

The Conceptualisation and Operationalisation of Emotion-based Political Brand Equity

Asaad H. Almohammad¹

1.0 Abstract

Guided by political emotion causation theory, this paper endeavours to conceptualise, operationalise, and investigate the predictive power of emotion-based political brand equity over voting behaviour. Extrapolating on a broad range of research, a dual emotion-based construct is conceptualised. To that end, data from American National Election Studies, namely, 2008-2009 panel study is utilised to operationalise the construct and investigate its predictive power. The final sample included a total of 711 American, eligible voters, who completed the selected waves. The results demonstrate that the new construct is parsimonious, valid, reliable, generalisable and predictive across several segments of political consumers. The article closes by concluding its contributions, implications and directions for future work.

Keywords: implicit brand emotion; explicit brand emotion; political brand equity; conscious and unconscious information processing; voting

2.0 Introduction

Politics and marketing are among the most influential forces over the general social psyche; both remarkably shape the broader citizenry and individuals' interactions with and within government/s, business firms, and peers (O'Cass 2009). Political science refers to the study of "who get what, when and how" (Lasswell 1950) and the restricted use of power (Goodin and Klingemann 1996). The explananda of marketing (broadening aspect) in one hand and variety of political sub-disciplines (e.g. political psychology, communication, sociology, etc.) in the other unveil a complexity in studying political phenomena from a political marketing perspective.

¹ PhD Candidate, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang. His current research interests are political cognition, affect, attitude, emotion and branding. Mailing Address: 3B-32-04 N-Park, Batu Uban, 11700, Penang, Malaysia. Email Address: asaadh84@gmail.com Phone Number: 0060165154572

Moreover, in inherently complex societal settings, where encountered and projected problems and questions do not confide in a sole field, the urgency to explore and resolve issues of concern combined with technological advances increasingly stimulate multidisciplinary efforts (Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research 2005). Contemporary marketing and political research, rapidly, becoming more eclectic. Political and marketing scholars adopt prolifically from various disciplines, including but not limited to, psychology, sociology, economics, anthropology, and statistics. In this study, the researcher endeavours to contribute to two of the main disciplines (political science and marketing) most promising interdisciplinary endeavours: political psychology (for review see, Kinder 1998, McGraw 2006, Druckman, Kuklinski and Sigelman 2009) and brand equity (e.g., Scammell 2007, Phipps et al. 2010, French and Smith 2010, Smith and French 2011, Parker 2012, Almohammad, et al. 2013) research on electoral behaviour.

As such, theories, perspectives, methods, techniques, and data from a wide array of research are integrated to advance the fundamental understanding in an eclectic way. In reconciliation with Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research (2005) and Sherif and Sherif's (1969) assessments, this paper is not limited to appropriating ideas from the literature of political psychology or brand equity. Instead, it pursues the amalgamation of a number of unconnected elements. Therefore, the selected disciplines are not ascribed and utilised as recipients and donors. It is noteworthy that the thorough review of voting behaviour in the selected fields portray a fascinating, yet elusive, conceptualisations and empirical findings (e.g., Lodge et al. 1995, Zajonc 1980, 2000, Bower and Forgas 2001, Lodge and Taber 2000, 2005, Burdein, Lodge and Taber 2006, Bargh 1997, 1999, 2007, Scammell 2007, Erisen 2009, Phipps et al. 2010, French and Smith 2010, Lodge, Taber and Verhulst 2011, Smith and French 2011, Parker 2012). Among a number of factors, the ambiguity of electoral behaviour emphasised the research of factors that elicit this behavioural consequence. To that end, it is noteworthy to mention that an inclusive interdisciplinary exploratory effort goes beyond the scope of one research.

First and foremost, it is important to mention that political marketing still faces contextual, conceptual and methodological challenges (for review see, Henneberg and O'Shaughnessy 2007, Butler and Harris 2009).

Hence, political marketing differs from mainstream marketing, and applications of the latter do not necessarily neatly fit the former (Dean and Croft 2001, Henneberg 2008).

As such, political marketing scholars recognised a number of similarities and differences with mainstream marketing (e.g., Lock and Harris 1996, Dean and Croft 2001, Brennan and Henneberg 2008, Peng and Hackley 2009). That said, the literature of political marketing continues to promote the adoption and adaptation to marketing concepts in studying political phenomena; for example, the use of the term "consumer" rather than "citizen" (Lock and Harris 1996). In addition, an intensive future research agenda drew the required academic development of political marketing theory (e.g., Henneberg and O'Shaughnessy 2007, Henneberg 2008). However, this study refrained from putting much emphasis on researching the differences between political and mainstream marketing and the nature of political consumer. Nonetheless, it accepts the forwarded terminology while acknowledging the assigned differences.

The main aim of the present paper is twofold. The first objective is conceptualise emotion-based brand equity and operationalise its scale of measure, guided by the implications of the utilised theory. The second is to test the predictive power of emotion-based political brand equity through investigates its behavioural consequence (voting).

3.0 Political Emotion Causation

The notion that emotions are significantly influential in shaping political behaviour is still modern in ahistorical sense (Bruce and Wilcox 2000, Marcus 2002). For a long time, scholars favoured reasoning and deliberation over such states (Foster 1984, Rabinowitz and MacDonald 1989, Aldrich 1993). Thus, literature along that vein considered the study of emotions as less valuable, and ultimately undesirable in understanding political behaviour (Marcus, Neuman and MacKuen 2000, Marcus 2002). However, recent advancement in the political domain contradicted previous considerations. To that end, emotion is posited to be a critical and desirable element of political attitude and behaviour. As such, scholars posit a central impact of emotions on public policy attitude (Huddy, et al. 2005, Pagano and Huo 2007), perception of officeholders' performance (Conover and Feldman 1986), and attitude toward candidates (Abelson, et al. 1982, Ottati, Steenbergen and Riggle 1992).

Additionally, evidence unveiled the role played by emotions in the enhancement of political learning and rational deliberative decisions (Marcus and MacKuen 1993, Marcus, Neuman and MacKuen 2000, Dolan and Holbrook 2001).

However, notwithstanding these insights, there is still room to improve our understanding of political emotions. We now realise, based on recent advancements, that emotion can be elicited and processed on implicit and explicit levels. In light of this, Almoammad's (2014) political emotion causation theory provides an integrative review of available evidence on dual emotional systems, guided by the distinction between "explicit" and "implicit" emotions. The theory conceptualises two sequential processes, at the three levels of analysis, implying several mechanisms which lead to the elicitation of implicit and explicit emotions, and thereby outline the interplay of the dual dimensions. In that sense, political emotions are socio-cultural constructions of acquired political knowledge. Thus, political knowledge is a determinant of the experience of emotions in reaction to political stimuli (Miller 2011).

Political emotion causation theory posits that, at the algorithmic level, political emotions' elicitation is a result of two cognitive functions, namely, associative (is tagged into positive or negative classes) and propositional. While the former is an automatic process in which an encountered object (i.e. person, image, animal, etc.) is tagged into positive or negative classes (Zajonc 1980), the latter reflects the conscious evaluative tendencies that individuals tend to undertake in order to assign emotional meaning and value (either discrete or valence emotions) to an encountered emotional stimulus (Cunningham, Johnson, et al. 2003, Barrett 2005, Nielsen and Kaszniak 2007). The spread of activation along associative networks – that encompasses nodes – is the basis of automatic activation; this process could manifest in Implicit Emotion (IE). That is, the first experienced emotional state that occur automatically with little or no conscious awareness. The elicitation of implicit emotion takes place due to incremental associative and/or activated pathways of pre-existing networks' changes. While the former follows evaluative conditioning, the latter is a regulatory process. That is, a process that takes place unconsciously and is evoked by encountering a relevant stimulus. It is worthwhile to mention that conditioning (i.e., the interception of positive (negative) unconditional stimuli (USs) with neutrally conditioned stimuli (CSs) (Kamin 1969, Rescorla and Wagner 1972, Rescorla 1988)) could create or reinforce IEs (e.g., fear) and regulatory processes are believed to reduce negative IEs. Under certain conditions, an individual might become consciously vigilant of US-CS contingencies and utilised implicit regulatory process(es) and, consequently, aware of her IEs propositional implications.

Moreover, propositional information processing of political stimulus emotionality is the second cognitive function that is superordinate to the spread of activations along associative networks. In that sense, the attainment of political information and levels of cognitive elaboration (i.e., the level of active thoughts devoted to endorse explicit emotions (Greenwald 1968, Petty, Ostrom and Brock 1981)) and load could be predictive of the complexity of propositional reasoning of IEs' forwarded implications. Particularly, additional propositions of a familiar stimulus, newly attained propositional beliefs of the world, and/or propositional strategy to achieve consistency based on self-perception, person inference and knowledge of social norms might determine the level of consistency between IEs and Explicit Emotions (EEs). Explicit emotion is the second experienced emotional state that is resulted from conscious information processing and endorsed by an individual. As such, individuals' hierarchal inhibition, suppression or negation may result in endorsing EEs which are independent of IEs.

For instance, the exposure of politically informed consumers to a political stimulus (e.g., John McCain's brand) is thought to trigger richer and deeper spread of activation, along memory networks, comparing to less informed consumers. With the attained information and the newly processed political data – the subject of motivated exposure –, highly informed customers are believed to form more links between retained nodes in long term memory. For example, McCainGroup's *Fairy Tales* advertisement – which might condition fear of Barak Obama's, the Democratic candidate of 2008 presidential election, supposed lack of foreign and counter-terrorism policies experience with a displayed danger and his 'childish' stance regarding war on terror – is an attack advertisement. Additionally, it intended to associate the Republican candidate, John McCain, with readiness, competence, experience and leadership. According to premises of political emotion causation theory, it is believed that consumers' reliable dissection of that message requires certain levels of political knowledge. Furthermore, high informed consumers might attain nodes about John McCain experiences, such as his service and imprisonment in Vietnam (Alexander 2002), Iraq War troop surge of 2007 (American Enterprise Institute 2007, Giroux 2007), the maverick (Welch 2007), tax cuts, social policies (Barone, Cohen and Ujifusa 2007), and etc. This type of consumers' encounter of that advertisement might trigger spread of activation, resulting incremental changes in associative networks and thereby, implicit fear.

Nevertheless, changes of the activation of different associative patterns along pre-existing networks, in terms of emotion regulation (e.g., conflict adaptation (i.e., an automatic, associative process, wherein an agent encounters emotionally relevant stimulus paired with incongruent information (Etkin, et al. 2006, Egner, et al. 2008)), might mediate the relationship between unconscious processing of political stimuli and IEs. Emotion regulation could, in turn, reduce implicit fear.

In addition, consumers could become consciously aware, under certain conditions, of forwarded proposition of IE, making it the basis of later endorsed explicit emotion. However, consumers might not become vigilant of IE and/or its propositional implications. Nevertheless, highly informed consumers are likely to consider additional propositions about the two candidates, newly attained propositional beliefs about that election, and/or certain propositional strategy to achieve consistency based on self-perception, person inference and knowledge of social norms. It is worthwhile to mention that such propositional processing is thought to determine the level of consistency between implicit and explicit emotions. As such, consumers' hierarchal inhibition, suppression or negation may result an EE that is independent of IE. To that end, highly informed consumers' manifested realisation, among other factors, might scare them into voting for John McCain. In contrast, politically uninformed consumers are less likely to comprehend and consciously process the advertisement; therefore, their IE could override EE. In the next section, this theory is applied to conceptualise and operationalise a scale of measure for emotion-based political brand equity, and investigate its behavioural consequences in terms of voting choice.

4.0 Political Brand Equity of Presidential Candidates

A handful of political marketing scholars extrapolated on existing concepts and measures to estimate or project consumer-based brand equity (e.g., Scammell 2007, Phipps et al. 2010, French and Smith 2010, Smith and French 2011, Parker 2012). That is to say "the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand" (i.e., a set of symbols that differentiate a product of certain company) (Keller 1993, P.8). In the following, the author endeavours to apply the theory of political emotion causation in deducing emotion-based brand equity, operationalise a scale to measure the construct, and investigate its predictive power over behavioural consequence (voting choice). However, in order to develop a better understanding of Political Brand Equity (PBE), it is important to review its state of affairs in the literature of political marketing.

4.1PBE State of Affairs in Political Marketing

Scammell (2007) defined PBE as “a gift that...” consumers “... may bestow or withhold; thus, it is a complex source of strength and weakness for...” a candidate...; “equally, it is acutely sensitive to competition and highly vulnerable even to small shifts in...” consumers’ “... perception and behaviour” (P. 179). In addition, she suggested that its utilisation is especially important in attracting undecided voters. Scammell considered that aspect as a critical area of difference, as compared to mainstream, consumer-based brand equity; hence, the latter, relatively and to a larger extent, aims to retain existing and attract prospective consumers. Furthermore, strong PBE, from her perspective, portrays reassurance, uniqueness, emotional attractiveness and connection, and provides consumers with consistent value. However, her paper neither identified nor adopted a scale to measure PBE; it, essentially, merely demonstrated the role of political branding in the ‘masochistic election’ strategy of Tony Blair.

Lloyd (2008), based on the Keller’s (1993) conceptualisation, explored the impactfulness of political branding in the UK 2005 General Election setting. Her main objectives were to measure candidates and parties negative political brands and determine their influence on political consumers’ behaviour. She used the ‘political life history’ method. However, notwithstanding this insight into voters’ perception of political brands and their strategies in evaluating them, her paper made no mention to the dimensions that construct voter-based brand equity.

Phipps et al. (2010) endeavoured to qualitatively illustrate the way voters contribute to the establishment of political brands – namely, image and equity. They utilized Yoo and Donthu’s (2001) operationalisation of Aaker’s (1991) Brand Equity Ten. Then, a modification was conducted in order to fit the political exchange. As a result, they reduced Aaker’s Brand Equity from Ten to Eight. They removed market share and price/distribution indices from their scale, since both are market behaviour measures. Their findings suggest that brand equities of both politicians and parties influence their constituencies voting behaviour; the strength of voter-based brand equity of politicians could allow them to overcome their parties’ negative connotations. Their findings also indicate that the strength of a corporate party’s brand equity can be just as important, and it could allow a politician to rely on her/his party brand equity more than a personal one.

Their two case studies were designed specifically to measure the construct in the Australian's context among highly involved consumers. However, in the American's setting, where the decline in partisans' membership and political engagement have long been noted (Putnam 1993, 1995, 2000, Mair and van Biezen 2001), the allocation of strategic resources for the presidential campaigns aims to attract undecided voters (for review see, Bartels 1985, Bergan, et al. 2005, Shaw 2006, Panagopoulos and Wielhouwer 2008, Huang and Shaw 2009, Lipsitz 2009, Panagopoulos 2006, 2009a) rather than highly involved consumers. As such, measuring PBE should also take into account the undecided, and capture the factors that influence their voting decisions.

Parker (2012) explored quantitatively PBE of the 2008 primaries, almost a year before the general election. He defined the concept as the intangible value that consumers ascribe for candidates name (i.e. Barack Obama). Similar to Phipps et al. (2010) he utilised Yoo and Donthu's (2001) scale of Aaker's Brand Equity Ten; specifically, brand awareness-association, perceived quality, and loyalty. Parker targeted respondents from two metropolitan markets in a close primary state. His respondents were affiliated with one of two major parties (Democrats and Republicans), or independents. In that paper, Yoo and Donthu's (2001) three factors of brand equity measures were employed. His findings unveiled that the strength of the 2008 primary candidates brand equity was a significant determinant of voting intention. Parker stated that "candidates with the highest brand equity in their respective parties won the primary election vote, and the candidate with the strongest overall brand equity eventually won the general election (i.e., Obama)" (P. 223). Notwithstanding the issues of generalisability that Parker's (2012) sampling method demonstrates, his paper was only organised around and limited by existing concepts and applications of mainstream marketing. Additionally, in line with Keller's (1993) ideas, brand loyalty is a behavioural construct that might be the manifestation of the other dimensions. Nevertheless, in psychological terms, brand awareness and recognition are knowledge constructs, whereas, perceived quality and perceptual strength of associations are subjected to consumers' attitude toward the brand. Hence, attitude refers to an ascribed favourability or disfavourability that is a result of individuals' psychological tendency to evaluate an object of thought (call it, attitude object) (e.g., tangible objects, ideas, people, etc.) (Eagly and Chaiken, *The psychology of attitudes* 1993, Zanna and Rempel 1988).

A wide array of empirical research supported the correlation between the aforementioned constructs (e.g., Lodge and Taber 2005, Burdein, Lodge and Taber 2006, Erisen 2009), making that operationalisation less appealing for capturing the perceptual value that a consumer ascribes to a brand.

Moreover, French and Smith (2010) investigated how consumers establish PBE. They extrapolated on Keller's conceptualisation and defined it as the differential impact of brand knowledge/associations on political consumers' response to the brand. It is noteworthy that although they exemplified it in terms of Aaker's Brand Equity Ten, their scale of measure merely operationalised Keller's (1993) conceptualisation (brands' favourability, strength and uniqueness) through Brand Concept Maps. That method was forwarded by John, et al. (2006). Their findings unveil respondents' assignment of two distinct sets of favourability, strength and uniqueness for the two major British parties (Labour and Conservative). However, their sample was limited to a small group of undergraduate students (49 student of one class), so it is unsurprising that their analysis uncovered few highly matched associations and, therefore, one can question the generalisability of their findings. Additionally, as noted by French and Smith (2010), the mapping approach is time consuming for larger samples, and it requires intensive training on the part of the researchers to properly utilise it.

Notwithstanding their invaluable insight, the selected papers shed some light on the applicability of consumers-based brand equity to the political exchange; all endeavours have utilised concepts which were originally developed for evaluating commercial brands. It is worthwhile to mention that political marketing researchers have long emphasised caution in the adoption of mainstream marketing methods and anticipation of equal effect on political consumers (e.g., Lock and Harris 1996, Dean and Croft 2001). Nevertheless, it is also argued that marketing strategies, concepts and application are employed by experts and political actors – i.e. political parties, politicians, political consultant, governments, single-issue groups, lobbying organizations, etc. (Newman 1999, Scammell 1995 Lees-Marshment 2001, Dermody and Scullion 2001). However, the researcher refrained from utilising and applying existing mainstream consumer-based brand equity conceptualisation. As such, a novel concept of emotional-based PBE is developed and operationalised.

4.3 Emotion-based PBE

Extrapolating on Keller's (1993) ideas, and the proposed theory's underlining assumption that emotion is a cognitive function when information processing is equated with cognition, the political brand equity of presidential candidate (PBE) is defined as the differential effect of brand emotion on consumers' voting decisions. In this sense, the differential effect refers to the manifested elicitations of consumers' emotions toward a political brand (e.g., Obama), as a result of all endeavours to market and attack (e.g., negative advertisement) that brand. Brand emotion is exemplified in terms of implicit and explicit brand emotions, and is conceptualised according to characteristics and relationships of IE and EE. Thus, this conceptualisation implies a candidate's being said to have a strong (weak) emotion-based PBE when consumers demonstrate both positive (negative) IEs and endorsed EEs toward that candidate. Additionally, strong emotion-based PBE might elicit political consumers to regulate their negative IEs and endorse more positive EEs toward it. Moreover, strong PBE portray positively consistent, dual dimensions regardless of which brand emotion (implicit or explicit) overrides the other (see the proposed theory of political emotion causation). In other words, both implicit and explicit brand emotions are equally predictive of a consumer's voting decision. Therefore, an action, like voting, is determined through the differential effect of both dimensions of emotion-based PBE.

Building on Scammell's (2007) ideas, the sensitivity and vulnerability of emotion-based PBE to attacks from competing candidates make managing it a complex task. However difficult, the author nevertheless posits that marketers can control emotion-based PBE, thorough the elicitation of implicit and explicit brands emotion. In this sense, implicit brand emotion management involves the projection and elicitation of positive, associative, and incremental pathways changes (reinforcement) in memory networks, in order to induce more resistant regulatory processes and new positive IEs, which in turn enhance implicit brand emotion. For instance, extrapolating on non-emotion cognitive processing, evaluative conditioning utilisation in political advertisement might manifest in positive implicit brand emotion (Gibson 2008) as a result of incremental associative changes. An example of emotion regulation or associative changes along pre-existing networks, based on non-emotion cognitive processing, can be inferred from Dimofte and Yalch (2007a) and Dimofte and Yalch's (2010a) studies.

Positive rumours and desired connotations of polysemous (i.e., multiple meanings) brand slogans might infuse a regulatory process of negative IEs through eliciting more positive patterns of activations along pre-existing networks. It is worthwhile to mention that implicit brand emotion is especially important and predictive of behaviour (i.e., voting) when consumers are less politically informed, high in their cognitive load, and low in cognitive elaboration.

Explicit brand emotion, in the other hand, can be controlled through eliciting positive, implicit brand emotion, and promoting positive propositions that reinforce and enhance endorsed EEs and invalidate negative propositions. Managing this dimension might provide marketers with the chance to eradicate negative implicit brand emotion. Thus, the attainment of additional propositions of the political brand, newly retained propositional beliefs of that brand, and/or utilised propositional strategies to achieve consistency might invoke the hierarchal inhibition, suppression or negation of forwarded propositions of negative implicit brand emotion. To that end, consumers' self-perception, personal inference and knowledge of social norms should be the bottom lines of the utilised marketing programmes for effective and efficient explicit brand emotion elicitation. As such, consumers may recruit their emotional states and others' emotions in evaluating the political brand emotionality at the explicit level.

As discussed, emotion-based PBE encompasses two dimensions; namely, implicit and explicit brand emotions. At the unconscious level, the differential effect of brand emotion manifests in positive or negative IEs toward a candidate (brand or stimulus). This dimension is tapped through Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP) (this measure is reviewed in the next section). Explicit brand emotion is the combination of two sub-dimensions; explicit candidate and party brands emotion. Due to the complexity of the propositional processing of a candidate's brand, and its profound reliance on additional propositions about the candidate, attained propositional political beliefs and values, and/or propositional strategy designed to achieve consistency between conflicting propositions, as based on consumer's self-perception, personal inference and knowledge of social norms; explicit party brand emotion is posited to hold a critical conscious influence over endorsed EEs.

Nevertheless, the de-alignment theory suggests that a weak voter's partisan alignment, inconsistent public opinion and the volatility of voting behaviour are key characteristics of most mature democratic systems (Carmines, McIver and Stimson 1987, MacAllister, et al. 2001). However, notwithstanding the decreasing strength of political parties' impact on public perception, and the erosion of partisan loyalty, scholars have long argued that professionalisation in political organisations, in light of the aforementioned changes, influences public perception and attitude (Plasser, Scheucher and Senft 1999, Plasser and Plasser 2002, Stromback 2007). In that sense, conceptual and empirical findings from the vein of political marketing unveiled the impactfulness of political consumers' perception of, and attitude toward, political parties in terms of voting decisions (e.g., Lock and Harris 1996, Scammell 2007, Phipps et al. 2010, Smith and French 2011). As such, campaigning strategists emphasise the significance of encompassing the party in all endeavours so as to market a partisan's candidate, and acknowledge its role in creating a comparative advantage (Westen 2007, Daye and VanAuken 2012). Additionally, in line with recent research on brand equity, consumers' perception of the party is central to evaluating a partisan's candidate (e.g., Scammell 2007, Phipps et al. 2010, French and Smith 2010, Smith and French 2011, Parker 2012).

4.4 Measuring Emotion-based PBE

In operationalising emotion-based PBE, the researcher utilised two distinct measures. Firstly is explicit brand emotion, wherein emotional responses to the candidate and party are collapsed in one dimension, which is considered discrete and captured accordingly. In the interest of reconciliation, to some extent, with dimensional variables (Schneirla 1959, Russell and Barrett 1999), discrete emotions (e.g., fear, anger, pride and hope) are defined as a salient manifestation of arousal (i.e., contrast the states of excitement with quietness), valence (i.e., captures the states of displeasure and pleasure), and approach-avoidance (i.e., captures the tendencies to approach and avoid the encountered stimuli) (for review see, Haidt and Keltner 1999, Mauss and Robinson 2009), which is guided by several determinants, such as a consumer's self-perception, personal inference and/or knowledge of social norms. For instance, the endorsement of anger, in response to Obama's brand, is understood in terms of high arousal, negative valence and high motivational approach. Such an explicit state could be the manifestation of a consumer's ascribed ideological beliefs, values and partisanship, anticipated reactions to a displayed consumer's emotional response by the groups with which she affiliates, and the inferred righteous and socially acceptable judgement.

It is worthwhile to mention that in accordance with political emotion causation (Almohammad 2014) and Barrette's (2006) theories, the reconciled discrete political emotions are considered as socio-cultural constructions (i.e., artefacts), rather than evolutionary categories given in nature (i.e., natural kinds). This approach is expected to shed some light on the differential effect of explicit brand emotion.

Secondly, AMP (Payne, Cheng, Govorun and Stewart, 2005) is used to tap implicit brand emotions. That is, a procedure developed specifically to explore unconscious automatic reactions (i.e., attitude and values). Briefly, AMP flashes a picture of a stimulus on a screen for a fraction of a second, then, a picture of a Chinese character (word) is flashed for a longer fraction of a second. Participant are asked to rate the valence of the ambiguous Chinese character instead of the stimulus. Notwithstanding that the participant are instructed to ignore the stimulus, they are believed to rely on their implicit affective reactions toward the stimulus due the persistence of its effect. As such, AMP is used to measure automatic affective reactions toward a stimulus. It is noteworthy to indicate that AMP possesses two advantages relative to other measures (Lebel and Paunonen 2011); first, it is highly reliable in terms of internal consistency; second, it is parsimonious regarding its construction and administration.

As discussed earlier, IEs toward a political brand are the manifestation of the spread of activation along a number of brain structures. In accordance with a wide array of neurological research, the amygdala, anterior cingulate and the prefrontal cortex are the neurological bases of automatic reactions (Stanley, Phelps and Banaji 2008). Based on political emotion causation theory's implementational level of analysis, the aforementioned structures are implicated in implicit emotional processing and regulation (Almohammad 2014). Moreover, under certain condition, IEs propositional implications could serve as the basis for later explicit emotional evaluative tendencies (i.e., explicit brand emotion). However, consumers' might not be consciously aware about the specific attribution of these states (see, Russell 2003, Baratte 2006). It is worthwhile to mention that the AMP is designed to capture indirectly implicit emotion, in light of the lack of attributions states (Payne, Cheng, Govorun and Stewart, 2005). However, unspecified and in line with Russell (2003) Baratte's (2006) theories, the researcher posits that AMP is a parsimonious tool used to capture and discriminate between positive and negative IEs.

5.0 Method, Results and Discussion

The author endeavours to operationalise a scale of measure of emotion-based PBE and to investigate its predictive power over voting decisions. The 2008-2009 American National Election Studies' (ANES) panel study was employed for a number of reasons: First, the two dimensions of PBE are scaled and measured throughout pre-election surveys. Second, conducting representative, face-to-face interviews is well-nigh impossible without funding. Additionally, the ANES's survey methodology is probability sampling, and possesses relatively high response rates for an online survey. Therefore, the prospective design is expected to allow inferring the predictive power of emotion-based PBE of voting choice. Hence, probability-based sampling methods are likely to allow researchers to generalise their findings to the American public. The recruitment of a representative sample was achieved through contacting potential participants by telephone using random digits. Compensations were paid to those who participated to complete a survey every month, while free web appliances and internet service were provided to those participants without internet access.

Moreover, ANES commonly measured explicit emotional response toward the two major political parties (Democratic and Republican) and presidential candidates, with anger, fear, hope, and pride. Each item is measured on a five point, Likert, like response format (e.g., How angry does the Democratic party make you feel: *extremely angry, very angry, moderately angry, slightly angry, or not angry at all*). The eight items of emotional responses to Obama and the Democratic Party are posited to measure his explicit brand emotion. The values of negative emotions (anger and fear) were reversed, and the respective responses were replaced accordingly to capture the strength (weakness) of positive (negative) emotions and to serve the explicit dimensional purpose of emotion-based PBE. Measure of emotional responses of Democratic Party and Obama were obtained from wave one (January, 2008) and wave 9 (September, 2008), respectively.

Furthermore, AMP was conducted during August (wave 9) and September (wave 10), 2008. Two versions were administered in each wave. Half of the respondents' implicit affective reactions toward candidates were measured during August, and the other half in September. Only IEs towards Obama were considered to capture his implicit brand emotion from both waves. Participants responded to eight colour photographs of Obama that were paired with Chinese characters in three different positions. The images showed the candidate expressing a number of facial gestures in different skin-tone conditions.

Each of the 24 trials began with a fixation point, followed by Obama's photo for 75 milliseconds, followed next by a Chinese character for 250 milliseconds, and then, a white and black noise mask that remained on the screen until a response was registered. Respondents were instructed to rate the valence of the Chinese character (i.e., pleasant or unpleasant) while avoiding the influence of the candidate's photos. The values of the twenty four items that capture implicit brand emotion of Obama were modified to zero and one for pleasant and unpleasant; then, the respective response values were replaced accordingly, in order to measure the differential effect of this dimension and facilitate results interpretation. The proposed behavioural outcome (voting) was obtained from wave 11 (November, 2008). Responses to this question were dichotomised so as to test the predictive power of emotion-based PBE, using logistic regression analysis. Of the 2,367 individuals who completed the initial survey, the final sample included 711 respondents who completed all measures and registered the valence of the Chinese character within 300 milliseconds.

5.1 Results

5.1.1 Operationalising Emotion-based PBE

Principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was carried out in order to assess the underlying structure for the thirty two items of emotionally based PBE (see table 1). The obtained outcomes indicate that each item is associated, significantly, with the other 31. Some of the correlation coefficients are high (e.g., + or - .90 or greater) and some are very low. However, concluding the results of the analysis require the interpretation of other indicators. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) (measure of sampling adequacy) value should be greater than .7, while the Bartlett test has to be at a level significantly lower than .05. The results show a marvellous KMO at .987 and a significant Bartlett test at .000. Likewise, most values of item-specific Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) are at .77 and higher, which is significantly above the threshold value of .5. These results indicate that the measured items are sufficient for each factor, and there is a significant difference between identity and correlation matrixes. Therefore, the data provides an appropriate basis for principal axis factor analysis.

Now, the researcher can proceed with the factor extraction process. The total variance-explained table unveils how the variance is divided among all items.

As specified, SPSS results revealed two dimensions, implicit and explicit brands' emotions, which account for 84.250 per cent of the overall variance and their respective rotated squared loadings are 70.810 and 13.441 per cent respectively. The obtained total eigenvalues (a measure of explained variance) is a determinant of factors usefulness. However, the information gained from total variance explained table is not sufficient to justify retaining the two factors. To that end, the scree plot curve can be utilised to offer a clearer insight and facilitate extraction/retention decisions. The slope of that curve also uncovered two appropriate factors. Nevertheless, this indicator is in accordance with Kaiser's criterion. As such, continuing the evaluation necessitates the inspection of a rotated factor matrix. That table demonstrates each item's loadings and sorts them into two overlapping groups, each of .35 loading or higher. Items loading in the first dimension (implicit brand emotion) are higher than .96, while those of the second (explicit brand emotion) are higher than .65. These loadings are greater than the assigned threshold value (.35). Last, but not the least, the reproduced correlation matrix shows that 3% of the residuals (i.e., the difference between reproduced and observed correlations) have values greater than .05, and the commonality table indicates that at least .63 of each variable's variance is explained by these factors. Therefore, the results indicate a good model fit.

Additionally, the reliability of the scale was tested. Specifically, the researcher assessed emotion-based PBE scale's internal consistency. As such, SPSS was employed to measure dimensional and overall construct Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The result unveiled high implicit and explicit brand emotion reliability, with values of 0.998 and 0.900, respectively. The value of the overall construct reliability is 0.976. These figures show that Cronbach' Alpha coefficients lie above the commonly suggested threshold of 0.70, indicating the dimensional and overall all construct scales' internal consistencies.

5.1.2 Emotion-based PBE's Predictive Power

Logistic regression was conducted to assess whether emotion-based PBE predicts voting behaviour. However, due to the absence of both tolerance and VIF scores from logistic regression command, the researcher ran a linear regression to test for multicollinearity. The results indicate that both dimensions' tolerance statistics are equal to 1 and the adjusted R square is .573. The values of these indicators imply that multicollinearity is of no concern. Therefore, the researcher presumed an appropriate basis for direct logistic regression.

When both dimensions are considered together, emotion-based PBE was statistically significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 711) = 578.22, p < .001$, indicating that the construct distinguishes between respondents who voted for Obama and someone else. Emotion-based PBE explained between 55.7% (Cox and Snell R square) and 74.2% (Nagelkerke R squared) of variance in voting's choices, and correctly classified 87.6% of cases. As shown in table 2, both dimensions made a unique, significant contribution to emotion-based PBE. The strongest predictor of voting behaviour was implicit brand emotion, scoring an odds ratio of 1.413. This indicates that respondents, who reacted positively at the unconscious level, were 1.413 times more likely to vote for teams' Obama. Explicit brand emotion recorded a significantly weaker odds ratio of .021, implying that for an increase in endorsed emotion by one unit, the likelihood of voting team's Obama decreases by .021.

5.2 Discussion

Together, these findings support the dual dimensional structure of emotion-based PBE and indicate its power in predicting consumer's voting choice. Moreover, the operationalized construct has important practical and theoretical implications that benefit PBE research in two ways. First, the measure can be utilised to determine how emotion-based PBE results from its potential antecedent (i.e., political sophistication). Similarly, the behavioural consequences of each dimension (i.e., voting), among different voters segments (i.e., Battleground States, Democratic, Lean Democratic, Republican, and Lean Republican) need to be efficiently investigated. Second, notwithstanding the reliability and validity of emotion-based PBE, this construct is also parsimonious, which can help campaigners and other practitioners in tracking PBE of individual politicians on regular basis. When the measure is employed in tracking consumers' emotional evaluation of PBE, users might understand clearly within which area the brand (i.e., incumbent politician) either fails or succeeds. Thus, marketers can allocate permanent campaigning resources more efficiently, so as to maintain a positive and strong emotion-based PBE, and eradicate the impact of opponents' endeavours on consumers' emotional responses (e.g., attack advertisement, spinning, etc.). As they understand the dynamics between a politician's stance on a current issues (i.e., political, social, or otherwise) and emotion-based PBE, campaigns' strategists may be able to set reasonable goals for the elicitation and building of emotion-based PBE.

Moreover, the proposed construct demonstrates a robust and crucial determinant of voting decisions, as reflected in the study results. The operationalised emotion-based PBE attains 87.6 per cent predictive power of consumers' voting behaviour. The implicit dimension demonstrated strong predictive power in capturing the behavioural consequence of emotion-based PBE. However, a weak negative relationship between explicit brand emotion and voting decisions was uncovered. It is noteworthy to mention that the findings of research on reported explicit emotions are in line with those of this study. For instance, consumers high in social desirability (Paulhus and John 1998) or alexithymia (Lane, Ahern, et al. 1997) might provide less valid reports of their emotions, due to either their unwillingness or limited capabilities in disclosing such states. Moreover, based on the utilised theory, explicit may diverge from implicit brand emotion as a result of additional propositions about the brand, attained propositional political beliefs and values, and/or propositional strategy, in order to achieve consistency between conflicting propositions based on self-perception, personal inference, and knowledge of social norms.

Notwithstanding these aforementioned individual-differences variables (social desirability and alexithymia), low cognitive load and elaboration might make implicit brand emotion more predictive of voting decisions, especially when forwarded propositional implications of implicit brand emotion are dissonant with endorsed explicit brand emotion. These factors, in terms of endorsed brand emotion, arguable explained the 'Bradley effect' – that is, a phenomenon whereby Caucasians consumers display more positive attitude toward an African American candidate, but in the privacy of the voting booth they fail to vote for that candidate (Couzin 2008, Nevid and McClelland 2010). However, data collected with other methods, at one time, or for different candidates (i.e., John McCain) likely would have yielded different outcomes. Nonetheless, this study forwards the application of emotion-based PBE as a theoretical alternative to polling data for predicting candidates' potential with voter segments and the advancement of related research from the psychological, political and marketing veins.

6.0 Conclusion, Contribution and Future Research

The present article attempts to achieve two objectives. First, based on the theory of political emotion causation, it aims to conceptualise emotion-based PBE and operationalise its scale of measure. Second, it endeavours to investigate emotion-based PBE predictive power of voting as a behavioural consequence.

For this reason, a multidisciplinary holistic attempt is made to broaden the extent of political knowledge from a novel marketing lens. In that sense, the political exchange reflected through emotional stimulus/emotional elicitation (i.e., candidate - voter dyad or brand - emotion-based PBE dyad) is explored. Moreover, the conceptualised emotion-based PBE was extrapolated from a wide array of research on psychological and political veins, and its deployment is believed to clarify the psychological, political and marketing ramifications. Therefore, the researcher posits that emotion-based PBE provides a meaningful ethical construct which would allow the anticipation of voting behaviour. Hence, emotion-based PBE is conceptualised and operationalised to align with the political exchange, based on recent advancements in the psychological vein, while allowing the integration with concepts from established voting behaviour schools of thoughts, such as Columbia (e.g., Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet 1944, Bartels 2010, Niemi, Weisberg and Kimball 2011), Michigan (e.g., Campbell, Gurin and Miller 1954, Campbell, Converse, et al. 1960, Lewis-Beck, et al. 2008), and Rational Choice (e.g., Downs 1957, PopKin 1991, Redlawsk 2001, Wood 2012).

However, notwithstanding the adopted political exchange ontology, the meta-theoretical assumptions of emotion-based PBE can be labelled as structural connectedness (see, Henneberg 2008). As such, emotion-based PBE is assumed to be a product of political knowledge, and its elicitation relies on both the brand's connotations and denotations of past and contemporary socio-political issues. This article also pursued a wider interpretation of political marketing theory as it developed a novel measure of consumer-based brand equity that is specifically designed to explore the underpinning political exchange. To that end, the conceptualisation and operationalisation of emotion-based PBE met a number of Henneberg's (2008) research agendas on political marketing. These agendas are, namely, investigating the construct and its behavioural consequence empirically, engaging with state-of-affair theory, the development of an ethical theory for the underpinning exchange, exemplifying voter's behaviour in marketing lingo, and creating politics as a theory network.

As such, it seems important for further studies to revisit the conceptualised and operationalised construct, and its dual dimensions to refine them and suggest emotion-based PBE implications for political marketing strategies and tactics. Several noteworthy questions emerge with regard to the elicitation of emotion-based PBE.

For example, the impact of permanent campaigning and attack advertisement on implicit and explicit brand should be clarified. If emotion-based PBE is defined in terms of a consumer's ascribed emotional value, which results from the sum of endeavours to market a brand, it seems important to investigate not only which dimension is affected but also how the respective elicitation is influenced by a particular variable. Moreover, the mediating, predictive power of emotion-based PBE can be uncovered in the effects of multiple variables. Additionally, modifying emotion-based PBE so as to be utilised with different foci (e.g., emotion-based brand equity of parties) could allow future researchers to draw upon its behavioural consequences. Lastly, the construct is believed to allow scholars to explore its antecedents and behavioural consequences in terms of contemporary and traditional voting behaviour concepts from the political vein. Thus, it could provide an adequate and ethical framework of analysing the impact of political marketing on various political phenomena, such as pessimism, apathy, nihilism, cynicism, efficacy, activism, and more.

Table 1: Factor and Reliability Analyses

Item	Factor loading		Communality	Overall
	Implicit Brand emotion	Explicit Brand Emotion		
w9amp_q2_face5_choice. Black : data only: response	.974		.632	
w9amp_q2_face17_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.736	
w9amp_q2_face24_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.682	
w9amp_q2_face3_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.689	
w9amp_q2_face1_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.606	
w9amp_q2_face14_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.783	
w9amp_q2_face9_choice. Black : data only: response	.973		.658	
w9amp_q2_face13_	.973		.743	

choice. Black : data only: response				
w9amp_q2_face21_ choice. Black : data only: response	.972		.951	
w9amp_q2_face15_ choice. Black : data only: response	.972		.939	
w9amp_q2_face11_ choice. Black : data only: response	.972		.952	
w9amp_q2_face16_ choice. Black : data only: response	.972		.943	
w9amp_q2_face19_ choice. Black : data only: response	.971		.954	
w9amp_q2_face23_ choice. Black : data only: response	.971		.947	
w9amp_q2_face8_ choice. Black : data only: response	.971		.942	
w9amp_q2_face22_ choice. Black : data only: response	.971		.946	
w9amp_q2_face6_ choice. Black : data only: response	.970		.950	
w9amp_q2_face12_ choice. Black : data only: response	.970		.942	
w9amp_q2_face18_ choice. Black : data only: response	.970		.947	
w9amp_q2_face10_ choice. Black : data only: response	.969		.946	
w9amp_q2_face7_ choice. Black : data only: response	.969		.949	
w9amp_q2_face4_ choice. Black : data only: response	.969		.950	
w9amp_q2_face20_ choice. Black : data only: response	.969		.946	

choice. Black : data only: response				
w9amp_q2_face2_choice. Black : data only: response	.968		.947	
w9t8. How hopeful does Obama make R		.817	.952	
w9t9. How afraid does Obama make R		.760	.944	
w9t10. How proud does Obama make R		.757	.947	
w1w8. How hopeful does Democratic party make R		.747	.942	
w1w9. How afraid does Democratic party make R		.729	.949	
w9t7. How angry does Obama make R		.695	.947	
w1w7. How angry does Democratic party make R		.656	.945	
w1w10. How proud does Democratic party make R		.654	.950	
KMO				.987
Bartlett's Test				.000
Eigenvalues	22.659	4.301		
% of variance	70.810	13.441		84.250
Cronbach's Alpha	0.998	0.9		0.976

Note Loadings < 0.35 are omitted

Table 2: Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Voting's Decision

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	P	Odds Ratio	95% C.I. for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Implicit_Brand_Emotion	.346	.130	7.094	1	.008	1.413	1.096	1.823
Explicit_Brand_Emotion	-3.886	.303	164.115	1	.000	.021	.011	.037
Constant	-.418	.133	9.881	1	.002	.658		

7.0 References

- Bargh, J, A, and T, L Chartrand. "The unbearable Automaticity of Being." *American Psychologist* 54 (1999): 462-479.
- Bargh, J, A, M, P Gollwitzer, A Lee-Chai, K Barndollar, and R Troetschel. "The Automated Will: Nonconscious Activation and Pursuit of Behavioral Goals." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81 (2001): 1014–1027.
- Bargh, John, Annette Chen, and Lara Burrows. "Automaticity of Social Behavior: Direct Effects of the Trait Construct Stereotype Activation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71 (1996): 230-44.
- Barrett, L, F. "Feeling is perceiving." In *Emotion and Consciousness*, by L, F Barrett, P, M Niedenthal and P Winkielman, 255–84. New York: The Guilford Press, 2005.
- Barrett, L, F. "Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10 (2006): 20-46.
- Barrett, L, F, B Mesquita, K, N Ochsner, and J, J Gross. "The experience of emotion." *Annual Reviews in Psychology* 58 (2007): 373–403.
- Barrett, L, F, J Gross, T, C Christensen, and M Benvenuto. "Knowing what you are feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation." *Cognition & Emotion* 15 (2001): 713–724.
- Bartels, Larry. "Resource allocation in a presidential campaign." *Journal of Politics* 47 (1985): 928–936.
- Bartels, Larry, M. "The Study of Electoral Behavior." In *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*, by Jan Leighley. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Bergan, Daniel, Alan Gerber, Donald Green, and Costas Panagopoulos. "Grassroots mobilization in the 2004 presidential election." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69, no. 5 (2005): 760-777.
- Bousch, D, et al. "Affect Generalization to Similar and Dissimilar Brand Extensions." *Psychology and Marketing* 4, no. Fall (1987): 225-237.
- Bruce, J, M, and C Wilcox. "Pollsters, political scientists, and affect: Comparing the treatment of emotional response." *Votes & Opinions* 3, no. 8-11 (2000): 28–31.
- Brunel, F, F, B, C Tietje, and A, G Greenwald. "Is the Implicit Association Test a Valid and Valuable Measure of Implicit Consumer Social Cognition?" *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 14 (2004): 385–404.
- Buil, I, L de Chernatony, and E Martinez. "A cross-national validation of the consumer-based brand equity scale." *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 17, no. 6 (2008): 384–392.
- Butler, Patrick, and Phil Harris. "Considerations on the Evolution of Political Marketing Theory." *Marketing Theory* 9, no. 2 (2009): 149–164.
- Campbell, A., G. Gurin, and W. Miller. *The Voter Decides*. Row, Peterson: Evanston, IL, 1954.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip, E. Converse, Warren, E. Miller, and Donald, E. Stokes. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Carmines, E, G, J, P McIver, and J, A Stimson. "Unrealized partisanship: a theory of dealignment." *Journal of Politics* 49, no. 2 (1987): 376-400.

- Chaiken, Shelly, and Durairaj Maheswaran. "Heuristic Processing Can Bias Systematic Processing: Effects of Source Credibility, Argument Ambiguity, and Task Importance on Attitude Judgment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, no. 66 (1994): 460-473.
- Aaker, D.A. *Building Strong Brand*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- Abelson, R, P, D, R Kinder, M, D Peters, and S, T Fiske. "Affective and semantic components in political person perception." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 42 (1982): 619-630.
- Aldrich, J, H. "Rational choice and turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1993): 246-278.
- Almohammad, A, A. "Toward a Theory of Political Emotion Causation." *Journal of Political Psychology* (in press 2014).
- Arnold, M, B. *Emotion and Personality: Vol.1 Psychological Aspects*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Bargh, J, A. "Conditional automaticity: Varieties of automatic influence in social perception and cognition." In *Unintended thought*, by J, S Uleman and J, A Bargh, 3-51. New York: Guilford Press, 1989.
- Bargh, J, A. "The automaticity of everyday life." In *Advances In Social Cognition*, 10, by Robert Wyer, 1-61. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1997.
- Chakravarti, N, and R, T Wilcox. "Private Labels and the Channel Relationship: A Cross-Category Analysis." *Journal of Business* 71, no. 4 (1998): 573-600.
- Chen, S, and S Chaiken. "The heuristic-systematic model in its broader context." In *Dual-process theories in social psychology*, by S Chaiken and Y Trope, 73-96. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.
- Christodoulides, George, and Leslie de Chernatony. "Consumer-based brand equity conceptualisation and measurement: A literature review." *International Journal of Market Research* 52, no. 1 (2010): 43-66.
- Clark, L, A, and D Watson. "Temperament: A new paradigm for trait psychology." In *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2nd ed., by L Pervin and O John, 399-423. New York: Guildford Press, 1999.
- Clarke, S, G. "Emotions: Rationality without cognitivism." *Dialogue* 25 (1986): 663-674.
- Conover, P, J, and S Feldman. "Emotional reactions to the economy: I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it anymore." *American Journal of Political Science* 30 (1986): 50-78.
- Couzin, J. "Do voter surveys underestimate the impact of racial bias?" *Science* 322 (2008): 180-181.
- Cunningham, W, A, M, K Johnson, J, C Gatenby, J, C Gore, and M, R Banaji. "Neural components of social evaluation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (2003): 639-649.
- David, Daniel, Mircea Miclea, and Adrian Opre. "The Information-Processing Approach to the Human Mind: Basics and Beyond." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 60, no. 4 (2004): 353-368.
- Daye, Derrick, and Brad VanAuken. "U.S. Political Party Brand Analysis Proves Revealing." *Branding Strategy Insider*. 23 April 2012.
<http://www.brandingstrategyinsider.com/2012/04/us-political-party-brand-analysis-proves-revealing.html>.
- de Sousa, R. *The rationality of emotion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987.

- Dean, D, and R Croft. "Friends and relations: Long-term approaches to political campaigning." *European Journal of Marketing* 35, no. 11/12 (2001): 1197–1216.
- Dijksterhuis, A, and A van Knippenberg. "The Relation between Perception and Behavior, or How to Win a Game of Trivial Pursuit." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (1998): 865–877.
- Dimofte, C, V. "Implicit measures of consumer cognition: A review." *Psychology & Marketing* 27 (2010): 921–937.
- Dolan, K, A, and T, M Holbrook. "Knowing versus caring: The role of affect and cognition in political perceptions." *Political Psychology* 22 (2001): 27–44.
- Downs, A. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York, NY: Harper, 1957.
- Dyson, Paul, Andy Farr, and Hollis, S Nigel. "Understanding, Measuring, and Using Brand Equity." *Journal of Advertising Research* 36, no. 6 (1996): 9-22.
- Eagly, A, H, and S Chaiken. *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1993.
- Egner, T, A Etkin, S Gale, and J Hirsch. "Dissociable neural systems resolve conflict from emotional versus nonemotional distracters." *Cerebral Cortex* 18, no. 6 (2008): 1475-1484.
- Ekman, P. "An argument for basic emotions." *Cognition and Emotion* 6 (1992): 169-200.
- Ekman, P. "The directed facial action task." In *Handbook of emotion elicitation and assessment*, by J, A Coan and J, J, B Allen, 47-53. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Erdem, T, J Swait, and A Valenzuela. "Brands as signals: a cross country validation study." *Journal of Marketing* 70, no. 1 (2006): 34–49.
- Erdem, T., and J. Swait. "Brand equity as a signaling phenomenon." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 7, no. 2 (1998): 131– 157.
- Etkin, A, K, E Prater, F Hoeft, V Menon, and A, F Schatzberg. "Failure of anterior cingulate activation and connectivity with the amygdala during implicit regulation of emotional processing in generalized anxiety disorder." *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 167, no. 5 (2010): 545-554.
- Etkin, A, T Egner, D, M Peraza, E, R Kandel, and J Hirsch. "Resolving emotional conflict: A role for the rostral anterior cingulate cortex in modulating activity in the amygdala." *Neuron* 51, no. 6 (2006): 871-882.
- Foster, C, B. "The performance of rational voter models in recent presidential elections." *American Political Science Review* 78 (1984): 678–690.
- French, Alan, and Gareth Smith. "Measuring political brand equity: A consumer oriented approach." *European Journal of Marketing* 44, no. 3/4 (2010): 460-477.
- Goldie, P. *The emotions: A philosophical exploration*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Greenwald, A, G. "Cognitive learning, cognitive response to persuasion, and attitude change." In *Psychological foundations of attitudes*, by A, G Greenwald, T, C Brock and T, M Ostrom, 147–170. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1968.
- Greenwald, A, G, and M, R Banaji. "Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes." *Psychology Review* 102 (1995): 4-27.

- Haidt, J, and D Keltner. "Culture and facial expression: Open-ended methods find more expressions and a gradient of recognition." *Cognition and Emotion* 13, no. 3 (1999): 225-266.
- Henneberg, S, C, and N O'Shaughnessy. "Theory and Concept Development in Political Marketing: Issues and an Agenda." *Journal of Political Marketing* 6, no. 2/3 (2007): 5-32.
- Henneberg, Stephan, C. "An Epistemological Perspective on Research in Political Marketing." *Journal of Political Marketing* 7, no. 2 (2008): 151-182.
- Hofmann, W, T Gschwendner, B, A Nosek, and M Schmitt. "What moderates implicit-explicit consistency?" *European Review of Social Psychology* 16 (2005): 335-390.
- Huang, Taofang, and Daron Shaw. "Beyond the Battlegrounds? Electoral College Strategies in the 2008 Presidential Election." *Journal of Political Marketing* 8, no. 4 (2009): 272-291.
- Huddy, L, S Feldman, S Taber, and G Lahav. "Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2005): 593-608.
- Izard, C, E. Human emotions. New York: Plenum Press, 1977.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1996). *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential campaign advertising*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Kamin, L. "Predictability, surprise, attention, and conditioning." In *Punishment and aversive behavior*, by B, A Campbell and R, M Church, 279-296. New York: Appleton-Century- Crofts, 1969.
- Keller, K, L. "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity." *Journal of Marketing* 57, no. 1 (1993): 1-22.
- Keller, Kevin, Lane. "The brand report card." *Harvard Business Review* 78, no. 1 (2000): 147-158.
- Lane, R, D, G, L Ahern, G, E Schwartz, and A, W Kaszniak. "Is alexithymia the emotional equivalent of blindsight?" *Biological Psychiatry* 42, no. 9 (1997): 834-844.
- Lane, R, L Nadel, J Allen, and A Kaszniak. "The study of emotion from the perspective of cognitive neuroscience." In *Cognitive Neuroscience of Emotion*, by R Lane, et al. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lassar, W, B Mittal, and A Sharma. "Measuring customer-based brand equity." *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 12, no. 4 (1995): 11-19.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul, Bernard Berelson, and Helen Gaudet. *The People's Choice*. New York: Duell, Sloane, Pearce, 1944.
- Lebel, E, P, and S, V Paunonen. "Sexy but often unreliable: The impact of unreliability on the replicability of experimental findings with implicit measures." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 37 (2011): 570-583.
- LeDoux, Joseph, E. *The Emotional Brain*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Lee, K, H, and G, J Siegle. "Common and distinct brain networks underlying explicit emotional evaluation: a meta-analytic study." *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience* 7, no. 5 (2012): 521-534.
- Lees-Marshment, J. "The marriage of politics and marketing." *Political Studies* 49, no. 4 (2001): 692-713.
- Leuthesser, L. *Defining, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity*, Working Paper 88-140. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 1988.
- Lipsitz, Keena. "The consequences of battleground and "spectator" state residency for political participation." *Political Behavior* 31 (2009): 187-209.

- Lloyd, Jenny. "Positively negative: the impact of negativity upon the political consumer." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 13 (2008): 301–314.
- Lock, Andrew, and Phil Harris. "Political marketing – vive la différence!" *European Journal of Marketing* 30, no. 10/11 (1996): 14-24.
- Lodge, M, and CS Taber. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis." *Political Psychology* 36, no. 3 (2005): 455-482.
- Lodge, M, and CS Taber. "Three Steps Toward a Theory of Motivated Political Reasoning." In *Elements of Reason: Understanding and Expanding the Limits of Political Rationality*, by A Lupia, MD McCubbins and SL Popkin. London: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Lodge, Milton, Charles Taber, and Brad Verhulst. "Conscious and Unconscious Information Processing with Implications for Experimental Political Science." In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, by James, N Druckman, Donald, P Green, James, H Kuklinshi and Arthur Lupia, 280-309. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Lodge, Milton, Kathleen McGraw, and Patrick Stroh. "An Impression-Driven Model of Candidate Evaluation." *American Political Science Review* 83 (1989): 399–420.
- Lyon, D, C, J, J Nassi, and E, M Callaway. "A disynaptic relay from superior colliculus to dorsal stream visual cortex in macaque monkey." *Neuron* 65, no. 2 (2010): 270-279.
- MacAllister, I, R, J Johnston, C, J Pattie, H Tunstall, D, F, L Dorling, and D, J Rossiter. "Class dealignment and the neighbourhood effect: miller revisited." *British Journal of Political Science* 31, no. 1 (2001): 41-60.
- Marcus, G, E. *The sentimental citizen: Emotion in democratic politics*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Marcus, G, E, and M, B MacKuen. "Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns." *The American Political Science Review* 87 (1993): 672–685.
- Marcus, G, E, W, R Neuman, and M, B MacKuen. *Affective intelligence and political judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Mauss, Iris, B, and Michael, D Robinson. "Measures of emotion: A review." *Cognition & Emotion* 23, no. 2 (2009): 209-237.
- McDowell, W. "Exploring a free association methodology to capture and differentiate abstract media brand associations: A study of three cable news networks." *Journal of Media Economics* 17, no. 4 (2004): 306-320.
- Miller, L, A, K, H Taber, G, O Gabbard, and R, A Hurley. "Neural underpinnings of fear and its modulation: Implications for anxiety disorders." *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience* 17 (2005): 1–6.
- Miller, Patrick, R. "The Emotional Citizen: Emotion as a Function of Political Sophistication." *Political Psychology* 32, no. 4 (2011): 575-600.
- Nevid, J, S, and N McClelland. "Measurement of implicit and explicit attitudes toward Barack Obama." *Psychology & Marketing* 27 (2010): 989–1000.
- Newman, B, I. *Handbook of political marketing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999.

- Nielsen, L, and A, W Kaszniak. "Conceptual, theoretical, and methodological issues in inferring subjective emotion experience: recommendations for researchers." In *Handbook of Emotion: Elicitation and Assessment*, by J, A Coan and J, J, B Allen, 361–78. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Nussbaum, M. *Love's knowledge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- O'Cass, Aron. "A Resource-Based View of the Political Party and Value Creation for the Voter-Citizen: an Integrated Framework for Political Marketing." *Marketing Theory* 9, no. 2 (2009): 189–208.
- Ottati, V, C, M, R Steenbergen, and E Riggle. "The cognitive and affective components of political attitudes: Measuring the determinants of candidate evaluations." *Political Behavior* 14 (1992): 423–442.
- Pagano, S, J, and Y, J Huo. "The role of moral emotions in predicting support for political actions in post-war Iraq." *Political Psychology* 28 (2007): 227–255.
- Panagopoulos, Costas. "Campaign dynamics in battleground and nonbattleground states." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73, no. 1 (2009a): 119–130.
- Panagopoulos, Costas. "Vested interests: interest group resource allocation in presidential campaigns." *Journal of Political Marketing* 5 (2006): 59–78.
- Panagopoulos, Costas, and Peter Wielhouwer. "Polls and elections: The ground war 2000–2004: strategic targeting in grassroots campaigns." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (2008): 347–362.
- Panksepp, J. *Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Panksepp, J. "Emotions as natural kinds within the mammalian brain." In *Handbook of emotions*, 2nd ed., by M Lewis and J, M Haviland-Jones, 137-156. New York: Guilford Press, 2000.
- Parker, Brian, T. "Candidate Brand Equity Valuation: A Comparison of U.S. Presidential Candidates During the 2008 Primary Election Campaign." *Journal of Political Marketing* 11, no. 3 (2012): 208-230.
- Paulhus, D, L, and O, P John. "Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives." *Journal of Personality* 66, no. 6 (1998): 1025-1060.
- Payne, B, K, C, M Cheng, O Govorun, and B, D Stewart. "An inkblot for attitudes: Affect misattribution as implicit measurement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89 (2005): 277-293.
- Peng, Norman, and Chris Hackley. "Are voters, consumers? A qualitative exploration of the voter-consumer analogy in political marketing." *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 12, no. 2 (2009): 171-186.
- Petty, R, E, and D, T Wegener. "The elaboration likelihood model: Current status and controversies." In *Dual process theories in social psychology*, by S Chaiken and Y Trope, 41–72. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.
- Petty, R, E, T, M Ostrom, and T, C Brock. *Cognitive responses in persuasion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981.
- Petty, R. E., Tormala, Z. L., Briñol, P., and Jarvis, W. B. G. (2006). Implicit ambivalence from attitude change: An exploration of the PAST model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(1), 21.
- Phipps, Marcus, Jan Brace-Govan, and Colin Jevons. "The duality of political brand equity." *European Journal of Marketing* 44, no. 3/4 (2010): 496-514.

- Plasser, F, and G Plasser. *Global Political Campaigning: A Worldwide Analysis of Campaign Professionals and their Practices*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
- Plasser, F, C Scheucher, and C Senft. "Is There a European Style of Political Marketing? A Survey of Political Managers and Consultants." In *Handbook of Political Marketing*, by B, I Newman, 89–112. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999.
- Putnam, R, D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Putnam, R, D. "Tuning in, Tuning out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *Political Science and Politics* 28, no. 4 (1995): 664-683.
- Putnam, Robert D. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Rabinowitz, G, and S, E MacDonald. "A directional theory of issue voting." *American Political Science Review* 83 (1989): 93–121.
- Reynolds, Thomas, J, and Carol, B Philips. "In Search of True Brand Equity Metrics: All Market Ain't Created Equal." *Journal of Advertising Research* 45, no. 2 (2005): 171–186.
- Russell, J, A. "Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion." *Psychological Review* 110 (2003): 145-172.
- Russell, J, A, and L, F Barrett. "Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76, no. 5 (1999): 805-819.
- Scammell, Margaret. "Political Brands and Consumer Citizens: The Rebranding of Tony Blair." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611, no. 1 (2007): 176-192.
- Scherer, K, R. "Appraisal considered as a process of multilevel sequential checking." In *Appraisal processes in emotion*, by K, R Scherer, A Schorr and T Johnstone, 92-120. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Scherer, K, R. "Feelings integrate the central representation of appraisal-driven response organization in emotion." In *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam symposium*, by A, S, R Manstead, N, H Frijda and A, H Fischer, 136-157. Cambridge,UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Schneirla, T, C. "An evolutionary and developmental theory of biphasic processes underlying approach and withdrawal." In *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, by M, R Jones, 1-42. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1959.
- Seetharaman, A, Z Nadzir, and S Gunalan. "A Conceptual Study on Brand Valuation." *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 10, no. 4 (2001): 243-256.
- Shankar, V, P Azar, and M Fuller. "BRAN*EQT: a multicategory brand equity model and its application at Allstate." *Marketing Science* 27, no. 4 (2008): 567–584.
- Shaw, Daron, R. *The race to 270*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006. Smith, Gareth, and Alan French. "Measuring the changes to leader brand associations during the 2010 election campaign." *Journal of Marketing Management* 27, no. 7-8 (2011): 718-735.
- Solomon, R, C. *The passions: Emotions and the meaning of life*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

- Srinivasan, V. "Network models for estimating brand-specific effects in multi-attribute marketing models." *Management Science* 25, no. 1 (1979): 11–21.
- Stein, Jason, L, et al. "A validated network of effective amygdala connectivity." *Neuroimage* 36, no. 3 (2007): 736-745.
- Stein, N, L, and L, J Levine. "The early emergence of emotional understanding and appraisal: Implications for theories of development." In *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion.*, by T Dalgleish and M, J Power, 384–408. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 1999.
- Stromback, J. "Political Marketing and Professionalized Campaigning." *Journal of Political Marketing* 6, no. 2/3 (2007): 49–68.
- Swait, J, T Erdem, J Louvière, and C Dubelaar. "The equalization price: a measure of consumer-perceived brand equity." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 10, no. 1 (1993).
- Wagner, A, D, E, J Pare-Blagoev, J Clark, and R, A Poldrack. "Recovering meaning: left prefrontal cortex guides controlled semantic retrieval." *Neuron* 31 (2001): 329–338.
- Westen, D. "Branding the Democrats." *The American Prospect* 18, no. 5 (2007): 44.
- Williams, L, M, P Das, B, J Liddell, A, H Kemp, C, J Rennie, and E Gordon. "Mode of functional connectivity in amygdala pathways dissociates level of awareness for signals of fear." *The Journal of neuroscience* 26, no. 36 (2006): 9264-9271.
- Yoo, B, and N Donthu. "Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale." *Journal of Business Research* 52, no. 1 (2001): 1–14.
- Young, De, and G Coling. "Discussion on 'Automatic and Controlled Processes in Behavioural Control: Implications for Personality Psychology' by Corr." *European Journal of Personality* 24 (2010): 404–422.
- Zajonc, R. "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences." *American Psychologist* 35 (1980): 151-175.
- Zajonc, R, B. "Feeling and thinking: Closing the debate over the independence of affect." In *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition*, by J Forgas, 31-58. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Zanna, M, P, and J, K Rempel. "Attitudes: A new look at an old concept." In *The Psychology of knowledge*, by D Bar-Tal and A, W Kruglanski, 315–334. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University, 1988.