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1.0 Abstract

Guided by political emotion causation theory, this paper endeavours to conceptualise, operationalise, and investigates 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.
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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.
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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, rabidly, 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).
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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, Almohammad’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 manifests 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’ hierarchical 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.
4.1 PBE 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-Marshalment 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's (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 hierarchical 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, Barratte 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) Barratte’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 trails 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 metatheoretical 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Implicit Brand emotion</th>
<th>Explicit Brand Emotion</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face5_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face17_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face24_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face3_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face13_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face14_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face9_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face13_choice. Black: data only: response</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice. Black : data only: response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face21_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face15_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face11_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face16_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face19_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face23_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face8_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face22_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face6_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face12_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face18_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face10_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face7_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face4_choice. Black : data only: response</code></td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w9amp_q2_face20</code></td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice. Black : data only: response</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9amp_q2_face2</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9t8. How hopeful does Obama make R</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9t9. How afraid does Obama make R</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9t10. How proud does Obama make R</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w1w8. How hopeful does Democratic party make R</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w1w9. How afraid does Democratic party make R</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9t7. How angry does Obama make R</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w1w7. How angry does Democratic party make R</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test</td>
<td>22.659</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>70.810</td>
<td>13.441</td>
<td>84.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note Loadings < 0.35 are omitted

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% C.I. for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Brand Emotion</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Brand Emotion</td>
<td>-3.886</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>164.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>9.881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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