the respondents due to the kinship influence on their voting preferences. Hence, other research types and designs are not intended in the study because it limits and is unable to fill the gaps to further synthesize and discuss by the researchers in this study. Therefore, the research methodology will entail the research study process using a qualitative case study design to determine the influence of kinship on the voting preference of the youth voters in Barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City, in the 2022 Mayoral Election without the use of numerical calculations and measurements to gather the data.

● **Participants/Respondents of the Study**

The respondents of the study are composed of youth voters ages nineteen (19) to twenty-one (21) years old. According to Lopez (2022), for the Mayoral Elections in 2022, the youth voters is estimated at fifty-six percent (56%) in which as mentioned by Baclig (2022) this age of young voters depicts the peak of voter turnouts in the Philippines since the 2016 Election.

In gathering the data, the researchers will choose the qualified respondents based on the inclusion criteria of:

- Respondents must be active registered voters of Barangay Pasong Tamo and residents of District 6, Quezon City;
- The respondents must aged between nineteen (19) to twenty-one (21) years old;

- The respondents must have participated in the most recent Philippine elections in May 2022; and
- They still dwell with their kin within an extended or single-family compound in the Barangay Pasong Tamo, District 6, Quezon City.

The researchers will start to conduct ten (10) interviews from different households in BPT as the sample size for the data collection for an extensive and systematic analysis to interpret the results. If the ten (10) respondents will not be enough as a sample size for a qualitative study, the researchers will increase the sample size until the data achieve the point of saturation of the research study. Point of saturation refers to the point of the research process where the data is recurring and no new insights are given by additional sources (Faulkner & Trotter, 2017). In this study, the point of saturation is to assess the validity of the results as the researchers transcribe the collected data. Since the study is qualitative, the depth of the data is more important than numbers.

● **Instrument/s of the Study**

The research instrument that will be used to conduct this study is a recorded semi-structured interview via Zoom with the respondents. A semi-structured interview engaged a two-way casual yet at the same time formal interview between the interviewer and interviewee (Doyle, 2020). The researchers will use this as an instrument to conduct the study in order to give comfortability to the respondents during the process of the interview. A semi-structured interview also ends with an open-ended question that benefits the researchers to fully understand and organize the responses for unbiased results (George, 2022). Thus, the researchers opt to know and understand the perspectives of the respondents regarding the influence of their kinship to their voting preferences in the 2022 Mayoral Elections in Quezon City. Moreover, the questions are aligned with the research questions that should be thoroughly sought for the entire process of the study. Hence, the interview is divided into categories:

Category 1: The researchers will ask for the general demographic profile of the respondents for formality and to make them comfortable during the interview. This includes their:

- 1.1. Name (optional)
- 1.2. Gender
- 1.3. Age
- 1.4. If they live with their kinship/family
- 1.5. How many are they in their household?
- 1.6. If they are an active voter in Quezon City.

Category 2: The researchers will ask on how politically active the respondents are:

2.1. What does being politically active mean to you? (*Para sa'yo ano ang ibig-sabihin ng pagiging politically active?*)

2.2. During the election season, how often do you see politically active people with the same age range as you? (*Sa nagdaang eleksyon, gaano karaming tao na kasing-edad mo na iyong namasid na politically active rin?*)

2.3. How politically active are you? (*Sa iyong palagay, ikaw ba ay maituturing na politically active rin?*)

a. From one (1) to ten (10), how do you rank yourself as politically active person? Elaborate your answer. (*Mula isa (1) hanggang sampu (10), paano mo i-rarango o maihahambing ang iyong sarili bilang politically active? Ipaliwanag nang mabuti.*)

Category 3: The third category of the interview is to ask the respondents about the characteristics they seek for their City Mayor:

3.1. What are the characteristics you seek for your selected City Mayor? (*Ano-ano ang mga katangiang hinahanap mo sa iyong napipisil na Mayor?*)

a. Do they have enough experience to run for the mayoral candidacy for you to vote for them? (*May sapat bang karanasan ang napili mong mayor para piliin mo siya?*)

b. Are their platforms good enough for them to be your selected City Mayor? (*Sapat ba ang mga plataporma niya para piliin mo siyang bilang Mayor?*)

3.2. What personal expectations do you have for your City Mayor? (*Ano ang mga inaasahan mo sa Mayor ng Quezon City?*)

3.3. What are your family's personal references in choosing a city mayor? (*Ano ang personal na katangian na gusto ng iyong pamilya sa pagpili ng Mayor?*)

Category 4: The last category of the interview is for the researchers to ask the respondents about the influence of kinship regarding their voting preferences.

4.1. Does any member of your family tells you to vote? Explain/elaborate your answer. (*May mga miyembro ba ng inyong pamilya na nagsasabi sa iyo na bumoto? Ipaliwanag ang iyong sagot.*)

4.2. Do your family members influence your voting preferences? Can you please briefly explain your answer? (*Nakakaimpluwensiya ba ang miyembro ng iyong pamilya sa iyong kagustuhan na iboboto? Maaari mo bang ipaliwanag?*)

4.3. In what way does your family influence your own choice of candidate? (*Sa paanong paraan nakaapekto ang impluwensiya ng iyong pamilya sa iyong pagpili ng kandidato?*)

a. Were you being single-out in the decision of the family to vote for their respective candidate? Briefly explain your answer. (*Ikaw lang ba ang inuimpluwensiyahan ng magulang mo na iboto ang gusto nila o pati ang iba niyong ka-miyembro na kalapit sa edad mo? Ipaliwanag ito.*)

4.4. Does your voting preference match the voting preference of your family? Why or why not? (*Ang karakter at katangian ba ng iyong iboboto ay magkatugma o magkapareho sa kagustuhan ng iyong pamilya?*)

a. Does your family follow a patriarchy or matriarchy system? If so who decides in the family? (*Patriarkal o matriarkal ba ang sistema ng iyong pamilya? Kung gayon, sinong miyembro ng pamilya mo ang nagdedesisyon para sa inyo?*)

b. Who in your family has the huge influence to decide on your voting preference? (*Sino sa miyembro ng pamilya mo ang may malaking impluwensiya patungkol sa iyong pagpili ng iboboto?*)

c. Is the decision of the family extended to the other members of the family? (*Ang desisyon ba ng ka-miyembro mo ay nakararating ba sa ibang miyembro ng pamilya niyo? (Ex: tita, tito, lola, lolo, etc.)*)

4.5. Are you able to vocalize your political stands without any boundaries with your family? Why or why not? (*Nagagawa mo bang ipahayag ng malaya ang iyong mga paninindigan at saloobin sa pulitika nang walang anumang hadlang sa iyong pamilya?Bakit o bakit hindi?*)

a. How will it affect your decision if you do not follow the decision chosen by your family members regarding your voting preference? (*Paano makaapekto sa iyo kung hindi mo susundin ang gusto ng magulang mo bata sa kagustuhan mo pagdating sa pagboto?*)

Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection Plan

Data collection in qualitative research is conducted through interviews. Interviews allow the researchers and the respondents to fully understand the problem of the study (Barrett & Twycross, 2018). Since the study is qualitative and a case study in nature, the researchers opt to collect the data from the respondents through semi-structured interviews for transparent analysis. In addition, the researchers planned to collect the data until it reaches the point of saturation by conducting themes connected to the problem of the study. As this study is a case study analysis, the goal is to saturate the responses.

Therefore, the importance of achieving saturation in this research study is to perceive and understand that the shared responses are no longer feasible in the study due to the obvious and continuous information collected. Hence, interviews also allow the researchers to analyze and understand the perspective of the respondents regarding the influence of their kinship to their voting preferences on the 2022 Mayoral Election.

The data gathering started between September 01, 2022 to September 08, 2022, where a total of twelve (12) respondents were interviewed. Initially, the researchers planned to conduct ten (10) interviews stated in the previous chapter, however the researchers did not feel confident that the data had reached the point of saturation at this point. The number of respondents does not stimulate the ideal plan to achieve the saturation, due to the insufficient results of shared experiences and insights of the respondents. The researchers ensured that the data collected was saturated enough by interviewing two (2) additional respondents for the study, giving a total of twelve (12) respondents to be interviewed in this study. After each interview, the researchers

transcribed the responses manually. Subsequently followed by coding the themes of the interview to collect the accuracy of the analysis. Coding is a long and repetitive process that the researchers firmly organized using a tabular method to ensure the precision and validity of the data. The tabular method of coded themes helped the researchers to interpret and analyze the given data.

The interview was conducted following the research procedures that are included in the methodology and informed consent. The ethical considerations included in the methodology were utilized in data collection. First, the researchers gave the informed consent in both English and Filipino language to the respondents. These informed consents help to protect and secure the data privacy of the respondents throughout the data collection. Additionally, the researchers did not offer monetary compensation to the respondents. Before the actual interview, the researchers explained the purpose of the study and their option to withdraw if they feel uncomfortable during the interview. The researchers explained to the respondents the purpose of the study before the actual interview.

Results and Discussions

Results

Table 1: The Respondent's Definition of Political Activeness

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R1	Engaging and Participating in Politics	<i>Pagiging open mo sa opinion about sa politics.</i>
R2	Expressing Politics Views	<i>Active in expressing their political views.</i>
R10	Exercising Right to Vote	<i>Simula nung naging voter ka every election ka na bumoboto.</i>
R11	Politically Aware	<i>Aware po tayo sa nangyayari sa politics.</i>

All respondents had similar answers. Their responses were classified by the researchers based on themes. As seen in table 1. there are four (4) themes that were constantly mentioned by the respondents, namely; Expressing Political Views, Engaging and Participating in Politics, Politically Aware, and Exercising Right to Vote as the respondents defined the idea of being politically active.

In defining political activeness, R2 defined political activeness as a person's "activeness" in expressing political views. Other respondents offered similar definitions, such as "*Nakikipag engage ka sa mga political issues. Aware about sa mga kung anong nangyayari ngayon.*" (Actively engaging and

participating in politics and awareness on current events.) Whereas R3 believes that "*Politically active kapag nakikipag-engage ka sa mga political issues in a way na open ka about sa mga kung anong nangyayari ngayon, hindi lang sa current na city mo kundi sa buong country.*" (Politically active when you engage in political issues in a way that you are open about what is happening now, not only in your current city but in the entire country.) R3 stated that an individual who is politically active is politically aware and engaging in politics not only in the city they residing on but on the whole country, quite similar to R2's answer. R4 added that a politically active individual means that they are aware and interested in the Politics and Government of the country, "*Someone na interesado sa politics and*

government and mayroon ding participation politically.” (Someone who is interested in politics and government and also has political participation.) Though, R5 stated that “Politically active is that you engage with the political affairs that happens in our country, kapag ikaw po may opinion ka doon mayroon kang mga alam doon. Hindi lang natin bine-base yung pagiging politically active just by telling na registered voter ka or hindi po.” (Politically active is that you engage with the political affairs that happen in our country, when you have an opinion there you have knowledge. We don’t base being politically active just by telling whether you are a registered voter or not.) R5

extends their definition of being politically active by engaging and involving yourself in the overall political affairs of the country and also added that being politically active is not limited to being a registered voter. Similar to R2 and R3, R8, R9 and R11 both mentioned that politically active are those individuals who are aware of the current event and situations in the country as well as people have the right to choose. And also, R1 mentioned that politically active means being open to politics. On the contrary of R5’s definition, R10 and R12 stated that a politically active individual is those who have been voting since they became a registered voter.

Table 2: The Respondents Answer on How Many of Their Age Are Seen Actively Participating in Politics

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R4	Same Age	<i>Mas ramdam ko yung participation ng kabataan and ng mga ka-age ko</i>
R8	Not All	<i>Hindi ganun lahat, hindi lahat nakaboto kasi I think yung registration din is sobrang hassle.</i>
R9	People Are Active	<i>People are very much active compared to the previous election.</i>

Majority of the respondents answered that they indeed saw that most of the people with the same age range as them are considered to be politically active during the recent election. The researchers classified the respondent’s answers. As seen in table 2, there are three (3) answers that were mentioned by the respondents, namely: same age, not all, and people are very much active when asked how many of their age they see who are politically active.

R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R9, R10, R11, R12 all shared the same thought that there are many youths, same as their age are more involved in politics especially in the recent May 2022 elections, though R5, R6 and R10 added that the youth they see are actively participating on various social media platforms. As

for R12, they answered “Mostly, halos lahat kasi ng nakita kong more on kabataan, sigura I’d say mga 50% din.” (Mostly, almost everything I’ve seen is more on youth, I’d say about 50%) R5 gave a percentage of the youth voters similar to their age that are considered politically active individuals during the recent elections. However, R8 answered “Hindi ganun lahat. Hindi lahat nakaboto kasi I think yung registration din is sobrang hassle.” (It’s not like that at all, not everyone was able to vote because I think the registration is also too much hassle.) R8 did not see and considered that most of the individuals with the same age as them are politically active due to not all youth voters were able to vote during the recent election.

Table 3: The respondents are asked to assess themselves if they are considered politically active and rank themselves from one (1) to ten (10).

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R3	No	<i>Hindi sobrang politically active</i>
R6	Yes	<i>Active ako. Nakikita ko yung mga nangyayari sa lipunan ngayon.</i>

Majority of the respondents, R1, R2, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11, R12 considered themselves as politically active. Although, they have different explanations on why they answered that they are

politically active. For instance, R1, “Aware po ako sa mga nangyayari po and doon po sa mga para po sa akin kung sino ang dapat kong iboto and ayon.” (I am aware of what is happening and there are those

who are for me who I should vote for and agree with.) R3 stated “*Yeah, but I observe some limitations.*” Whereas R6 and R1 stated that the reason they consider themselves politically active is due to knowing and seeing the situations that are happening in the country today. As for R8, R10 and R12 stated that they are politically active due to having voted. Among the three, R12 specifically

mentioned that “*Yes, kasi bumoboto ako.*” (Yes, because I am voting.) On the other hand, only R3 answered that they do not consider and view themselves as someone who is an extremely politically active being because they do not engage in political activities that much “*Hindi sobrang politically active.*” (Not very politically active.)

I. Ranking

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R2	Six	<i>I only like, share my thoughts and views if asked. Sometimes, I even sugar coat the-my answer, like uhm, or hide my opinion, it depends on the situation.</i>
R4	Eight	<i>Involve ako sa mga nangyayari sa paligid ko. Especially, kung alam kong hindi lang ako yung maaapektuhan pero yung buong bansa and yung city na saan ako nakatira.</i>
R5	Nine	<i>I might be engaging on things like political parties, there are still room for improvement.</i>
R7	Ten	<i>I engage my social media to spread awareness.</i>

The respondents ranked themselves from one to ten on how politically active they are. R2 and R3 ranked themselves as six out of ten. Then R1, R4, R6, R8, R9 and R12 answered they assessed themselves as eight out of ten. Among the six responses R4, answered “*Involved ako sa mga nangyayari sa paligid ko.*” (I am involved in what is happening around me.) Meanwhile R5 is the only one who answered that they are nine out of ten due to “*I think there are still room for improvement.*” Lastly, R7, R10, and R11 considered themselves as a politically active being and scored themselves ten out of ten.

The respondents explained why they ranked themselves with the corresponding number out of ten. R2 and R3 both said that they are six out of ten of being politically active. R2 explained that they only share their thoughts and views if asked. They added that depending on the situation, they sugarcoat their opinions “*I only like, share my thoughts and view if asked. Sometimes, I even sugar*

coat my answer, like hide my opinion, it depends on the situation.”. They do not want to sacrifice a given opportunity just because of different political views. On the other hand, R3 shared that they do not engage excessively in political activities “*Hindi naman ganun kadalas ako mag engage sa mga political activities.*” (I don’t often engage in political activities.) As for R4, R6, R8, R9, and R10 they have similar answers wherein they engage and participate in political activities and let themselves be involved in such activities. Meanwhile, R12 ranked themselves eight solely because they have casted their votes on the previous election “*I don’t like myself to get into-involve masyado sa politics.*” (I don’t like myself to get into-involve too much in politics.) A similar explanation given by R10; however, the latter does not want to be involved in political activities “*Masasabi ko na tama naman ‘yung binoto ko.*” (I can say that I voted correctly.) As for R1, they also ranked themselves as eight because they know who they can cast their votes.

Table 4: The respondents were asked for their preference in the Characteristics of Mayor

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
-------------	----------	------------------

R5	Good Leadership	<i>Leadership, alam mo kung paano pamumunuan yung mismong sinasakupan mo, good communication, magkakaroon ng communication mula sa Mayor tapos feedback galling doon sa mga mamamayan, nararamdaman niya yung sentiment mo, Knowledge on how to manage things, knowledge about political affairs, knowledge on political leadership.</i>
	No Criminal Record	<i>May malinis na record, Merong plataporma na maganda para sa bayan niya, at hindi corrupt, yung maganda background.</i>

As for the personal preference of the respondents towards the characteristics of their preferred mayoral candidate, there are few similarities and differences to the respondents' answers. As seen in table 4 there are two (2) classifications, Good Leadership and No Criminal Record.

Despite the respondents having the same answers they have different reasons and explanations as to why Good Leadership is their preference in the characteristic of a mayor. For instance, R2 wanted a hands-on and an observant characteristic for a mayor for the people to see their actions and transparency, they added that since these candidates always use social media, it will give them an opportunity to show if they genuinely cared for the welfare of the people and the city by uploading through the media their participation, platforms and overall involvement to connect not just with the people but also the city itself *“Hands-on and observant? Siguro kasi all Mayor, like yung mga candidates ngayon they are using social media na rin. So, by that parang nakikita natin yung mga participation and platforms. I’m not really sure kung for show lang bay un or genuine sila sa paggawa nun, pero their involvement in social media also give them an idea kung anon a yung situation ng lugar nila-ng city.”* (Hands-on and observant? Maybe because all the

mayors like the candidates now, they are using social media as well. So, by that we seem to see the participation and platforms. I'm not really sure if it's just for show or if they're genuine in doing that, but their involvement in social media also gives them an idea of what the situation is in their area-the city.) For R3, R4, R7, R8, R11 and R12 they stated that a mayor should be able to cater the needs of the city they are governing, as well as practice the ‘walk the talk’ and thinks about the general welfare of the city. Among the six, R7 specifically stated that *“kung may nagawa na ba siya, ano yung plataporma niya.”* (If he has done anything, what is his platform.) R5 and R9 are quite similar in a way that a mayor should be consistent and have a good communication to its governing city. R1 mentioned that the mayor has a clear intention for the position that they are running to *“Para sa akin yung clear ‘yung intention niya sa posisyon na gusto niyang takbuhin at makikita rin naman iyon sa mga sinasabi niya. tuwing may meeting about doon sa gusto niyang itakbo na position.”* (For me, his intention is clear in the position he wants to run and that can also be seen in what he says. every time there is a meeting about the position he wants to run.) On the other hand, R6 and R10 preferred that the characteristic of a mayor should not have any criminal record.

Table 5: The respondents are asked if their chosen Mayor have the experience, and a good platform and programs to become a mayor.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R1	No	<i>Hindi, wala.</i>
R2	Past Terms	<i>Usually kino-compare ko lang kung “ok ba siya last term?”</i>
R3	Credentials	<i>Mayroon.</i>
R7	Yes	<i>May nagawa na siya for QC then kahit may mistakes siya, she tried to make things better rather than the sumusunod na partylist ka kalaban niya, doon na ako sa may nagawa na and mas maayos na yung plataporma .</i>

The respondents were asked if their preferred candidate in the 2022 mayoral elections has enough

experience/s to lead and serve the city. Most of the respondents answered that their preferred mayor

indeed has enough experience. Now, R2 explained that they usually compare the candidates' service during their last term. It does not specify that R2 agrees that their selected mayor has enough experience, but the given the formulated response it is a positive response "Usually kino-compare ko lang kung 'ok ba siya last term?'" (I usually just compare if he was ok last term.) When asked if the programs and platforms of their chosen Mayoral Candidates were enough for them to lock in their votes, all of the respondents agreed. R4 stated that they are doing background research of their candidates' credentials are important to them before making a decision because experience alone is not enough even though the running candidate for mayor have already served in the past "Hindi naman sapat yung experience na halimbawa nakapag-serve

na sila as Mayor before, mas tinitignan ko pa rin yung credentials and yung pwede nilang mapakita." (The experience is not enough, for example they have served as Mayor before, I still look more at the credentials and what they can show.) On the other hand, quite similar to R2, R6 saw the running candidate's improvements during the past term that they have served "Dati na siyang mayor dito sa qc, so nakita ko naman na yung mga naging past activities niya and improvements din na nangyari sa past na naging term niya.." (He used to be the mayor here in QC, so I have seen his past activities and improvements that happened in his past term.) However, only R1 voted for a mayor who has not enough experience and platforms "Yes. Actually, I'm not-None." (Oo. Actually, hindi ako-wala-wala.)

Table 6: The respondents are asked for their expectations for the current mayor.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R5	Solve Challenges in the City	Ma-target niya naman yung mga hindi masyado napupunan ng pansin in regards dito sa Quezon City, mag-focus din tayo sa mga health facilities sa mga anything health related.
R12	Good Leadership	Mapagkakatiwalaan and yung sinusunod niya yung platform na nilalatag niya sa mga tao, tsaka yung mayroong empathy.

The general consensus is that everyone is hoping for an honest Mayor that will serve the community to the best of their ability, without the people having to rally and call out for help, and, a mayor that will work their platforms into fruition. As seen in table 6 there are two (2) classifications, Good Leadership and Solve Challenges in the City.

R1, R2, R3, R4, R6, R7, R10, R11 and R12 all stated and specified that they hope for the new mayor to act immediately and accordingly to a situation as well as to become honest and to have more improvements in the city they are serving on. Among the nine, R7 specifically added that they wish the city to become like the city that Mayor Vico Sotto is handling, with no corruption and a people centered government

"Maging mabuting mayor siya saka yung Quezon City sana maging katulad siya nung hinahawakan ni Mayor Vico." (Let him be a good mayor and Quezon City, I hope he will be like when Mayor Vico handled it.) On the other hand, R5, R8 and R9 expects to solve challenges in the city such as the traffic concern for the commuters, improvements of the medical facilities as well as improving the aid for mental health. R9 specifically stated, "Traffic. we wanted to change, we begin in the smallest streets, ligtas na balik eskwela, ligtas na environment here in Quezon City." (Traffic. we wanted to change, we began in the smallest streets, safe return to school, safe environment here in Quezon City.)

Table 7: The respondents are asked what their kins preference and expectations for the Mayor of Quezon City.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R4	Familiarity and Experience	Kagaya ng nabanggit, mas prefer ng family ko yung kilala nila.
R6	No Corruption	Walang bahid ng kurapsyon.
R7	One Party Support	Mahirap kasi pag family yung paguusapan kasi sila mismo ay iba yung mga belief-naniniwala sila sa isang partylist lang.
R8	Helps with Everyday Needs	Masusulentohan yung pangangailangan nila like basic needs.

They value someone who is worthy for their vote. Good credibility, the mayoral candidate has good experience, tapat na, subok na, and good educational background.

When it comes what their kins expectations and preference to the current city Mayor, the majority have different preference as well as expectations to their kin. In table 7. there are five (5) frequently mentioned by the respondents, namely; Good Leadership, Helps with everyday needs, Familiarity and experience, One party support, and No Criminal Corruption.

R2, R9 and R12 stated their kin have the same expectations and preference for the city Mayor. The mayor should possess a good leadership skill that is hands-on to the job, credibility, and consistent. R9 also stated that *“they value someone who is worthy for their vote”* and added that a good educational background is also a must for them. On the other hand, R3 and R8 observed their kins expectations and preference on the mayor as someone who helps with their everyday needs. R8 also added that their mindset is different to their kins *“Basta mapunan yung needs nila even though hindi naman ka-vote vote yung taong yun, siempre kapag natutulungan sila financially yun yung iboboto nila.”* (As long as their needs are met, even though that person is not

worthy of their vote, and of course as long as they they can be of help financially, that’s who they will vote for.) Among the different responses that were said in the is the One-Party Support, wherein R7 stated that in their family *“Kung sino yung president niya hanggang baba kung sino sinusupportahan ng president nila hanggang baba yun na yung susupportahan nila.”* (Whoever they voted for the President up to the bottom of the bracket, who their president is supporting up to the bottom, that is who they will support.) Though for R4 and R5, familiarity and experiences of the mayor matters to their kin *“Mas prefer ng family ko yung kakilala na nila.”* (My family prefers people they already know.) Lastly, R6, R10 and R11 stated that their kin are looking out for a mayor with no corruption or with a clean record in politics. Among the three, R10 specifically stated *“Tapat po sa bayan, wala pong bahi ng any corruption, any issues about politics po.”* (Loyal to the people, there is no smell of any corruption, any issues about politics.) However, R1 did not stated the preference and expectations of their kin for a mayor.

Table 8: The respondents are asked if their Kin Influences them Directly to Vote and Choose their Mayoral Candidate

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R4	No	<i>Wala naman pumipigil din sa akin sa family naming.</i>
R5	Not Totally	<i>May mga naiimpluwensiyahan din po sila na ka-edad ko.</i>
R7	Yes	<i>Since elders nga sila they want to be followed, gusto nuka sila lagi nasusunod so kung anong gusto nila ipapadama nil ana ito yung gusto nila and pag sumuway ka doon there are things na magiging limited.</i>

Majority of respondents stated that their kin influenced them in choosing a mayoral candidate. Although, having said yes in their kin influencing them, R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11 and R12 gave different reasonings. For R1, R2, R6 and R10 their kin tell them who they will vote for and because they are their families, they will submit to whom they will cast their votes for. Among the four, R6 specifically stated *“Oo, mas matanda s aiyo parang makikinig ka sa advice nila.”* (Yes, they are older than you, you seem to listen their advice.) R1 added that their uncle is working for a certain mayoral candidate that’s why he tells them to vote for that candidate. Although for R7 and R8 the situation is quite different due to their kins will emphasize or

stressed out their opinions though having freewill and *“Siempre mas matanda sila sa akin so ang mindset nila is mas alam nila.”* (They are older than me so their mindset is that they know better.) R3, R9 and R11 shared the same situation wherein there is an open discussion within their kin and believes that their kin will add insights to their candidates aside from that thoroughly scrutinizing the candidates before casting their votes stating *“Ginagawaan po naming ng background study or research ‘ano nga ba yung katangian po ng isang mayor na yun.’”* (We are doing a background study or research 'what are the characteristics of that mayor.) On the other hand, R4 stated that they are not being influenced by their kin because they have their own opinions

“Hindi, kasi may sarili rin akong opinion.” (No, because I also have my own opinion.) Quite similar to R4 is R5 wherein though the kin has an influence on them at the end of the day it is still up to them on who will they will vote for stating “Nakaka-

influence po sila pero not that much because at the end of the day it is still my decision po.” (They influence me but not that much because at the end of the day it is still my decision.)

Table 9: The respondents are asked if the influence of their kins extends to other members in their family.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R1	Yes	<i>Opo 'yung tito ko pinupush niya talaga sa buong family namin.</i>
R4	No	<i>Yung sabihan ka ng “iboto mo si ganuito, ganyan” wala namang ganun nangyayari.</i>

Majority of the respondent’s answered yes if their kins influence extends to other members. Although, their reasons on how it extends to the other members are different. R2 stated every time their relatives share some political opinions or views during discussion, they just keep quiet. They did not even ask about their perspective on such issues “Kahit nagsha-share na ng opinion during the discussion time, tumatahimik na lang. Di ko na tinatanong kung ano opinion nila about sa sinabi ng napagusapan.” (Even when sharing an opinion during the discussion time, I just stay silent. I don't ask what their opinion is about what was said in the discussion.) Meanwhile for R1, their uncle really pushes their relatives to vote a certain candidate, stating “Kitang-kita ko kung paano niya i-push sa family namin na ito, ito dapat 'yung kailangan niyo iboto.” (I can clearly see how he will push this in our family, this should be what you have to vote for.) On the other hand, R5, R6, R7, and R8 shared the same situation wherein the youth voters need to follow them on who they will vote for and since the respondent’s kin shared the same candidates, they believe that the respondents cannot decide on their own. Among the four, R8 specifically mentioned,

“Oo, siempre kasi they believe na we still like-hindi namin kaya mag-decision on our own.” (Yes, because they always believe that we still like-we can't make decisions on our own.) Whereas R3 and R9 are quite similar, the influence of their kin extends to other members because they believe that the reasoning of their kin is not only for their own benefit but it has benefit for the family, stating “Yes, kasi yung-yung pagpili nila siempre hindi lang naman sa kanila yung effect nun.” (Yes, because the--their choice is always not only theirs, but the effect is not theirs.) For R4, in their family, there are open discussions but they are not obliged to follow their kin as they firmly believe that they are open when it comes to political discussions “Family ko super open pagdating sa politics and wala na-I mean nag-sh-share ng mga opinyon about sa mga tumakbo, sa mga candidates pero yung sabihan ka ng “iboto mo si ganito, si ganyan” wala namang ganun nangyari.” (My family is super open when it comes to politics and nothing else-I mean we shared opinions about those who ran, about the candidates, but when you were told to "vote for such and such" nothing like that happened.)

Table 10: The respondents are asked on what way their Kin influence them in Choosing a Candidate.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R1	Coercive	<i>Ganon po siya ka-push na dapat ayon daw ang dapat manalo.</i>
R4	None	<i>Pagboto wala naman siyang masyadong influence.</i>
R7	Persuasive	<i>Yeah, may freewill kami pero siempre nandoon pa rin yung ididiin talaga nila yung gusto nila.</i>

When it comes in what way their kin influence the respondents in choosing for a candidate, the majority answered that there is indeed persuasion in

order to have the same candidate. Thus, in table 10. there are three (3) frequently mentioned answers by

the respondents that were classified, namely; Coercive attitude, Persuasive, and None.

R1, R2 and R8 stated that their kin have an influence on them in choosing for a candidate in a coercive way due to what *R2* and *R8* said that if their family knew that they voted for a different candidate they will scold and get mad at them. *R2* also added that their religion also has significant effect due to their called “paglaban” that they cannot go against the decision of their church, “*Nakakaapekto siya, and I think in a very authoritarian way? So, we call that parang “paglaban” you went against the decision, so siguro in that way na parang nako-konsensiya ka kung sakali na gusto ko na magdecide na ibang tao-sundin ko yung gusto ko. I would make me feel guilty, parang ganun, baka ma- “my gosh baka malaman ng papa ko” yung mga ganun so I think yung mga ganung situations makakaapekto siya.*” (It affects me, and I think in a very authoritarian way? So we call that like “resistance” you went against the decision, so maybe in that way it's like you feel guilty if I want someone else to decide-I'll follow what I want. I would make me feel guilty, it's like that, maybe- “my gosh, maybe my dad will know” those kinds of things, so I think those kinds

of situations will affect him.) However, for *R1*, they stated that their uncle pushed them to vote for a certain mayoral candidate “*Pinupush niya talaga sa buong family namin. Nagtrabaho po siya doon sa kandidato.*” (He really pushed our whole family. He works there for the candidate.) For *R2, R5, R6, R7, R10, R11* and *R12* the situation is different, their kin are persuading them in choosing the same candidates as them by always reminding them, always saying their opinions, *R3* also added that their kin believe and spread fake news and does not know how to fact check “*May family members po kasi ako na parang fake news-mahilig po silang magpakalat ng fake news like mag-sh-share sila ng ganito ganyan.*” (I have family members who are like fake news-they like to spread fake news like they share things like this.) Whereas *R7* stated that though they have freewill their kin will stress out and emphasize why they should vote for the certain candidate “*May freewill kami, pero siempre nandoon pa din yung ididiin talaga nila yung gusto nila.*” (We have free will, but of course there is still that they will really emphasize what they want.) On the other hand, *R4* and *R9*'s kin do not influence them in choosing a candidate.

Table 11: The respondents are asked who is in-charge in the decision making in their family.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R1	Uncle	<i>Kasi ‘yung tito ko nagtrabaho kay Mike Defensor. So ayon parang respect na rin sa kaniya kasi mataas ang tingin ko sa tito ko</i>
R7	Grandmother	<i>My grandmother.</i>
R8	Father	<i>Si papa po.</i>
R9	Breadwinners	<i>Workung class. Alam nila kung gaano kamahal ang pamasaha, dumadaan sila minsan sa mga gas station at alam nila kung gaano katas presyo ng gas.</i>
R10	Mother	<i>Yung nanay ko yung nagsasabi na kung sino yung dapat naming iboto.</i>
R11	None	<i>Kami po mismo nag-d-decide on our own.</i>
R12	Both Parents	<i>Parang equal naman siya. I wouldn't say patriarchal or matriarchal yung pamamalakad.</i>

The respondents who answered that their fathers are the person in-charge in the family are *R2, R3, R4, R6, and R8*. Among the five responses, *R2* specifically mentioned that “In a very authoritarian way.” There were also few respondents who answered that their mother is the person in-charge such as *R5* and *R10*. *R5* specifically stated, “*Most of the time siya po kasi lagi ko pong kasama then*

marami rin yung-marami rin po siyang say about sa politics kaya feeling ko po siya po yung may pinakamalaking impluwensiya.” (Most of the time he is because I am always with him then there is also a lot-he also has a lot to say about politics so I feel he is the one with the biggest influence.) The remaining respondents have different answers. *R7* answered their grandmother. Then *R9* mentioned

that the people in-charge in their family are the members who belong in the working class, stating “Those who are in the working class. Kasi doon sa mga namamlengke alam nila ‘yung presyo ng bilihin. Sa mga nagtrabaho alam nila kung gaano ka-traffic. Alam nila kung gaano kamahal ang pamasahe, dumadaan sila minsan sa mga gas station at alam nila kung gaano kataas ang presyo ng gas. Alam nila kung gaano sila kailangan mag-double ingat because of some crime rates. Uhm...naiintindihan nila ‘yung minimum- ‘yung value nang pagkakaroon ng minimum wage and so on and so forth. So, let’s just say I am more inclined to believe in them kasi alam kong mas marami silang factors na tine-take in into making a decision.” (Those who are in the working class. Because those who go to the market know the price of the product.

For those who work, they know how much traffic there is. They know how expensive the fare is, they pass by gas stations sometimes and they know how high gas prices are. They know how much they need to be double careful because of some crime rates. Uhm...they understand the minimum- the value of having a minimum wage and so on and so forth. So, let’s just say I am more inclined to believe in them because I know they take more factors into making a decision.) R1 stated that their uncle is the people in-charge in their family. Next, R11 explained that they are the ones who are in-charge in their family. Lastly, R12 answered that there is no such thing as patriarchal and matriarchal system in their family and both parents are equal to be in-charge in their family.

Table 12: The respondents are asked if their preference for the city mayor matched with their kin.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R5	No	<i>Hindi po. Most of my family po kasi ang binoto is this certain candidate na wala po siyang magandang track record.</i>
R9	Yes	<i>Lahat kami halos dito sa bahay naming, gaya-gaya na rin kami.</i>
R12	Most of the Time	<i>Mayroong hindi, pero mayroon namang points na oo.</i>

The data shows mixed responses from the respondents if the characteristics of their preferred candidate matches with their kin. R1, and R2 answered that most of the time it matches with their kins’ preference and added that they may have different thinking from their kin, stating “Tumutugma naman, nakiking yung parents namin sa amin, nakiking din kami sa kanila.” (It matches, our parents listen to us, we also listen to them.) Meanwhile, R3, R8, and R9 said “yes”, due to following their kin. Among the three, R8 specifically mentioned “Hindi eh. Mayroon at some point-mayroong mga points sa vote ganun, pero sa iba hindi eh.” (No. There are some points-there are points in the vote like that, but not in others.) Although, R8 emphasizes that their preference matches because they do research on each and every candidate. However, the following respondents answered the opposite; R4, R5, R6, R7, and R10. R5 explained that their preference does not match with their kin is because quite the opposite of R8, their kin does not do background checking and easily believes in fake news “Hindi po siya aligned kasi yung parang gusto po ng pamilya ko is like parang

most of my family po kasi ang binoto is this certain candidate na wala po siyang magandang track record po tapos hindi ko naman po pinagmamaliit na hindi college graduate or such pero kung i-co-compare po kasi dun sa candidate na college graduate may mga degree sa law and economist feeling ko, i-we-weigh kasi natin yung qualifications nila, mas pabor ako dun sa mas qualified kaso sila kasi parang more-much more nainpluwensiyahan sila ng fake news tapos kaya binoto yung isang candidate po na ganun.”(It is not aligned because what my family seems to like is like most of my family because the one who was voted for is this certain candidate who does not have a good track record. but if you compare it to the candidate who is a college graduate with degrees in law and economist, I feel that we should weigh their qualifications, I am more in favor of the more qualified case because they seem to be more-much more they were influenced by fake news and that's why they voted for a candidate like that.) Then R1 did not stated if their kin match their preferences for mayoral candidate.

Table 13: The respondents are asked if they have freedom to express their political views and opinions.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
-------------	----------	------------------

R4	Yes	<i>Sa pamilya ko nakakapagsabi talaga ako. Open kami sa mga ganyang bagay.</i>
R8	No	<i>Hindi, takot ka ngang mapagalitan.</i>

Majority of the respondents can express their political views and opinions freely since their households are open for political discussion such as. R2 used their knowledge to state their views and respectfully correct her kin if their opinions became unrealistic *“I use this knowledge parang i-educate rin yung parents ko to be fair with-in making decisions especially parang nagiging below the belt na minsan yung opinion nila and it’s unrealistic, so I would respectfully correct them.”* (I use this knowledge to educate my parents to be fair with-in making decisions especially when sometimes their opinion seems to be below the belt and it's unrealistic, so I would respectfully correct them.) R5 mentioned that their kin know their personality which helps them to be vocal in expressing themselves freely particularly in political issues *“I have the freedom to say anything that I want sa family ko. Alam naman na po nila siguro ugali ko na hindi po ako masyado nagpapatalo sa mga ganyang usapin po so, they better be na pinababayaan na lang po nila ako on my thoughts kaysa po magkaroon ng arguments na hindi po nila kayang i-sustain po.”* (I have the freedom to say anything that I want to my family. They probably already know my habit that I don't give in easily about such matters, so it's better for them to leave me alone on my thoughts rather than having arguments that they can't sustain.) Although R10 agreed that they can express their political views, there is an underlying impact from the elders in their household who view themselves as someone superior over the younger members of the family *“Very vocal ako sa candidate na iboboto ko. Kaso mas may nakatatanda sa inyo parang tapos- parang sila pa ‘yung ano dito*

superior. So ang nangyayari kaming mga mas bata nagiging ano lang sunod-sunuran.” (I am very vocal about the candidate I will vote for. In some instances, there is someone older than you, it seems like they are your superior. So, what happens is that we younger people become just obedient.) Therefore, R10 stated that at the end, it will still affect them to blindly follow the preferred candidate chosen by their kin. As for R1, they can express their political views but there are some limitations since they don't want to offend their uncle *“I think..pwede naman...and siguro hindi ko lang nagawa kasi ayon dahil na rin sa respeto sa tito ko kasi baka kasi ‘pag sinabi ko yung opiniyon ko about doon sa kandidato niya baka po ma-offend ganon po... baka hindi niya magustuhan ganon.”* (I think..it's possible...and maybe I didn't do it because it was out of respect for my uncle because maybe if I told my opinion about that to his candidate he might be offended by that...he might not like it that.) Meanwhile there are two respondents who answered they are unable to express their political views and opinions freely. R8 reasoned out that they are afraid to be scolded *“Hindi kasi ano nga eh, takot ka ngang mapagalitan kasi kapag lumaki pa yung ano-yung issue mas mahirap diba kasi yun nga family mo yun eh.”* (It's not what it is, you're afraid of being scolded because when the thing grows up-the issue is more difficult, isn't it, because it's your family, right?) As for R12, they are unable to express themselves freely due to it may result in conflict *“Hindi masyado kasi, minsan nag-s-start siya ng con-I wouldn't say conflict, argument.”* (Not too much, because sometimes he started a con-I wouldn't say conflict, argument.)

Table 14: The respondents are asked if there are effects of not choosing the same candidate with their kin.

Respondents	Category	Sample Responses
R5	No Effect	<i>Hindi po siya makakaapekto po sakín kasi it is my life and it is my right to have my own decision.</i>
R8	Tightened Allowance	<i>Hindi ka nila bibigyan ng ano kapag hindi hindi mo sila sinunod, they believe na wala kang sariling pagúisp para mag-decision sa bagay na iyon.</i>
R10	Conflict in the Family	<i>Magkakatampuhan, Tampuhan lang naman.</i>

I will feel guilty, kasi siempre sila yung nag-de-decision so parang it's just right for me to follow sila kung ano man yung desisyon nila.

In this table the respondents were asked if there is an effect if they do not choose the same mayoral candidate with their kin. Most respondents answered that there is a personal effect if they do not choose the same candidates preferred by their kin. Majority of the respondents such as R2, R6, R7, R11, and R12 responded that they feel guilty if they do not follow or choose the same candidate preferred by their kin. R2 stated that it may affect their mental health and they would feel guilty *"Makakaapekto siya, like my mental health, I would feel guilty."* (It will affect, like my mental health, I would feel guilty.) though, the respondent also added that if they strongly believe they made the right decision, they would not feel guilty at all. However, they added that the ties and trust between their kin will be weakened due to a betrayal and guilt they feel unconsciously *"There is a feeling na parang ano ka uncomfortable, ganun and then also, yeah guilty? pero kasi kapag you strongly believe na you made the right decision, parang you wouldn't feel guilty, parang "I made the right decision, why should I feel guilty? Parang ganun yung feeling. So, siguro mawawala lang yung ties-ay hindi na ganun ka ano yung trust, siguro like, since you betrayed him unconsciously or her, na 'di nila alam na ikaw lang nakakaalam so ikaw sa sarili mo."* (There is a feeling like you're uncomfortable, like that and then also, yeah guilty? but because when you strongly believe that you made the right decision, it's like you wouldn't feel guilty, like "I made the right decision, why should I feel guilty? It's like that feeling. So, maybe the ties will just disappear-you're not that trust anymore, maybe like, since you betrayed him unconsciously or her, that they don't know that you're the only one who knows, so you're on your own.) Meanwhile, R8 explained it will probably affect their allowance if they do not follow the chosen mayoral candidate given by their kin *"Sa mga allowance ganun, kasi hindi ka nila bibigyan ng ano kapag hindi mo sila sinunod eh, yun yung panlaban nila "Wala kang allowance for this month" or "this week" eh ano eh like sumusuway ka sa kagustuhan namin e, so yun, yun yung isang factor, yung isa naman, yun sa decision making kasi they believe na wala kang sariling pagiisip para mag decision sa bagay na iyon."* (With allowances like that, because they won't give you anything if you don't follow them, that's their defense "You don't have an allowance for this month" or "this week" eh, it's like you're disobeying our wishes, so that, that's one factor, the other one, that's in decision making because they believe that you don't have your own thinking to make a decision on that matter.) Then R10 mentioned that they will most likely feel upset if they will not follow their kin. On

the other hand, the remaining respondents such as R3, R4, R5, and R9 all mentioned that it will not affect them if they choose not to obey the chosen candidate preferred by their kin. Among the four, R9 specifically stated *"There is still free will within our family. It doesn't affect me that much if I voted for someone else."* These respondents explained that they have their own free will and they do not let themselves be affected by the opinions of their kin.

Discussions

The results of the test and analyses were combined with the questions that are stated in the first chapter and analysis of procedure using the data gathered from the fourth chapter. After vigilantly deliberating the interpretation and analysis here are the summarizations of the research. This qualitative case study summarizes the analysis of the distinct experiences of the respondents in regards to their kinship's influence towards their voting preferences in reliance in the 2022 Mayoral Elections in Quezon City. The purpose of this study is to convey on how kinship expands its influence to the youth voters in the relevancy of the mayoral elections in Quezon City.

The interview was conducted from September 01 to 08 of 2022 and the researchers interviewed twelve (12) qualified respondents to participate in this research study. These respondents were able to participate due to the use of multiple sampling techniques- mainly the criterion sampling, and snowball sampling to indicate the credibility of these respondents in accordance with the inclusion criteria given in the research procedures and informed consent. Thus, the researchers summarize the analysis of the responses from the research questions. It is in order to further understand the unseen influence of kinship to the voting preferences that affects the youth voters.

A. Political Activeness

Political Activeness defines that an individual can engage themselves in political issues of their country and city (Willingham, 2017) The study conveys the political activeness of the respondents from Barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City on the 2022 Mayoral Elections. Based on the data presented, the respondents shared their insights of what politically active means and how they identify themselves as one. Among the respondents, forty percent (40%) defined that being politically active means that they are aware of the issues manifested in politics. Moreover, twenty-seven percent (27%) engaged and participated in politics; twenty percent (20%) mentioned that being politically active means

that the people exercise their right to vote; lastly, thirteen percent (13%) stated being politically active means expressing political views. The data reaffirms the study of Matthes (2022) that political activeness in youth voters refers to the directed outcomes of politics in society. For instance, participating in youth organizations or issue-based NGOs, debates and community issues.

In connection, with the affirmation of study by Elemia (2022) that youth plays as a key actor during the recent elections, whilst the eighty-four percent (84%) respondents shared their insights that there are visible politically active youth voters within their same age range. R5 shared, “*If I’m going to base on the social media masasabi ko po na most my-most of our age po is very active in terms of engaging with political parties po*” [If I’m going to base on the social media, I can say that most of our age is very active in terms of engaging with political parties.]. The findings also presented that there are eight percent (8%) who stated *not all*. Based on R8’s response, “*Hindi ganun lahat na naka parang hindi lahat nakaboto kasi I think ano eh yung registration din is sobrang hassle.*” [not all wherein not all [youth] are able to vote because I think the [voting] registration is hassle.] Aside from that, under the theme of political activeness, the findings also presented how politically active and aware the respondents are in their own observation. It was transpired from the previous chapter that ninety-two percent (92%) affirmed and were aware how political they are. On the other hand, eight percent (8%) disagrees. This data connects to the study of Cabo (2018), which mentioned that although youth is one of the disadvantaged groups in society, it does not hinder them to empower their desire to be involved and participate in social and political changes.

Therefore, the analysis in this study observes that the respondents of Barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City who are active voters during the 2022 Mayoral Election indeed manifest the political activeness that the researchers sought after because of the data shown in the previous chapter. The respondents shared their insights clearly and truthfully which makes the analysis accurate and relatively ideal for a qualitative case study design.

B. Youth Voters and Kinships’ Voting Preference

Voting preference refers to what the people prefer on a party or candidate whose policy positions most closely match their own (Jenke & Huettel, 2020). In the study of Çavuşoğlu & Pekkaya (2016), as cited in Karabulut & Önder (2017), youth voters prefer to analyze the candidate's projects, educational background, and the feasibility of commitment to its constituents. As the study conveys, the respondents

shared their preferences on the characteristics of city mayor. Eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents preferred a mayor who has good leadership. For instance, the mayor should cater the needs of its citizens, has clear intention, and is observant. R5 also added that a mayor should have a “knowledge on how to manage things, knowledge about political affairs, knowledge on political leadership”. On the other hand, seventeen percent (17%) of the respondents prefer a mayor who has no criminal record. The data also shows that sixty-seven percent (67%) of the respondents voted for a mayoral candidate who has enough experience, programs, and platforms. Seventeen percent (17%) of the respondents stated that they compared the candidate's service in the past term. While eight percent (8%) of the respondents are doing a background research on the candidate's credentials wherein R4 stated that experience alone is not enough, that's why it is important to look for the candidate's credentials before making a decision. However, eight percent (8%) of the respondents voted for a mayoral candidate who doesn't have enough experience, programs, and platforms. This data reaffirms the study of Gatdula (2021) that voters who examine the candidate's education, competence, experiences, and sense of accountability, desire for a positive change and justice in their society. As for the expectations of the youth voters on the mayor, seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents expected for a mayor to act immediately and accordingly, to become honest, and to improve the city they're governing. The remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of the respondents expected for a mayor to solve some challenges in the city. The data assert the Local Government Code of the Philippines in Chapter 3, Article 1 § 444 which stated that the city mayors are the chief executive and they shall exercise their power to perform their duties, responsibilities, and functions to their constituents. Neiger (2022) also stated that one of the duties of the city mayor is to oversee plans, programs, services, and projects of their local government as well as to carry out the disaster risk and reduction programs for their cities in times of the calamities.

Meanwhile, the study shows that the kinships' preferences and expectations on a mayor have differences. Similarly with the youth voters, the majority of the kinship, which comprises twenty-eight percent (28%), prefers a mayor who has a good leadership and twenty-seven percent (27%) of the kinship prefers a mayor who has a clean record. R9 added that “they value someone who is worthy for their vote”. Lastly, eighteen percent (18%) of the kinship expects and prefers a mayor who helps with their everyday needs. This data affirms in the study of Mendoza (2019) that people who think for the benefit of all than their gains desire for a society to

change and not to suffer. In addition, R8 stated their kinships' mindset, "*Basta mapunan yung needs nila even though hindi naman ka-vote vote yung taong yun, siempre kapag natutulungan sila financially yun yung iboboto nila*" (As long as their needs are met, even though that person is not worthy of their vote, and of course as long as they can be of help financially, that's who they will vote for.) This response conveys in the study of Mendoza (2019) that people resort to voting for such a candidate who will give them benefits rather than to think of a nation since they lost the trust in democracy.

However, in the study of Wong (2022), Filipino voters prefer to elect a candidate which is based on fame and family background, instead of plans, programs, and platforms that the candidate offers. Based on the data presented, eighteen percent (18%) of the kinship prefers a mayor who is familiar to them as well as has experience. Moreover, Wong (2022) explained that the ideology of the political parties were not justified in the realities in Philippine politics, instead Filipinos are candidate-centered. The findings presented that nine percent (9%) of the kinship supported only one-party wherein R7 stated that in their family, "*Kung sino yung president niya hanggang baba kung sino sinusupportahan ng president nila hanggang baba yun na yung susupportahan nila*" (Whoever they voted for the President up to the bottom of the bracket, who their president is supporting up to the bottom, that is who they will support.) Further, this data conveys matching preference of kinship and the youth voters in regards with their choice of the mayoral candidate. A majority of thirty-six percent (37%) affirmed that the respondents and their kin have similar choice of the candidate. R10 explained, "*Oo. Kasi ano tulad dito sa amin 'yung nanay ko 'yung nagsasabi na kung sino 'yung dapat naming iboto, parang ganon. Tapos so lahat kami halos dito sa bahay namin, gaya-gaya na din kami kasi... ayun.*" (Yes. Because my mother is the one who says who we should vote for. So all of us here in our home will do the same thing and follow her.) In contrast, thirty-six percent (36%) disapproves followed by R5's statement, "*Hindi po. Hindi po siya aligned kasi yung parang gusto po ng pamilya ko is like parang most of my family po kasi ang binoto is this certain candidate na wala po siyang magandang track record*" (No. It is not aligned because the candidate that my family voted for is this certain candidate without a credible track record.).

Therefore, the study affirms that the youth respondents of the Barangay Pasong Tamo prefer a mayor who has good leadership and serves the needs of its constituents. In contrast, their kinship has different preferences and expectations on the mayor but majority of them prefer good leadership and have a clean record. Consequently, this conveys that

a similar preference of candidate to both the youth voters and their kin is different from being directly influencing them regarding their voting preferences.

C. Kinship Influence in Youth Voters Voting Preference

Economists now recognize that "social preferences," or a person's concern for how resources are distributed to others, also influence human decisions in addition to self-interest. Further, the environment in which preferences are formed, particularly social networks and peer pressure, may have an impact on those preferences (Gao, 2022). The data presented connects with the study of Luscombe (2021) that there are inevitable disagreements within the family especially in decisions, thus the findings in the previous chapter presented that seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents admitted that their choice of a mayoral candidate was affected by their kin. Informing them of their voting intentions will force them to submit to those candidates since they are their relatives. R9 mentioned, "*Yes they play a part of choosing who I am going to vote. That's for one kasi naniniwala naman ako sa open discussion. Yeah so dahil nga naman maganda ang academic background nila, I did my own research. Tsaka there's no bad reason not to believe them.*" (Yes they play a part of choosing who I am going to vote. That's for one because I believe in open discussions. Yeah so due to their good academic background, I did my own research. Also there's no bad reason not to believe them.). Then seventeen percent (17%) mentioned that due to their kin, it will accentuate or stress out their ideas despite their freewill, the scenario is vastly different. R3 shared, "*Malaki din yung influence kasi may time na may mga [i]binibigay sila na insights din sa mga candidates na possible na makapag dagdag ng thoughts ko kung sino ba yung pipiliin kong candidate, ganun.*" (There's a huge influence because there are times that they give insights about the candidates that I can possibly add and assess my thoughts to who I should choose as my candidate.) Meanwhile, the remaining eight percent (8%) mentioned that there is an open dialogue among their kin. wherein they feel that by carefully examining the candidates before voting, their kin will also give insights to the candidates.

The researchers also found out that fifty-eight percent (58%) of the respondents stated there is certainly a persuasion of belief to choose the same candidate as their kin when asked how the latter influence them to their voting preferences. Also it is shown in the data that twenty-five percent (25%) claimed that their kin exerts a coercive impact on their choice of candidate because they fear retaliation from their family if they cast a ballot for a particular candidate. For instance, R8 explained, "*Oo naman nakaka-nakakaimpluwensiya yun kasi*

pag nalaman nila kung sino yung binoto ko magagalit sila siyempre nakakakonsensiya yun kasi parents yun eh” (Of course there is an influence because if they know who is my preferred candidate, they will get mad and it will eat up my conscience since [they are my] parents.) Lastly, seventeen percent (17%) claimed that their family members constantly remind them of their ideas and influence them to vote for the same politicians they do. Their kin also propagate false information and lack the skills to fact-check their sources as shared by R5.

This study also analyzes the immense influence of kinship to the youth voters’ freedom of speech and expression about their political views and opinion. The data from the previous chapter showed that seventy-five percent (75%) claimed that they can vocally express their political views and opinions without limitations to their kin. Moreover, with this affirmation from the respondents, it conveys that they respectfully state their insights to their family members as well as correct them particularly if the latter are prone to disinformation. On the other hand, seventeen percent (17%) stated that they are unable to express their views and opinions. This connects with the study of Adcox (2022) wherein political opinions transpires to an argument and strong emotional exchanges between the family members. As R12 shared that they cannot express themselves freely since it may result in conflict. It also presents the choice and perspective of the kin to consider the voice of the youth that because of generational gap, it might come off as insolent and disrespectful and end up in a disagreement between the kin and the youth. Thus, the remaining eight percent (8%) of the respondents claimed that they undoubtedly cannot really express their political views and opinions either.

The researchers found out the underlying instances of a youth voter not choosing the same candidate with their kinship. Majority does not have any struggle if they do not follow their kinship’s choice, however, there are some array of consequences that are stated such as a constrict of allowance, feeling guilty, and a greater result of conflict within the family. This concerns the family values and norms that subsequently exhibits manipulation. Forty-six percent (46%) of the respondents shared that they feel guilty if they do not choose the same candidate with their kinship. For instance, R11 mentioned, *“Siguro, I [will] feel guilty kasi yung-siyempre sila yung nagdedesiyon so parang it’s just right for me to follow sila kung ano man yung desisyon nila.”* (I think, I [will] feel guilty because—of course they are the ones who decide so it’s just right for me to follow whatever their decision is.). It coincides with a psychological tactic of guilt-tripping in which it is relevant to close relationships such as kinship (Raypole, 2020). The researchers analyze that the

data given by most of the respondents is a form of ineffective characteristic of the kin by asserting dominance over the youth if the latter abstain to follow their kinship’s preferences.

Therefore, kinship’s influence in this study engaged in political views and opinions and how it directly affects the youth members if they do not follow their preferences for choosing the mayoral candidate in the 2022 Mayoral Elections. The way they influence the respondents corresponds to how they perceive their choices and decisions in political situations. Indeed the respondents have their own free will, however, the data conveys the persuasive and coercive influence of their kinship. Thus, if the respondents do not follow their kinship’s preference, it may result in some consequences such as feeling guilty and a conflict will occur within the household members.

Conclusion

Based on the gathered data and information, the researchers concluded that kinship indeed influenced the youth voters voting preferences during the 2022 Mayoral Elections. In line with the research questions from the beginning of the study, these bonafide twelve (12) youth voters of barangay Pasong Tamo, Quezon City explained their experiences with their kinship throughout the recent mayoral elections and how they were being influenced by them. Through the designed theoretical framework which is the Social Choice Theory, the researchers were able to understand and analyze the situation between the interconnectedness of kinship, youth voters, and influencing the voting preferences. The SCT by Kenneth Arrow delivered the broadened sense of individual’s choices which can also be applied in political behaviors. The political behaviors are relied on by the influence of social groups including kinship which is relevant and specific in the research study. The role of the kinship is to assist the youth in political discussions as claimed by Cain (2016). They primarily mold the knowledge of the younger members and oversee high choices and decisions. Thus, the researchers sought after the influence of kinship to the youth voters regarding their voting preferences on the recent 2022 mayoral elections. It allows the researchers to understand the data collected through the coded themes presented namely; political activeness, comparison of kinship and youth voters preferences for their chosen mayoral candidate, and the kinship influence to the voting preferences. From the data collected, it was conveyed that the preferences and expectations of youth voters and their kins are different from each other, yet the influence of the latter is huge in contrast to the youth voters’ freewill to decide on their own and chosen candidate.

Likewise, as the mayoral election was not given ample attention compared to the national elections this year, this study contributes to ensuring the importance of the local government to the Filipino youth. As stated in the Local Government Code of the Philippines in Chapter 3, Article 1 § 444 clearly states the importance, duties, and responsibilities of the City Mayors, these city mayors are the chief executives of the city, and they shall exercise their powers to perform their duties, responsibilities, and functions to their constituents provided by the power vested on them by the Local Government Code as well as to other laws. The study shows that the youth voters expect their city mayor to have a good leadership skills to perform their duties, to become honest, to improve the city they're governing, and to solve some issues that their city encounters. Hence, this further supports the claims of the data collected from the findings and summary of the study in which although majority of the youth voters are able to voice out or to express their political opinions and views, they still follow their kin because they, especially the older generations, assert superiority to the younger generations. And this instilling of fear to the youth made them feel guilty if they vote for a candidate that their kin does not prefer. However, there are some youth voters who shared similar preferences and expectation for their mayor with their kin, the differences of voting the mayoral candidate still contradicts them thus influencing each other with their beliefs and ideologies particularly in voting preferences becomes a common issue within the household.

Recommendations

After thorough assessment and considering the foregoing findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are presented:

Future Researchers

The researchers would like to recommend that a quantitative research is to be done involving a larger demographic to confirm the results of the study. In addition, the future researchers could also explore other barangays in Quezon City as well as other municipalities in the Philippines with the same concept as this study to distinguish the kinship and youth voters as key actors of politics.

Local Government Unit

In order to build a fair, just and well-organized society, the local government should look into setting a high qualifications and making sure that what the candidates proposed in their platforms, if for the benefit and welfare of the people, should be done and not only for them to win peoples heart in campaigns.

Commission on Elections

During the recent elections, the participation of the youth is prevalent. The youth are moving forward demanding for a better government and better education system. As mentioned by the respondents, there are cases where their voices are not properly heard in their household or rather it is restricted simply because they are believed to be young minded individuals who cannot decide on their own. The COMELEC should look into Youth Political Empowerment by supporting or launching events that is centered on the importance of youth participation in the elections as well as to fully exercise the youth's inherent right as a responsible voter of the Republic of the Philippines.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest between the authors in this manuscript.

References

1. Halalan Result (2019). ABS-CBN News. <https://2019halalanresults.abs-cbn.com/local/quezon-city>
2. Abiera, M. A. C., et. al (2022). Voting Preferences in the National Election: A Case among First-Time Voters. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 7, 1234-1243. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6849873
3. Adel, R. (2019). List of local candidates 2019: Quezon City. Philstar. <https://www.philstar.com/nation/2019/04/30/1913862/list-local-candidates-2019-quezon-city>
4. Adel, R. (2022). 2022 Local Candidates Quezon City: Complete list. Philstar. <https://interaksyon.philstar.com/politics-issues/2022/05/09/216773/2022-local-candidates-quezon-city-complete-list/>
5. Adcox, S. (2021). Why Enmeshed Families Are Too Close. *Very Well Family*. <https://www.verywellfamily.com/can-a-family-be-too-close-1695789>
6. Adorador, S. M. (2021). Why the Padrino System has Always Been a Prevailing Problem? *Daily Guardian*. <https://dailyguardian.com.ph/why-the-padrino-system-has-always-been-a-prevailing-problem/>
7. Adzima, T. (2019). Persuasion and Compliance Gaining in Cults. *Medium*. <https://medium.com/@tayloradzima/persuasion-and-compliance-gaining-in-cults-e02c8e4a796>
8. Alelaimat, M.S. (2019). "Factors affecting political participation (Jordanian universities students' voting: field study 2017-2018)". *Review of Economics and Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/REPS-05-2019-0072>
9. Anabo, F. D. (2021). What Matters Most to Student Voters? A Conjoint Analysis of

- Political Candidate Attributes. *Philippine Social Science Journal*. <https://355-Article%20Text-1834-1-10-20210617.pdf>
10. Arata, N. B., Torneo, A. R., Contreras, A. P. (2020). Partisanship, Political Support, and Information Processing Among President Rodrigo Duterte's Supporters and Non-Supporters. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 41(1-2), 73-105. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/2165025X-BJA10006>
 11. Arguelles, C. V. (2020). Apathetic millennials? The personal politics of today's young people. *Academia*. https://www.academia.edu/44860421/Apathetic_millennials_The_personal_politics_of_todays_young_people
 12. Arugay, A. A. (2022). 2022/33 "Stronger social media influence in the 2022 Philippine elections". ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute. <https://www.iseas.edu.sg/articles-commentaries/iseas-perspective/2022-33-stronger-social-media-influence-in-the-2022-philippine-elections-by-aries-a-arugay/>
 13. Aspers, P. and Corte, U. (2019). What Is Qualitative in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 42(2), 139-160. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7>
 14. Baclig, C. E. (2022). By the numbers: More voters in 2022 than in previous polls. *Inquirer.net*. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1579736/by-the-numbers-more-voters-in-2022-than-in-previous-polls#ixzz7Uwwcs42g>
 15. Batará, E. B., et. al. (2021). Factors Affecting Youth Voting Preferences in the Philippine Senatorial Election: A Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) Analysis. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan (Journal of Government & Politics)*, 12(3) 242-264. <https://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/jsp/article/view/12946>
 16. Bernardo, A. I. (2018). Exploring Political Values of Filipinos Using an Etic Approach. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. <https://www.pap.ph/file/pjp/pjp2017-50-2-pp7-38-bernardo-exploring-political-values-of-filipinos-using-an-etic-approach.pdf>
 17. Bernido, R. E. (2022). Joy Belmonte poised for second term as QC mayor. *Rappler*. <https://www.rappler.com/nation/elections/results-mayoral-race-quezon-city-2022/>
 18. Bhandari, P. (2020). What is qualitative research? Methods & examples. *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-research/>
 19. Briggs, J. (2017). *Young People and Political Participation: Teen Players*. Palgrave Macmillan.
 20. Brown, A. (2022). What Is The Importance Of Family In Modern Society? *Better Help*. <https://www.betterhelp.com/advice/family/what-is-the-importance-of-family-in-modern-society/>
 21. Bruter, M., & Harrison, S. (2020). *Inside the Mind of a Voter: A New Approach to Electoral Psychology*. Princeton University Press.
 22. Calalo, A. O. (2022). QC richest LGU despite pandemic - Belmonte. *The Manila Times*. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2022/04/28/news/national/qc-richest-lgu-despite-pandemic-belmonte/1841555>
 23. Cabo, W. L. (2018). Youth and Political Participation in the Philippines: Voices and Themes from a Democracy Project. *Journal of Politics and Governance*, 8(1), 259–271. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jopag/article/view/123298>
 24. Carlos Jr., M. (2018). Sa mga Kabataang Nagugulumihanan Sa Politika. *Kadlit Press*. <https://medium.com/@kadlitofficial/sa-mga-kabataang-nagugulumihanan-sa-politika-ae&Oba2c348d>
 25. Chen, M. K. & Rohla, R. (2018). The effect of partisanship and political advertising on close family ties. *Science*, 360(6392), 1020-1024. doi:10.1126/science.aaq1433
 26. Cherry, K. (2020). Bandwagon Effect as a Cognitive Bias. *Very well mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-bandwagon-effect-2795895>
 27. Clark, R. (2020). The Importance of Voting. *Castleton*. <https://www.castleton.edu/news-media/article/the-importance-of-voting/>
 28. Cohen, D. & Crabtree, B. (2006). Criterion Sampling. *Qualitative Research Guidelines Project*. <http://www.qualres.org/HomeCrit-3814.html>
 29. Collado, Z. C., Orozco, N. I. & Banaria, D. B. (2020). "What are they up to?": The pre-election mindset and behavior of young Filipino voters. *Youth Voice Journal*, 10, 1-26. Retrieved from https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/faculty_research/410
 30. Crossman, A. (2019). Kinship: Definition in the Study of Sociology and the Basic Underpinning of All Human Relationships. *ThoughtCo*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/kinship-3026370>
 31. Del Mundo, J. S. (2021). Every Filipino's role in the game-changing 2022 elections. *Inquirer.net*. <https://business.inquirer.net/328570/every-filipinos-role-in-the-game-changing-2022-elections>
 32. Department of the Interior and Local Government (1991). *Local Government Code of the Philippines*. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/downloads/1991/10oct/19911010-RA-7160-CCA.pdf>

33. Department of the Interior and Local Government (2019). The City Mayor Tasks and Responsibilities Checklist: A Reference Guide to Action. Local Government Academy. <https://lga.gov.ph/uploads/publication/attachments/1590688409.pdf>
34. Doherty, C., Killey, J. & O'hea, O. (2018). The Generation Gap in American Politics. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/03/03-01-18-Generations-release2.pdf>
35. Doyle, A. (2020). What is a Semi-Structured Interview? The Balance Careers. <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/what-is-a-semi-structured-interview-2061632>
36. Elemia, C. (2022). Young Filipinos stand to be a force in May 9 general election. Benar News. <https://www.benarnews.org/english/news/philippine/youth-vote-05052022150215.html>
37. Elmusharaf, K. (2016). Qualitative Sampling Techniques. Geneva Foundation for Medical Education and Research. <https://www.gfmer.ch/SRH-Course-2016/research-methodology/pdf/Qualitative-sampling-techniques-Elmusharaf-2016.pdf>
38. España, J. L. (2021). Bakit mahalaga ang pagboto ng kabataan sa eleksyon?. Novaliches Cathedral. <https://www.novalichescathedral.com/post/bakit-mahalaga-ang-pagboto-ng-kabataan-sa-eleksyon>
39. Ewherido, F. (2020). Nuclear family and extended family. Vanguard. <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2020/12/nuclear-family-and-extended-family/>
40. Figueras, C. (2019). An approach to social choice theory. Diposit Digital. <http://hdl.handle.net/2445/148799>
41. Fortes, M. (1969). Kinship and the social order: the legacy of Lewis Henry Morgan. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p. 237
42. Frey, B. (2018) Snowball Sampling. Sage Research Methods. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139.n636>
43. Gatdula, J. (2021). Voting for the 'lesser evil' is a bad idea. <https://www.bworldonline.com/opinion/2021/10/21/405362/voting-for-the-lesser-evil-is-a-bad-idea/>
44. Gavazza A, Nardotto M, Valletti T. (2019.) Internet and politics: evidence from U.K. local elections and local government policies. Rev. Econ. Stud., DOI: 86:2092-135
45. Gavin, S. (2019). Why don't Filipinos move out of their parents' houses? When in Manila. <https://www.wheninmanila.com/why-dont-filipinos-move-out-of-parents-houses/>
46. Gentzkow M, Shapiro, JM (2011). Ideological segregation online and offline. Q. J. Econ. DOI: 126:1799–839
47. Gerber, A., Huber, G. & Washington, E. (2010). Party Affiliation, Partisanship, and Political Beliefs: A Field Experiment. American Political Science Review, 104(4), 720-744. doi:10.1017/S0003055410000407
48. Generations defined by name, birth year, and ages in 2022. (2022). Beresford Research. <https://www.beresfordresearch.com/age-range-by-generation/>
49. George, T. (2022). Semi-Structured Interview, Definition, Guide & Examples. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/semi-structured-interview/>
50. Goyala, J. (2019). Traditional Filipino family values that make us distinct among others. Medium. <https://medium.com/@janeellapangoyala/traditional-filipino-family-values-that-make-us-distinct-among-others-7a439fd28a>
51. Graison, S. (2020). The Bandwagon Effect on Elections. Good Guys Sign. <https://www.goodguysigns.com/blog/the-bandwagon-effect-on-elections/>
52. Hong, Y. and Lin, T. (2017) The Impacts of Political Socialization on People's Online and Offline Political Participation-Taking the Youth of Singapore as an Example. Advances in Journalism and Communication, 5, 50-70. doi: 10.4236/ajc.2017.51003.
53. Ibezim, E. A. C. (2019). The Philosophy of Youth Inclusion in Nigerian Politics: Trend, Challenges and Prospect. Journal of Religion and Human Relations, 11(1), 119-136.
54. Ilas, J. (2019). Why Filipinos sell their votes, and for how much. CNN Philippines. <https://www.cnnphilippines.com/news/2019/4/12/philippines-vote-buying-2019-elections.html>
55. Javier, J. R., et.al. (2018). Voices of the Filipino Community Describing the Importance of Family in Understanding Adolescent Behavioral Health Needs. Family & community health, 41(1), 64-71. <https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0000000000000173>
56. Janmaat, J. G. & Hoskins, B. (2021). The Changing Impact of Family Background on Political Engagement During Adolescence and Early Adulthood. Social Forces. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soab112>
57. Jorge, C. (2022). Understanding the youth vote. Inquirer.net. <https://opinion.inquirer.net/149856/understanding-the-youth-vote>
58. Karabulut, N. & Önder, M. (2017). A Research About the Youngs' Voting Behavior in Local Elections: Metropolitan Municipality Election. Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5(12), 69-88. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/genclikarastirmalari/issue/66480/1040727>
59. Keating, A. & Melis, G. (2017). Social media and youth political engagement: Preaching to the converted or providing a new voice for youth? The British Journal of Politics and

- International Relations, 19(4), 877-894. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148117718461>
60. Khan, S. (2018). Parents Interference In Their Children Lives. Thrive. <https://thriveglobal.com/stories/parents-interference-in-their-childrens-lives/>
 61. Kinder, D. R. (2006). Politics and the Life Cycle. *Science*, 312(5782), 1905-1908. doi:10.1126/science.1127891
 62. Kuper, A. (2018). We need to talk about Kinship. *Anthropology of this Century*, 23(23). https://www.academia.edu/download/57650008/We_need_to_talk_about_kinship.pdf
 63. Kudrnáč, A. & Lyons, P. (2017). Parental Example as a Motivation for Turnout among Youths. *Political Studies*, 65(1_suppl), 43-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321716644614>
 64. Lalu, G. (2022) 'Anak ng BBM supporter for Leni'? Robredo gives homework to youth to convince their parents: convince parents to shun Marcos. *Inquirer.net*. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1563339/anak-ng-bbm-supporter-for-leni-robredo-gives-homework-to-youth-convince-parents-to-shun-marcos?>
 65. Lazar, S. (2018). A 'kinship anthropology of politics'? Interest, the collective self, and kinship in Argentine unions. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 24(2), 256-274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.12809>
 66. Lewis, R. (2020). Enmeshed family: What it is and its impacts. *Healthline*. <https://www.healthline.com/health/enmeshed-family#signs-of-enmeshment>
 67. Levinsen, K. & Yndigegn, C. (2015). Political Discussions with Family and Friends: Exploring the Impact of Political Distance. *The Sociological Review*, 63(2_suppl), 72-91. doi:10.1111/1467-954X.12263
 68. Luscombe, B (2021). "It Makes Me Sick With Grief": Trump's Presidency Divided Families. What Happens to Them Now? *Time*. <https://time.com/5931349/trump-divided-families/>
 69. Maskin, E. (2017). Kenneth Arrow's Contributions to Social Choice Theory. *Econometric Society*. https://www.econometricsociety.org/sites/default/files/inmemoriam/arrow_maskin.pdf
 70. Matthes, J. (2022). Social Media and the Political Engagement of Young Adults: Between Mobilization and Distraction. *Online Media and Global Communication*, 1(1), 6-22. <https://doi.org/10.1515/omgc-2022-0006>
 71. Martin, S. (2019). The Enmeshed Family System: What It Is and How to Break Free. *Psych Central*. <https://psychcentral.com/blog/imperfect/2019/05/the-enmeshed-family-system-what-it-is-and-how-to-break-free>
 72. Muddiman, E. (2019). The generation game: does family shape young people's political engagement? UK in a Changing Europe. <https://ukandeu.ac.uk/the-generation-game-does-family-shape-young-peoples-political-engagement/>
 73. Neiger, C. (2022). How Mayors Work. How Stuff Works. <https://people.howstuffworks.com/government/local-politics/mayor1.htm>
 74. Neundorf, A. & Smets, K. (2017). Political Socialization and the Making of Citizens. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935307.013.98>
 75. Nissen, S. (2021). Political Participation: Inclusion of Citizens in Democratic Opinion-Forming and Decision-Making Processes. *Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*, 665-675. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95960-3_42
 76. Ottenheimer, M. (2007). Review of the book *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. *Anthropological Quarterly* 80(2), 597-610. doi:10.1353/anq.2007.0032.
 77. Pajayon-Berse, P. P. (2022). Beyond their numbers: The youth vote, their concerns and aspirations. *Business World*. <https://www.bworldonline.com/opinion/2022/03/07/434345/beyond-their-numbers-the-youth-vote-their-concerns-and-aspirations/>
 78. Parker, K., Graf, N. & Igielnik, R. (2019). Generation Z Looks a Lot Like Millennials on Key Social and Political Issues. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2019/01/17/generation-z-looks-a-lot-like-millennials-on-key-social-and-political-issues/>
 79. Passmore, S. and Jordan, F. (2020). No universals in the cultural evolution of kinship terminology. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 2, E42. doi:10.1017/ehs.2020.41
 80. Patinio, F. (2021). Comelec logs 4M new voters aged 18 to 21. *Philippine News Agency*. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1156804>
 81. Phan, L. T. V. (2017). The role of mayor-based leadership in promoting sustainable local policies. A case of Bristol, the United Kingdom. *Radboud University*. https://theses.uibn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/123456789/5539/Phan%2C_Le_Tuong_Vi_1.pdf?sequence=1
 82. Picardal, A. (2019). [OPINION] Can my vote make a difference? *Rappler*. <https://www.rappler.com/voices/thought-leaders/230233-can-my-vote-make-difference-elections-2019/>
 83. Portuondo, N. (2021). Family and friends may decide whether you vote or not, according to new nonvoter survey. *Medill News Service*. <https://dc.medill.northwestern.edu/blog/2020/12/15/family-and-friends-may-decide->

- [whether-you-vote-or-not-according-to-new-nonvoter-survey/#sthash.jkBjbAzD.dpbs](#)
84. Punzalan, J. (2022). Old friends, new allies, struggling partners: Faces of the Robredo people's campaign. ABS-CBN News. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/spotlight/03/11/22/the-struggling-the-comfortable-faces-of-the-robredo-peoples-campaign>
 85. Qorri, F. (2018). The Psychology Behind Voting Behavior in Kosovo. Rochester Institute of Technology. <https://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses/9813>
 86. Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18(18), 1-13. Sagepub. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>.
 87. Raypole, C. (2020). Family Manipulation Tactics and How to Respond to Them. Healthline. <https://www.healthline.com/health/mental-health/family-manipulation>
 88. Romero, M. (2019). We need to talk about the importance of voting. Inside Manila. <https://insidemanila.ph/article/509/we-need-to-talk-about-the-importance-of-voting>
 89. Russo, S. & Stattin, H. (2016). Stability and Change in Youths' Political Interest. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 643-658. doi:[10.1007/s11205-016-1302-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1302-9)
 90. Sarrouf, T. (2020). The Value of Voting as a Family. World Youth Alliance. <https://www.wya.net/op-ed/the-value-of-voting-as-a-family/>
 91. Scruggs, X. and Schrodt, P. (2021). The frequency and comfort of political conversations with parents as mediators of family communication patterns and relational quality in parent-child relationships. *Journal of Family Communication*, 21(1), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2020.1860053>
 92. Simpson, R. (2020). When is it ethical to vote for 'the lesser of two evils'? *Psyche*. <https://psyche.co/ideas/when-is-it-ethical-to-vote-for-the-lesser-of-two-evils>
 93. Singh, S. P. & Thornton, J. R. (2018). Elections Activate Partisanship Across Countries. *American Political Science Review*, 1-6. doi:[10.1017/S0003055418000722](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000722)
 94. Sircar, N. (2015). A Tale of Two Villages: Kinship Networks and Political Preference Change in Rural India. *Casi Working Paper Series*. <https://casi.sas.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/research.pdf>
 95. Stouffer, Ryan. (2015). Political Content and Political Behavior: Using Functional Theory to Test The Ability Of Political Content To Stimulate Political Interest. Wayne State University Dissertations. Paper 1169.
 96. Stren, R., & Friendly, A. (2019). Big city mayors: Still avatars of local politics? *Cities*, 84, 172-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.08.005>
 97. Teegavarapu, S., Summers, J. D. & Mocko, G. M. (2008). Case Study Method for Design Research: A Justification. Volume 4: 20th International Conference on Design Theory and Methodology; Second International Conference on Micro- and Nanosystems. <https://doi.org/10.1115/detc2008-49980>.
 98. Tekindal, M. (2017). The Position of the Youth in Political Participation. *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 17(39), 119-140. DOI: [10.21560/spcd.vi.375476](https://doi.org/10.21560/spcd.vi.375476)
 99. Turan, E. & Tiras, O. (2017) Family's Impact on Individual's Political Attitude and Behaviors. *International Journal of Psycho-educational Sciences*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1254813.pdf>
 100. University of Michigan. (n.d.). Informed Consent. University of Michigan-Dearborn. <https://umdearborn.edu/informed-consent>
 101. Van Bavel, J. J. & Pereira, A. (2018). The Partisan Brain: An Identity-Based Model of Political Belief. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(3), 213-224. doi:[10.1016/j.tics.2018.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2018.01.004)
 102. Weiss, J. (2020). What Is Youth Political Participation? Literature Review on Youth Political Participation and Political Attitudes. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2020.00001>
 103. Willingham, A. (2017). 25 ways to be politically active (whether you lean left or right) CNN Politics. CNN, <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/15/politics/wyast-to-be-more-politically-active-trnd/index.html>
 104. Yamazaki D., D. Ikeshima, R. Tawatari, T. Yamaguchi, F. O'Loughlin, J.C. Neal, C.C. Sampson, S. Kanae & P.D. Bates (2017). A high accuracy map of global terrain elevations *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 5844-5853, doi: [10.1002/2017GL072874](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL072874)
 105. Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. *The Qualitative Report*, 20, 134-152.