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Abstract

Title: Effect of political branding on electoral success

Author: Audrey Anne Gangloff

Major Advisor: Dzmitry Yuran

It is assumed that a valuable political brand directly translates into the ability of a party to gain or sustain electoral votes. However, very little empirical research has been done that investigates whether that is true. The purpose of this study is to further explore the composition of politicians’ brands and the relationship between political brands and electoral votes. The following study uses quantitative content analysis to test the relationship between the components of Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) political human brand model and electoral success for 2016 U.S. Senate candidates. This research is the first to systematically explore the relationship between brand strength and, specifically, the strength of specific brand components (authenticity and authority) and electoral success within the unique context of a political environment. There is no statistically significant support for the hypotheses in this study. However, several observations were made that suggest there may indeed be a relationship between brand strength and electoral success. This research adds to the existing body of knowledge regarding
factors that may, or may not, influence electoral success. It should serve as a starting point for further clarifying the definitional components of political brands as well as the process of quantifying them in order to concretely determine how much of an effect branding has in political environments.
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Introduction

Branding has a long and rich history in the commercial marketing world but little has been done to sharpen its focus in the political arena. Much of the literature assumes that the function and composition of brands in politics mirrors branding concepts in the consumer marketplace. For example, a valuable political brand would translate directly into votes – much the same as a valuable commercial brand translates directly to corporate worth (Cox & McCubbins, 2004; Lock & Harris, 2001, p. 953; Needham, 2005, p. 348; Scammell, 2007, p. 187; Smith, 2001, p. 996; Veloutsu, 2015; White & de Chernatony, 2002, p. 49). Very little empirical research has been done that investigates this relationship, or even what constitutes a valuable political brand in the first place (Dumitrica, 2014; Marsh & Fawcett, 2011; Nielsen, 2016; Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016).

As political marketing researchers continue to explore the use of brands, they are faced with inconsistencies in how marketing concepts can be effectively applied in political environments. Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) insist that, “dragging ideas from one setting to another without due regard for its distinctive characteristics results in incomplete understandings and unconvincing arguments” (p. 131). To date, this is precisely what has been done with regard to political brand
research. Politics offer a unique climate of interactions that demands a novel application of branding to the field. As the investigation of branding in politics continues, it is imperative that the concept is studied within its own context as a unique phenomenon independent of commercial marketing brand principles.

Branding is not the only possible factor influencing the outcome of elections. For most of the 20th century political science examined voting patterns from the perspective of how specific demographics routinely voted with respect to party lines (Hague & Harrop, 2007). However, by the 1990’s voter partisanship in the United States had declined by over 10% (Bentley, Jupp, & Stedman Jones, 2000; Dalton & Wattenburg, 2000). Dalton and Wattenburg (2000) also found that candidates and political leaders seemed to have grown in electoral importance relative to the parties they represent. At the time, Fiorina (1981) found one reason for this trend was retrospective voting. “From Fiorina’s perspective, a vote is no longer an expression of lifelong commitment [to the party]…the electoral decision becomes an act of calculation rather than affirmation” (Hague & Harrop, 2007, p. 205).

Besides descriptive demographic details such as education, socioeconomic status, race, gender, age, etc. (Ranney, 1982; Lawson, 1985; Roskin, Cord, Medeiros, & Jones, 2000), several factors have been identified that are intervening variables in voters’ electoral calculations (Ranney, 1982). These include specific political issues, the state of the economy, who the party leaders are, their personalities, and party image, in addition to the effectiveness of the campaign and
media coverage (Heywood, 2007; Hague & Harrop, 2007).

Roskin et al. (2000) claim that modern elections are “heavily manipulated by the twin factors of personality and the mass media” (p. 219). Modern parties emphasize personality over policy and showcase candidates as charismatic, decisive, calm, caring, and, above all, optimistic. “Victory in U.S. elections almost always goes to the candidate who presents the most upbeat image of America” (Roskin et al., 2000, p. 219). While party-identification remains the strongest influencing factor in who gets elected (Hague & Harrop, 2007; Ranney, 1982), is it possible that a candidate’s human brand is an additional variable that also influences voter decisions?

The following study empirically investigates a new human branding theoretical construct of political brands in an attempt to overcome the inconsistencies that arise when transplanting similar ideas across disciplines. This research is the first to empirically test the relationship between the strength of human brand components and electoral success. In order to understand the future trajectory of branding within politics we must take this first step in understanding what effect different aspects of political branding are having right now.

The following literature review will outline the important differences between branding in the commercial and political fields. Brands, political brands, and human brands will first be discussed independently before continuing on to a detailed description of the theoretical underpinnings for this study.
Literature Review

Brands

The concept of branding has always been integral to human commercial interactions. The word ‘brand’ itself traces back to ancient times when farm animals were branded to prevent theft. The practice was further expanded to apply to handcrafted goods (Al-Kwifi & Ahmed, 2015). Modern study of branding as we know it began in 1931 when Procter & Gamble established a brand management department committed entirely to reflecting on product features (Aaker & Joachimsthaler, 2000).

At its most basic level, the purpose of a brand is to act as a consumer behavior heuristic or psychological shortcut for consumer choice, allowing consumers to quickly and easily differentiate between similar products in the marketplace (Maheswaran, Mackie, & Chaiken, 1992; Park & Lessig, 1981; Scammell, 2007). The term brand now saturates the commercial world. It is applied not only to products and companies but also to celebrities and private individuals. Branding has even become a common phrase in popular self-help culture for job seekers (Whitcomb, 2005).

Brands are the core mechanism through which corporations build long-term,
loyal consumer relationships (Tuskej, Golob, & Podnar, 2011). As a result, brands are a large part of an organization’s intangible value, which contributes massively to overall corporate worth (Scammell, 2007). However, unlike other advertised items in the marketplace, brands are unique in that they are not under the sole ownership and control of marketers. The value of a brand is dependent on the public’s experiences and perceptions of it (Scammell, 2007). Cova and Cova (2000) refer to this phenomenon as “twist.” Consumers take away products and images from marketed offers to create their own consumption experience, one that is sometimes very different from the marketer’s intent (Cova & Cova, 2000). Marketers only have control over the brand concept and projected image. As a result, they can only manage a brand’s value through purposeful representation of the brand over time (Herbig & Milewicz, 1995). The “twist,” or a consumer’s self-generated brand evaluation, is developed based on criteria outside of the marketer’s controlled sources (Veloutsou, 2015). The strength of resulting consumer-generated beliefs often supersedes the marketer’s preferred brand concept (Puzakova, Kwan, & Rocereto, 2013), highlighting the importance of the public’s role in the composition of a strong brand.

Brands are useful to customers by making consumer choices easier, and are useful for corporate success by increasing consumer brand loyalty and repeat purchases (Veloutsou, 2015). In today’s marketplace of media bombardment and fractured target audiences, it is ever more important for brands to accommodate consumers’ demands of value-for-money, expectations of corporate social
responsibility, and the need for emotional engagement with the product or service (Scammell, 2007). The concept of branding has intellectual appeal because it is not just a “convenient and fashionable term for image,” (p. 1) but rather offers analytical value by considering “a layer of emotional connection that operates over and above the functional use-value of a product” (Scammell, 2007, p. 2).

**Political Brands**

The field of political marketing is an important subfield of the political discipline that is both broad and inclusive, but there is disagreement among researchers on how it should be approached (Savigny & Temple, 2010). The field of political marketing is informed by three disciplines: communications, management, and political science (Scammell, 1999). Each of these disciplines provides a multitude of perspectives and theoretical foundations to draw from. Cwalina (2012) puts forth a perspective on political marketing based on the macro- and micro- structural elements of the economic discipline. Indeed, much of the political marketing literature to date has been based in traditional marketing and economically motivated approaches (Savigny & Temple, 2010). However, there is a growing body of literature calling for a critique of traditional marketing applications to the political realm (Henneberg, 2002; O'Shaughnessy, 1990; 2001; Savigny, 2007; 2008; Wring, 1996; 2005). Savigny and Temple (2010) and Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) explicitly warn against the direct transferal of marketing
literature and nomenclature to the analysis of politics.

Recently, political marketing researchers have showed a growing interest in how the brand concept applies to politics (Needham, 2005; Scammell, 2007; Smith & French, 2009). The broad application of brand concepts to entities outside its origins in commerce suggests the potential for similar analyses and applications to be present in descriptions of political phenomenon (Speed et al., 2015; Tomz & Sniderman, 2004).

Nielsen (2016) defines political brands as, “political representations that are located in a pattern, which can be identified and differentiated from other political representations” (p. 71). This definition closely mirrors commonly accepted commercial brand functions as defined in the literature (Maheswaran et al., 1992; Park & Lessig, 1981; Scammell, 2007). Schneider (2004) and French and Smith (2010) have made initial attempts at brand measurement by studying brand associations of political parties in the same way associations are made in commercial marketing. It is assumed that a valuable political brand directly translates into the ability of a party to gain or sustain electoral votes (Cox & McCubbins, 2004; Lock & Harris, 2001, p. 953; Needham, 2005, p. 348; Scammell, 2007, p. 187; Smith, 2001, p. 996; White & de Chernatony, 2002, p. 49), just as how a valuable commercial brand translates to financial value (Veloutsu, 2015). However, very little research has been done that empirically investigates whether that is true (Dumitrica, 2014; Marsh & Fawcett, 2011; Nielsen, 2016; Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016). As previously mentioned, the copycat
application of marketing concepts to the burgeoning political marketing field is a weakness in current analysis of modern politics (Savigny & Temple, 2010).

This is an essential area of continued study because as Scammell (2007) claims, the concept of branding has become so integral to politics that it is now the new permanent campaign. Needham (2005) even argues that the concept of branding, rather than that of the permanent campaign, is the more useful way to understand political campaign communication. Bill Clinton was the first to employ the permanent campaign strategy in his 1982 race for Governor in Arkansas. Through the use of focus groups and polling, Clinton created a winning candidacy that “was not about government per se. Its sole focus was electability” (Marcus, 2010, p. 355). Since its introduction, conversations surrounding the permanent campaign concept have been dominated by campaign finance considerations (Karol, 2015). The suggestion that branding may now be eclipsing monetary perspectives regarding political campaign communication emphasizes the growing importance of political brands as a deserving area for further study.

The definitional boundaries of a political brand have yet to be clearly defined in the literature. Political researchers have made repeated attempts to decipher voter preferences about political offers in order to begin refining the concept of political brands (Guzmán & Sierra, 2009; Henneberg, 2002; O’Cass & Pecotich, 2005; O’Shaughnessy, 1990; Parker, 2012). Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) point out these efforts as essential to the beginning of brand research in politics, as the social exchange in political marketing is markedly different than that in commercial
transactions. The most notable difference is the brand composition of the political offer. In contrast to the common two-pronged commercial brand composition that includes a product and a set of associated values, Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) claim that the political offer is a “distinctly multi-component phenomenon that combines the ideology, the person, and the party,” each of which are inextricably linked and cannot be offered separately (p. 132).

**Human Brands**

Human branding, independent of politics, is a relatively new field of theory lacking comprehensive study. What does exist has been dubbed atheoretical and mostly “self-help” in nature (Andrusia & Haskins, 2000; Graham, 2001; Peters, 1999). The most basic definition of a human brand is any well-known persona who is the subject of marketing communications efforts (Thomson, 2006). Most human brand analysis in the field of marketing has focused on cases where there is minimal connection between the human brand and the host organization. These studies focus primarily on the brands of celebrity endorsers or spokespeople. Where there is a significant connection, such as when the human brand is part of a sports team or the face of a business, the relationship has been heavily ignored in analysis (Speed et al., 2015).

Several researchers have attempted theory building of human branding (Hearn, 2008; Lair, Sullivan, & Cheney, 2005; Thomson, 2006), but overall there
has been little focus in commercial branding theory on the role of individual people and their personalities. This discrepancy is even more apparent within political marketplaces where the political actor is central and cannot be separated from the “product” being offered (Speed et al., 2015; Calfano, 2010). Nielsen’s (2016) rudimentary definition of political brands fails to account for the complex interplay of brand associations at organizational and individual levels. The inseparability of the person from the product is what makes the application of human branding to politics uniquely different from traditional human branding examples in the literature (Dion & Arnould, 2016) and in practice (Speed et al., 2015).

**Theoretical Framework: Human Brands in Politics**

Much of the political marketing literature surrounding candidate brands continues to look at political brands through a marketing frame. For example, what political brand components are important to consumers (Guzmán, Paswan, & Van Steenberg, 2014), what aspects compose a political brand ‘personality’ (Guzmán & Sierra, 2009), how candidate brands can be positioned within the greater market (Cwalina & Falkowski, 2015), and candidate brand equity as measured by brand awareness, associations, perceived quality, and loyalty (Parker, 2012).

Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) present two new insights establishing the *strength of a human brand* with regard to politics that arises from the
interdependence of actor, policy, and party. First, the political actor requires 
*authenticity* to be accepted as a credible advocate for their policies. Second, the 
political actor requires an aura of *authority*, implying that they can command their 
party and deliver on political promises (Speed et al., 2015). The authors suggest 
that these two components are what primarily comprise the successful brand of a 
political actor.

The purpose of this research is to further explore the composition of politicians’ 
brands within this human branding framework with an interest in how the strength 
of a political actor’s brand, and brand components, influence electoral success. 
There is no empirical literature of any scale on this subject (Kaneva & Klemmer, 
2016). Speed, Butler and Collins’ framework is especially relevant to study because 
while authenticity is a widely discussed concept in branding literature, the idea of 
authority as an additional component is unique to the political environment and has 
yet to be investigated (Speed et al., 2015).

Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) describe their political brand framework as a 
tri-component model representing the political offer or ‘product’ (Figure 1). The 
three elements of policy, politician, and party form the basis of voter knowledge of 
a particular political brand. In a foundational political branding case study of the 
2005 General Election in the U.K., Scammell (2007) found that the element of the 
political leader, Tony Blair, was crucial to overall brand perceptions of the 
incumbent Labour Party. The application of the human brand perspective to politics 
uniquely emphasizes the importance of the political actor within the model.
Figure I: Authenticity and Authority in the Political Offer

Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) make several theoretical observations about what aspects of the political actor create a strong brand. The premise is that both the relationship between the politician and the ideology/policy (authenticity), and the relationship between the politician and the party (authority), are crucial for creating a strong brand.
The following analysis will adhere to Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) definitions within the framework. That is, policy refers to the principles and institutions proposed for political order (ideology), party refers to the political organization that seeks to attain and retain power, and the person refers to the candidate running for election. The individual relationships between the person, policy, and party are the emphasis of Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) model, setting their theory apart from the current approaches being taken in political brand research.

*Authenticity* refers to the aspect of the human brand that links the politician to the policy, as the person must establish themselves as a credible advocate for those policies. *Authority* refers to the relationship between the politician and the party, as the political actor must establish within their brand the perception that they have sufficient authority to deliver on their political promises.

**Authenticity**

The literature supports Jones’ (2016) claim that “policy proposals alone rarely satisfy the public. Constituents also want to know their representative’s character and what motivates them” (p. 489). The issue of democratic representation is key as to why authenticity is such a highly valued virtue in American politics. The public knows that they will not be present to influence representatives’ decisions once elected. Authenticity helps to reveal what will motivate their representative in these contexts (Jones, 2016; Sheinheit & Bogard,
2016; Panova, 2017). To be considered authentic, a political actor must show that they consistently uphold and put into practice their values and commitments. The abandonment of commitments when faced with adversity casts doubt on the politician’s likelihood to fulfill campaign promises when in office and out from under immediate public influence (Jones, 2016). Authenticity is not a transparent judgment, as an individual’s true inner values can be secretly maintained. Rather, authenticity is judged based on violations – when individuals’ representations of their core values and commitments come in conflict with their actions (Jones, 2016).

Successful political campaigns are dependent upon coherent, compelling, and plausible narrative messages. If delivered correctly, the campaign narrative will be perceived as an accurate representation of both the politician’s ideology and their “inner self” (Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016). The ‘brand persona’ is a term used in human branding literature to describe this outward image that the individual seeks to project as part of their brand (Speed et al., 2015; Kaneva & Klemmer, 2016). The concept of a persona allows for the projected image to be an incomplete representation of the political actor’s true character. However, the intense scrutiny that politicians face in today’s media environment can easily point out areas where the portrayed brand persona does not “ring true” to the politician’s underlying personality (Speed et al., 2015). It is therefore imperative that the projected brand is one that the individual can reinforce throughout their day-to-day actions (Speed et al., 2015).
The strength of alignment between a politician’s portrayed brand and the image perceived by the public is what Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) refer to as the ‘authenticity’ of the politician. Political gaffes are unintentional and/or inappropriate statements that contradict the portrayed brand of a politician (Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016). The public is aware that much of a politician’s projected brand is a performance (Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016). Therefore, these ‘gaffes’ and image slips are perceived as more authentic and telling of a politician’s character than the crafted speech.

The destructive power of inauthenticity within a human brand is displayed by Sheinheit and Bogard (2016) in three case studies of prominent political figures losing complete control over their campaigns and ultimately losing their elections. These case studies show that authenticity is an interactive process that takes into account the audience and requires a feeling of solidarity or “fusion” between the brand projected by the candidate and the image perceived by the public (Alexander, 2004; Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016). Thus, authenticity in a strong political brand is the alignment between the politician’s values and advocated policy along with a lack of violations over time. Previous research has highlighted destructive, campaign-defining moments (Sheinheit & Bogard, 2016), but performative authenticity in political brands has not been examined in the literature.

Authority

The key difference between a human brand as an endorser of a product or
organization and a politician’s human brand is the ability to make promises on behalf of the organization as an office holder. Because of this ability, the public holds reasonable expectations that a political actor has some responsibility to deliver on their promises (Speed et al., 2015). Authority is the aspect of a political brand that describes the consumer’s perception of a politician’s ability to deliver on their campaign promises. If the perceived authority of a politician is low, then the public will not believe that they can get their advocated policies passed (Speed et al., 2015). Therefore, low or weak brand authority may be a predictor of a low electoral success.

Candidates running for office make political promises on various issues. Despite there being no legal restraints preventing political actors from breaking their word, candidates follow through on most of their promises (Budge, Robertson, & Hearl, 1987; Fishel, 1985; Krukones, 1984; Lederman & Pomper, 1980; Petry, 1995; Royed & Borrelli, 1997).

For incumbent political actors, the primary signal of authority is delivery on past political promises. Austen-Smith and Banks (1989) show that incumbents purposely try to follow through on their platforms in order to win reelection. More success in this arena translates into stronger brand authority and a greater chance of reelection (Speed et al., 2015). Aragonés, Palfrey, and Postlewaite (2007) demonstrate the advantage of strong authority within a political human brand by proving in a theoretical game that candidates can successfully promise a different policy if a reputation of keeping promises had been built and maintained over time.
The literature supports the idea that a political newcomer’s ability to show authority is based on the infractions of the incumbent. It is much more likely that newcomers will enjoy greater electoral success when the incumbent in the race is perceived to be corrupt or unable to deliver on promises (Hawkins, 2010; Seawright, 2012), and thus has a weak authoritative brand. The literature is not clear about how newcomers may use political rhetoric to establish authority within their brand when the incumbent enjoys an established history of brand authority.

**Policy/Ideology**

An ideology is a "constellation of ideas…which make it possible for members of the party to perceive a pattern in the happenings around them, to define a group identity in terms related to that pattern, and to sketch a course of action that would make the pattern change" (Banning, 1978, p. 15). The policy positions taken up by a political actor will signal a broader core ideological position, often placed on a dichotomous scale (Speed et al., 2015). The conservative–liberal (right-left) dimension is the most widely referenced ideological concept in political discourse (Malka, 2010).

Differences between right and left orientations help guide people’s interpretations and responses within their political environments (Abramowitz & Saunders, 2006; Jost, Nosek, & Gosling, 2008). Examples of core values within the conservative–liberal dimension are to maintain the status quo vs. supporting societal change (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; McClosky, 1958;
Wilson & Patterson, 1968; tolerance of vs. opposition to inequality (Bobbio, 1996; Jost et al., 2003); and a great vs. small emphasis on military strength (Shapiro & Bloch-Elkon, 2007). Several cultural stances have also been placed at either end of the spectrum since the 1970’s, such as stances on abortion and homosexuality (Adams, 1997; Baldassari & Gelman, 2008; Fiorina & Abrams, 2009).

These heavily embedded “valence politics” (Stokes, 1992) of the American two-party system have resulted in parties converging around “centrist” policies in order to maintain enough mass appeal to have a chance at election (Smith & French, 2009). Even when there are independent candidates on the ballot, the single-member plurality condition of the American electoral system – the candidate with the most votes wins – effectively limits voter choice to the two major parties (Quinn, 2016). For this reason, the following research will focus only on political actors from the democratic or republican national parties.

**Media Repetition**

The media presence that a political actor has within a given political environment is not a factor taken into consideration by Speed, Butler and Collins (2015). It is logical to assume that the media attention paid to one candidate over another is indicative of brand strength and may have an effect on electoral success, much as how increasing commercial brand awareness through constant, repeated exposure also increases commercial brand strength (Zaif, 2016). There are even
suggestions in the literature that simply being exposed to media about politics may influence voter turnout (Gerber, Karlan & Bergan, 2009). Given the exploratory nature of this study as an initial test of the brand components highlighted in Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) theoretical framework, media presence should be examined as a possible influencing factor. Future studies should take into account the level of exposure a candidate’s brand has with their constituents in order to further expand the understanding of what additional aspects of political branding have a significant effect on electoral outcome.

The Current Study

The following study will test the relationship between the components of Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) political brand model and electoral success for 2016 U.S. Senate candidates. This research is the first to investigate the relationship between brand strength and, specifically, the strength of specific brand components (authenticity and authority) and electoral success within the unique context of a political environment.

H1: Overall brand strength is positively correlated with electoral success of political candidates.

H1a: Brand authenticity is positively correlated with electoral success.

H1b: Brand authority is positively correlated with electoral success.

H1c: Media repetition is positively correlated with electoral success.
Methods

The current study relies on quantitative content analysis. The lack of empirical testing focused on political branding calls for systematic inquiry into the integrity of brand theories being put forth (Speed et al., 2015). This methodological approach best serves the research goal of conducting an initial empirical study on a thus far untested branding theory as it is deductive, systematic and grounded in the positivist research tradition (White & Marsh, 2006). Outside of interviewing each candidate and a sample of constituents in-person or with a questionnaire, the use of content analysis is the best option for analyzing the type of data needed for this study, that is, representations of the projected and perceived brands. Interview-based methods would not have been practical for collecting the large amount of data needed to draw conclusions about the public’s perceived brands directly. Therefore, in order to accurately represent the type of perceived brand currently being measured, this study will use the term news presented brand when referencing the brand being perceived by the public.
Quantitative Content Analysis

In order to determine the strength of a political brand it is imperative to study both the brand projected by the political actor and the perceived brand picked up by the public. The closer the “fit” (Speed et al., 2015) between the projected and news presented brand, the more likely that candidate will have electoral success.

The scope of this study is the 2016 U.S. senatorial races. Available 2016 campaign material was analyzed, including campaign websites and press releases as primary data sources to determine the projected brand of each candidate. To measure the extent to which the public accepted the news presented brands relevant news articles published during the 2016 senatorial races by prominent local news outlets in each state were analyzed.

As famously summarized by Bernard Cohen (1963), agenda-setting theory demonstrates that the media not only tell us what to think about (object salience), they also tell us how to think about it (attribute salience). This transfer of attribute salience is the second-level of agenda setting (McCombs, 2014). For example, when the public consumes media about candidates, the candidate attributes discussed are transferred from the media’s agenda to the public agenda, becoming the “pictures in our heads” (Lippmann, 1922).

The research on second-level agenda setting is extensive. Some of McCombs’ latest research shows that second-level agenda setting is most likely to occur when people consume more specialized and partisan media versus first-level agenda setting being the more likely result of traditional media use (McCombs,
Based on this accepted idea of candidate attribute salience in the media being representative of attribute salience in the public’s opinion, news content referring to the attributes of authority and authenticity can cautiously be inferred to be indicative of public brand perception. Actually surveying public opinion in order to determine brand perception was not possible for this study and so this method of measuring perception is being employed as the best option to measure the brand being perceived by the public. However, since this study does not directly measure public perception, it cannot by completely accurate in determining ‘perceived brand.’

Method of Analysis

Data Collection

In the 2016 Senate election there were 35 senate races (CNN, 2016). This study will focus on the brands of candidates from the two main political parties, republican and democrat. Due to the strength of the two-party system in American politics it is rare that a viable third-party candidate garners enough support to win, or even compete with the two main candidates (McKee & Hood, 2012). In fact, only 5 of the 55 third-party Senate campaigns held since 1990 were successful. Since this study has an empirical focus on electoral success, third-party Senate
candidates were excluded from analysis. Candidates who ran unopposed were also excluded.

All material collected for analysis was published between March 1, 2016 ("Super Tuesday") and the general election day November 8, 2016. Data sources for measuring portrayed brands of candidates were campaign websites and press releases. Data sources for measuring news presented brands were news articles collected from the Nexis Uni database, with a focus on local state publications. Candidates without a campaign website available or a strong enough local media presence in the Nexis Uni database were excluded from the study. The final sample included 16 senate candidates.

When collecting news articles, the use of a single news outlet as a data source is generally advised against (Woolley, 2000; Atkinson, 2014), as it may not be representative of the greater news agenda. However, intermedia agenda-setting suggests that news organizations often look to each other for guidance as to what issues are newsworthy (Atkinson, Lovett & Baumgartner, 2014; Denham, 2014). As a result, the content of multiple news outlets in a given media environment often mirrors that of outlets that are news leaders on the topic (Atkinson et al., 2014; Meraz, 2011; Ragas & Kiousis, 2010). In this case intermedia agenda-setting allows for purposive sampling to be used in the collection of news articles. This justifies the use of fewer news sources in the collection of data in order to provide for the most useful evidence in testing the hypotheses (White & Marsh, 2006).
News articles to measure news presented brands were collected within the primary to general election date range by searching the Nexis Uni database for each candidate’s full first and last name. The results were narrowed by filtering the search by “newspaper” publication type and further constrained to state publication location. Since it is not a guarantee that every article listed would contain relevant data, candidates were only included in the study if there were at least 50 unique local state publication articles listed. This cutoff was made in order to include as many candidates as possible while still excluding candidates with minimal media presence whose small data count may skew the results. The final sample included 359 articles, with an average of 22 articles per candidate ($n = 359, M = 22.44, SD = 2.81$).

It is important to note that repeated articles were taken note of as a possible factor in this study. A higher ‘story count’ for one candidate over another certainly may be a contributing factor when examining brand strength and electoral success. Story count was measured by tallying the number of similar or repeated articles grouped under each article search result.

The unit of analysis for campaign websites was an individual web page, or a single press release published on the candidate’s campaign website. The unit of analysis for news articles was the entire article as published. Each sentence within a single unit of analysis was examined and coded appropriately. It is possible for each sentence and therefore each unit of analysis to contain multiple codes. Data were analyzed using the IBM SPSS Statistics program based on a coding scheme of
8 variables designed to index units according to brand defining constructs: authenticity and authority. Further variables were computed after data collection was finished. The codebook was pilot tested on a random sample of documents from various candidates’ campaign and media material from the 2016 senate campaign.

Intercoder reliability is a crucial standard in content analysis research; without it, data and their interpretation cannot be considered objectively valid (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002). Intercoder reliability was not calculated for this research as the constraints inherent in this study (individual work in fulfillment of degree requirements) demand that a single coder will analyze the data. This is a significant, yet unavoidable, limitation to this research.

Measures

Appropriate measurement of brand components for this study were borrowed from a variety of sources in marketing and political science research as no directly applicable measures were available (Bruhn, Schoenmüller, Schäfer, & Heinrich, 2012; Cwalina & Falkowski, 2014; Delgado-Ballester & Munuera-Alemán, 2005; Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Guzman & Sierra, 2009; Lau & Lee, 1999). Most previously validated items can only partially describe a political brand as defined by this study, and thus required adaption to reliably measure ‘authenticity’ and ‘authority’ (APPENDIX A).

For example, brand authenticity is most often measured in business and
marketing research on the basis of brand heritage, quality commitment, craftsmanship, sincerity, nostalgia, cultural symbolism and design consistency (Napoli, Dickinson, & Beverland, 2014). Bruhn et al. (2012) come closer to the mark by focusing on four dimensions: continuity (to be stable and/or continuous over time), originality (to be creative and/or innovative), reliability (to keep promises and/or be reliable) and naturalness (to be genuine and/or natural).

Several attempts have been made in both the marketing and political science fields to create new constructs that would help bridge the gap between how brands are measured in the commercial world versus how they should be measured for politics. Guzman & Sierra (2009) created a new measurement construct adapted from Aaker’s (1997) personality and Caprara, Barbaranelli and Zimbardo’s (1997) candidate personality scales based on capability, openness, empathy, agreeableness, and handsomeness to analyze the brand personality of presidential candidates in Mexico. Cwalina and Falkowski (2014) used multidimensional scaling measures to position Polish presidential candidate brand images against the public’s ‘ideal candidate’ and against other candidates in the race. These measures analyzed the political brand associations compared to each other but not the relationship of components within a single brand itself.

In fact, there are no existing valid, verified measures that measure the political brand components of authenticity and authority as defined by Speed, Butler, and Collins (2015). Brand authority is a particularly novel concept lacking verified measures in the literature. Nevertheless, some measures were still borrowed and
adapted from the slightly more abundant ‘authenticity’ literature when possible.

For each candidate from a specific state, the campaign websites and press releases were coded first in order to establish each candidate’s portrayed brand. News articles were then coded directly after the coding of campaign material in order to more effectively measure how well the news presented brand fit with the candidate’s portrayed brand. This sequence of coding is essential to more accurately determining the valence of portrayed and news presented brand components. When coding portrayed brand components the unit was coded positively if it aligned with the morals, values and/or claims from the candidate’s campaign material. Similarly, if the unit was a ‘political gaffe’ or contradicted with the candidate’s intended portrayed brand then the unit was coded negatively. In a similar fashion, when coding news presented brand components in news articles, the unit was coded positively if the content aligned with what was portrayed in the candidate’s campaign materials and negatively if the content of the unit contradicted the portrayed components.

Each unit of analysis was coded for the following variables. The number of mentions for each variable were tallied into raw variable count scores for each unit. These variables serve to directly and specifically test the hypothesis put forward by this study.
Portrayed Positive Authenticity

Favorable statements from a candidate web page or press release that refers to the following: positive character traits, values that are important to the candidate, candidate actions that support positive character traits and values, comments and statements of personal commitments that are in line with the candidate’s moral constructs and advocated policy stances.

For example, if the candidate made efforts to sponsor or pass a bill on an issue they advocate for; statement about what the candidate believes should get done; choosing to stick with morals over politics with regard to controversial Donald Trump issues.

Portrayed Negative Authenticity

Actions or comments mentioned in the candidate’s campaign materials that contradict stated character traits, values, personal commitments and advocated policy stances. For example, discussion about political gaffes, or actions and comments that violate represented core values. This includes waffling or ‘flip-flopping’ in support of policies, specific political issues, or in endorsements of other candidates.

News Presented Positive Authenticity

Favorable statements from a news article that refers to the following: the candidate’s character traits, values, actions, comments and/or personal
commitments. Favorable statements about the candidate’s advocated policy stances, and/or the candidate’s past actions/statements. For example, if the candidate remains consistent in endorsements of specific policies or other candidates despite opposition.

**News Presented Negative Authenticity**

Unfavorable statements from a news article pointing out instances where the candidate’s actions or comments contradicted their established character, values, personal commitments and advocated policy stances. For example, political gaffes, mentions by a news article of candidate actions/comments that violate represented core values, instances where the politician was said to abandon their values when faced with adversity (in their personal life and/or in politics). This includes accusations against the candidate’s character made by the opposing campaign, ‘flip-flopping’ on issues and news article mentions about the candidate avoiding to comment on controversial topics regarding Donald Trump.

**Portrayed Positive Authority**

Statements by candidate and references on campaign website or press releases about the candidate’s responsibility, ability, history, and/or confidence in delivering on campaign promises. For example, if the candidate was responsible for getting bills passed or written, or mentions of specific policies that the candidate will fight for or against in Congress.
Portrayed Negative Authority

Statements by candidate or references on campaign website or press releases about instances when the candidate failed to deliver on campaign promises or shifts blame to the other party or other circumstances regarding their failure to fulfill campaign promises.

News Presented Positive Authority

Positive references in news article about the candidate’s responsibility, ability, history, confidence in delivering on campaign promises. For example, this includes a candidate being said to make “calls for action” on specific issues and positive comments about the candidate voting for or supporting bills that are in line with what their constituents want.

News Presented Negative Authority

Negative references in news article about the candidate being corrupt, being unable to deliver on campaign promises, or failing to deliver on promises in the past. Examples include missing votes, negative comments about advocated policies that don’t work or are bad, not sponsoring/voting for policies their constituents want, accusations of taking dark money or voting for special interests over the peoples’ needs.
Electoral Success

Electoral success was measured as a dichotomous variable: the candidate either won or lost. Candidates who ran unopposed were excluded from this study.

Analysis/Additional Variables

Coded data was aggregated to determine overall levels of brand authenticity, authority, and overall brand strength.

Brand Authenticity

Portrayed brand authenticity = (Pos. Portrayed authenticity)/(pos. portrayed authenticity count + neg. portrayed authenticity count). This value is the percent total of the positive portrayed brand authenticity.

News presented brand authenticity = (Pos. news presented authenticity)/(pos. news presented authenticity count + neg. news presented authenticity count). This value is the percent total of the positive news presented brand authenticity.

Brand authenticity = Absolute value [percent positive portrayed – percent positive news presented.] On a scale from 0 – 1, zero being the closest fit and highest strength of brand authenticity.
**Brand Authority**

Portrayed brand authority = (Pos. Portrayed authority)/(pos. portrayed authority count + neg. portrayed authority count). This value is the percent total of the positive portrayed brand authority.

News presented brand authority = (Pos. news presented authority)/ (pos. news presented authority count + neg. news presented authority count). This value is the percent total of the positive news presented brand authority.

Brand authority = Absolute value [percent positive portrayed – percent positive news presented.] On a scale from 0 – 1, zero being the closest fit and highest strength of brand authority.

**Overall Brand Strength**

Brand strength = (Brand Authority + Brand Authenticity)/2
Results

A series of Pearson correlation tests were conducted to test the proposed hypothesis using the IBM SPSS Statistics (v.24) analytics program.

The correlations were run on the data results for 16 candidates, two from each of eight states. Brand strength ranged from the tightest, best fit between portrayed and news presented brand sat a value of 0.121 to the weakest fit at a value of 0.848 ($M = .399$, $SD = .185$). Brand authenticity had the smallest range ($M = .324$, $SD = .145$, min = .127, max = .696) while brand authority values varied the most ($M = .475$, $SD = .325$, min = 0, max = 1). The tests did not detect any significant correlations between a candidate’s electoral success and their overall brand strength (H1) brand authenticity (H1a), authority (H1b), or media presence (H1c). When comparing candidates from the same state, in exactly half of the instances (50%) the candidate with the stronger overall brand (the lesser value) was elected. In states where the stronger branded candidate won, the average difference between the strength of the winning and losing candidates’ brands was higher ($M = 0.176$, $SD = .226$) than in states where the stronger branded candidate lost ($M = .069$, $SD = .076$).
Additional tests showed correlations between minor variables within the study. Both brand authenticity \( r(16) = .485, p = .028 \) and brand authority \( r(16) = .909, p = .000 \) were found to positively correlate with strong overall brand strength at the .05 and .01 levels of significance, respectively. However, news presented and portrayed brand authenticity are the only variables from the same brand component that positively correlated with each other \( r(16) = .460, p = .037 \) at the .05 level of significance.
Discussion

Is the political brand model proposed by Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) a valid descriptor of political brand components and does it provide a basis of measurement for determining the strength and effectiveness of a political brand? While the current study demonstrates that political branding as currently defined is not correlated with electoral success, it is possible that further refinements of the brand components and a more extensive data set might increase the explanatory power of Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) political human brand model. Based on the results of this study, the personal brand of candidates is not an influencing factor on electoral outcome on equal footing with established factors such as party-affiliation and stances on political issues. Heywood (2007) and Hague and Harrop (2007) claim that voters take the personality of political leaders into consideration. This research was not able to extrapolate this claim in order to explain possible existing relationships between political personality and electoral outcome for lower level political actors such as senate candidates.

However, this study contributes to the burgeoning field of research in political marketing that has thus far lacked any proper measures for comparing political brands in order to determine which components are stronger, more present,
or have more of an effective on electoral outcome than others (Henneberg, 2002; O’Shaughnessy, 1990; 2001; Savigny, 2007; 2008; Savigny & Temple, 2010; Wring, 1996; 2005). Several researchers have begun making attempts at refining the definition and measurement of political brands (Guzmán & Sierra, 2009; Henneberg, 2002; O’Cass & Pecotich, 2005; O’Shaughnessy, 1990; Parker, 2012) but many of these measures are borrowed from related fields and are unable to truly capture the essence of what a political brand is, especially when using Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) model as a foundation. This study makes an exploratory attempt at further quantifying these abstract concepts, leading to a more specific understanding of political brand components and how they can potentially be measured.

In political branding the end goal is for the candidate to win the vote of their constituents in order to get elected to public office (Cox & McCubbins, 2004; Lock & Harris, 2001, p. 953; Needham, 2005, p. 348; Scammell, 2007, p. 187; Smith, 2001, p. 996; White & de Chernatony, 2002, p. 49). Speed, Butler and Collins (2015) propose that the most important factors in a political brand in order to achieve electoral success are to have both strong authenticity and strong authority. In order to shed more light on the reliability of these claims, the current study employed a content analysis of relevant material to measure the presence of these components in political brands and if the strength of those brands is related to a candidate’s electoral success.
This study examined both the brands being portrayed by selected candidates from the 2016 senate elections, and the news presented brands observed by the public. The general idea proposed by this study is that a smaller discrepancy between the measured portrayed and news presented brands would indicate a greater likelihood of electoral success for candidates. The statistical tests performed revealed no significant correlations between the electoral success of candidates and their overall brand strength, nor the strength of the individual brand components of authenticity and authority. This study also measured each candidate’s media presence and found no statistical correlation between a higher media presence and likelihood of being elected.

The lack of strong, significant correlations as a result of this study indicate that either human branding of candidates based on Speed, Butler and Collins’ (2015) model is a non-factor with regard to electoral success, or the measures used in this study were not reliable. If the former is the case then examination of political personalities within the human brand framework can cease and political marketing researchers should continue to investigate political personalities from a different theoretical framework. However, given the methodological limitations in this study it is possible that the specific measures put forth simply did not accurately capture and describe the current state of human brands in today’s political landscape. In addition, more in depth analysis of the data outside the scope of this study may reveal more insights into the effect of political brands. For example, a multivariate analysis may show a significant effect of strong political
brands once other variables such as region, type of election, type of candidate (e.g. incumbent or newcomer), close races, etc. have been controlled for.

Despite the lack of significant findings regarding brand strength and electoral success, there was a difference between the variance of winning and losing candidates’ brand strength in individual states. In the states where the candidate with the stronger brand won, the average difference in brand strength between candidates was notably higher when compared to the average difference between candidate brand strengths in states where the stronger branded candidate lost. This observation hints that further, more in-depth and statistically reliable research may find that there is indeed a relationship between brand strength and electoral outcome. Perhaps it is not a direct correlation, but rather an instance of there needing to be a specific margin of discrepancy between two candidates’ brand strengths in order to statistically predict a specific electoral outcome.

There are several confounding factors that come to mind that may also explain this potential relationship outside of the candidate simply having a stronger brand as defined by this study. Perhaps the election was for a shoo-in candidate that the media found did not warrant the attention paid to the opposing candidate. Perhaps it was between a well-known incumbent and unknown newcomer. It is possible that very close races between two political rivals may have completely unique influences on the political brand success and strength of each candidate. There are several long-term factors that should also be examined in their effect not only on political brands but also how those brands may affect electoral outcome.
For example, the brands of incumbent candidates might inherently contain different components than a newcomers brand, simply because they have had more time to develop their image and can rely on different strategies than a political outsider can legitimately claim. There are also intervening factors such as the level of the election, the region and population of the location where the election is taking place and the demographics of the constituency. Each of these factors represent ways that future research can group election data in order to test for the efficacy of political brand strength in different contexts.

If we are to gain a complete understanding of the purpose and function of political brands it is imperative that future research continues to examine these phenomenon and how they affect the success of a political brand during an election, and during different kinds of elections.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The three most pressing limitations in this research are intercoder reliability, the lack of properly vetted measures and the amount of data collected. Future research should work towards closing these loopholes and specifically should focus on producing reliable measures for this new field of study. It is clear that current branding measures are not sufficient, nor are they effective, in accurately measuring the political branding landscape. This is the most important step towards gaining a clear and reliable idea of what it means to be a ‘political brand.’ This
research should serve as a starting point for further clarifying the definitional components of political brands as well as the process of quantifying them. It would be a promising step forward for identifying new potential valid measures for political brands if intercoder reliability is tested for these measures and the result is high. If these measures are proven to be accurate with further testing, future researcher could expand the data pool to continue down the path of redefining the importance of political brands, or ruling them out as not influential on electoral success.

An additional limitation in this study is that the actual perception of constituents regarding candidate perceived brands was not directly measured. This study had to rely on measuring the brand being portrayed by the media in place of actual perceived brand in order to obtain a measurement to “fit” against the candidate’s portrayed brand. Second-level agenda setting makes this cautious leap reasonable, but it cannot be denied that actual perception was not measured. If large scale, and even longitudinal, surveys are done that follow along the same style as those performed by Bruhn et al. (2012) in their brand authenticity research, then the reliability of the perceived brand measure would be greatly increased.

As the level of interest in this field of study continues to grow and researchers arrive at reliable methods of measurement, it is imperative that studies such as these are replicated using multiple coders and larger amounts of data. Attempting to quantify entities that are inherently subjective demands massive amounts of data points and multiple perspectives, especially regarding topics as
polarizing as politics. Only in this way can research and understanding within the field of political branding progress towards universally accepted standards.
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Appendix A: Codebook

Variable Codebook

Table 1: Codebook Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Nominal variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Candidate State</td>
<td>Nominal variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Election Result</td>
<td>1=won; 2=lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Candidate Party</td>
<td>1=Democrat; 2=Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>Candidate Gender</td>
<td>1=male; 2=female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>Media Type</td>
<td>1=web page; 2=press release; 4=news article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Media Item</td>
<td>Media type + 3 digits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td>MMDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>Total Article Count</td>
<td>String variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10a</td>
<td>Portrayed Pos.</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10b</td>
<td>Perceived Pos.</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10c</td>
<td>Portrayed Neg.</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10d</td>
<td>Perceived Neg.</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10e</td>
<td>Portrayed Brand</td>
<td>(V10a – V10c)/(V10a + V10c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10f</td>
<td>Perceived Brand</td>
<td>(V10b – V10d)/(V10b + V10d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variable Definitions

**V10a Portrayed Positive Authenticity**

Favorable statements from a candidate web page or press release that refers to the following: the candidate’s character, values, actions, comments and personal commitments being in line with moral constructs and the candidate’s advocated policy stances. For example, if the candidate made efforts to sponsor or pass a bill in an area they advocate for, statement about what the candidate believes should get
done, choosing to stick with morals over politics with regard to controversial
Donald Trump issues.

\textit{V10c} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Portrayed Negative Authenticity}

Actions or comments made by the candidate that contradict their established
character, values, personal commitments and advocated policy stances; e.g.
political gaffes, actions/comments that violate represented core values. These
include waffling or ‘flip-flopping’ in support of policies or in endorsements of
other candidates.

\textit{V11a} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Portrayed Positive Authority}

Statements by candidate and references on campaign website or press releases
about the candidate’s responsibility/ability/history/confidence in delivering on
campaign promises. For example, if the candidate was responsible for getting bills
passed or written or mention of specific policies that the candidate will fight for in
Congress.

\textit{V11c} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Portrayed Negative Authority}

Statements by candidate or references on campaign website or press releases about
instances when the candidate failed to deliver on campaign promises; shifts blame
regarding failure to fulfill promises.
V10b  New Presented Positive Authenticity

Favorable statements from a news article that refers to the following: the candidate’s character, values, actions, comments and personal commitments being in line with moral constructs, the candidate’s advocated policy stances, and/or the candidate’s past actions/statements. For example, if the candidate remains consistent in endorsements of specific policies or other candidates despite opposition.

V10d  News Presented Negative Authenticity

Unfavorable statements from a news article pointing out instances where the candidate’s actions or comments contradicted their established character, values, personal commitments and advocated policy stances; e.g. political gaffes, actions/comments that violate represented core values, instances where the politician was said to abandon their values when faced with adversity whether in their personal life or in politics. This includes accusations against the candidate’s character made by opposing campaign, ‘flip-flopping’ on issues and comments by about the candidate avoiding to comment on controversial topics regarding Donald Trump.

V11b  News Presented Positive Authority

Positive references in news article about the candidate’s responsibility/ability/history/confidence in delivering on campaign promises. This
includes “calling for action” from another entity on an issue and
dressing/supporting bills that are approved by constituents.

\[V11d\]  \textit{News Presented Negative Authority}

Negative references in news article about the candidate being corrupt, being unable
to deliver on campaign promises, or failing to deliver on promises in the past.
Examples include missing votes, negative comments about advocated policies that
don’t work or are bad, not sponsoring/voting for policies the constituents want,
accusations of taking dark money or voting for special interests over the peoples
needs.
## Appendix B: Variable Codes

Table 2: Identifier Variable Codes

*Variable Codes for candidate identifying information.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Van Hollen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Carter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Glenn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Kander</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Barksdale</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Isakson</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamala Harris</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Szeliga</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Sanchez</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Rubio</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bennet</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Murphy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Blumethal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Blunt</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate State</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Outlet</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Kirkpatrick Campaign Website</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain Senate Website</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamela Harris Campaign Website</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Sanchez Campaign Website</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Glenn Campaign Website</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bennett Campaign Website</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Carter Campaign Website</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Blumenthal Campaign Website</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Murphy Campaign Website</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Rubio Campaign Website</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Barksdale Campaign Website</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Isakson Campaign Website</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Van Hollen Campaign Website</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Szeliga Campaign Website</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Kander Campaign Website</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Blunt Campaign Website</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arizona Capitol Times</td>
<td>4001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrence Daily Breeze</td>
<td>4002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The San Diego Union Tribune</td>
<td>4003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Enterprise-Record</td>
<td>4004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Independent Journal</td>
<td>4005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily News of Los Angeles</td>
<td>4006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernadino Sun (California)</td>
<td>4007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Tribune</td>
<td>4008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Register</td>
<td>4009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Times-Standard</td>
<td>4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Herald</td>
<td>4011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Press – Telegram</td>
<td>4012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East Bay Times (California)</td>
<td>4013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Valley Daily Bulletin</td>
<td>4014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Camera (Boulder, Colorado)</td>
<td>4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hartford Courant</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay Times</td>
<td>4016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota Herald Tribune</td>
<td>4017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Times-Union (Jacksonville)</td>
<td>4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Post (Florida)</td>
<td>4019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Atlanta Journal-Constitution</td>
<td>4020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Augusta Chronicle (Georgia)</td>
<td>4021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baltimore Sun</td>
<td>4023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri)</td>
<td>4024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: SPSS Data

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Tested Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Result</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.50000</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
<td>.51600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Strength</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.12100</td>
<td>.84800</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.18521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Authority</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.32485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Repetition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.700</td>
<td>47.481</td>
<td>69.600</td>
<td>.32485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayed Authenticity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>242.0000</td>
<td>242.0000</td>
<td>57.181695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Authenticity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62.300</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>87.300</td>
<td>.15472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayed Authority</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.400</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.11072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Authority</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.17034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (Listwise)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.32485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Brand Strength</th>
<th>Brand Authority</th>
<th>Brand Authenticity</th>
<th>Media Repetition</th>
<th>Portrayed Authenticity</th>
<th>Perceived Authenticity</th>
<th>Portrayed Authority</th>
<th>Perceived Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Result</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Strength</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.909**</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>-.909**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Authority</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.909**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-1.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Authenticity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.772**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Repetition</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).
a. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.
### Intercorrelations for Tested Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Brand Strength</th>
<th>Brand Authority</th>
<th>Brand Authenticity</th>
<th>Media Repetition</th>
<th>Portrayed Authenticity</th>
<th>Perceived Authenticity</th>
<th>Portrayed Authority</th>
<th>Perceived Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portrayed Authenticity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Authenticity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.772</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portrayed Authority</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Authority</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sig. (1-tailed)       | .190 | .028 | .000 | .388 | .417 | .466 | .420 | .
| N                    | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |

*Note.** **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

a. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.