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ABSTRACT
The research in elector’ loyalty to party brand was still fragmented, isolated and under research. This research aims to investigate the relationship between party brand image and elector loyalty to party brand, as well evaluate the mediation role of elector’ affective commitment in primary relationship in line with social exchange theory and the role of the moderating influence of utilitarian reference group (tribe) in accordance with social comparison theory, to fill these gaps in marketing literature and to address the mixed findings in the previous studies. 87 surveys were obtained from electors toward party brand in Jordan context using systematic random sampling method. The data were analyzed using SPSS and PLS-SEM techniques. Result shows that there is a positive relationship in direct and indirect paths, whereas, no support for the moderator hypothesis. Ultimately, the study introduced a number of recommendations and set of directions for future research.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In commercial sector, brands generate many benefits (Steenkamp, 2014). In parallel, brands become commonplace in the context of politics to build concrete links with electors (Lees-Marshment et al., 2014). Of late, several billion dollar has been spent by political brands (e.g. parties, candidates) to increase the political market share as well as targeting the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of electors (Parker, 2012, O’Cass and Pecotich, 2005; Winther and Vinaes, 2014; Lewandowski, 2013; Guzmán and Sierra, 2009).

Recently, both of them (academicians and practitioners) have started to link between electoral behavior and party brand (French and Smith, 2010; Harmer and Wring, 2013; Phipps et al., 2010). However, few studies looked in the loyalty of electors toward party brand (Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013). Pervious researchers mentioned that the concept of elector loyalty in politics still needs to be addressed (Winchester et al., 2014; Parker, 2012), especially with spread the phenomenon of weakening and decreasing electors' loyalty toward party brand around the world (Hughes and Dann, 2010; Smith, 2014; French and Smith, 2010), particularly in Arab context (Khatib, 2012; Hamid, 2011; Farrag and Shamma, 2014). Hence, there is a crucial growing need to focus on elector as a customer to know their needs and desires (Harris and Lock, 2010; Winchester et al., 2014; Lees-Marshment, 2009). Therefore, due to the complexity nature of human behavior (Kura, 2014; Amani, 2015), especially, the elector behavior (Stadelmann and Torgler, 2013), there are many factors that shape this behavior (Amani, 2015). Hence, to understand the elector behavior (loyalty), several variables according to previous literature possibly play a role in it, whereas the factors that had received little attention is the brand image (perceptions) (Hermanto et al., 2014), affective commitment (attitudes) (Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013), and the influence of utilitarian reference groups (tribe) (cultural factor) (Al Shawi, 2002; Weir, 2013). To this end, this study aims to investigate the relationship among these constructs and with loyalty in line with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), and reference group theory (Hyman, 1968). This attempt aim to fill the gaps in the political brand literature especially in Jordan context, where the loyalty of electors toward political parties is still weak as well as going down compared with the results of independent candidates (Jordanian House of Representatives, 2013; The Centre for Strategic Studies, 2015).

Many of previous studies stressed the importance the multiple functions of political parties in serving the community as well as solving some economic and political matters (Osuagwu, 2008; Whiteley, 2011; Khatib, 2012; Gandhi and Lust-Okar, 2009). Therefore, the study of loyalty to political brand among Jordanian electors is important from point view of marketing (Khatib, 2012) because loyalty helps parties to form a strong government; this is reflected in the political stability of the country, and this in turn contributes to the economic growth, attracting investments and loyal elector is useful in reducing the marketing efforts (Winther and Vinaes, 2014; Khatib, 2012); especially the political brands spent on 2013 campaigns multimillion dollars to influence on elector choice. Thus, the study could provide an empirical evidence of how party brands benefit from electors support to enhance the political brand in Arab countries (Farrag and Shamma, 2014). Ultimately, this research came to deal with this issue in addition to address the inconclusive findings in the previous brand loyalty studies (Hosseini and Nahad, 2012; Liu, Liu and Lin, 2013; Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013; Gruen et al., 2000; Ogba and Tan, 2009; Farrag and Shamma, 2014; Hermanto et al., 2014).
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Electors' loyalty to “party” brand

In light of the strong competition in the markets, brand loyalty has become today a crucial indicator and bedrock for the success of organizations and their services (Sharma et al., 2013). Furthermore, it is an important issue for the existence of the organizations (Li and Green, 2011; Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). Likewise in politics, Winchester et al. (2014) and Downer (2013) stated that electors' loyalty to party brand is considered very significant in a way that brings some benefit in political market especially when treating an elector as a customer.

Internationally, the research in brand loyalty is a renewed topic from many perspectives in products, services, destinations branding and others (Moolla and Bisschoff, 2012; Chinomona and Dubihlela, 2014; Huang and Cai, 2015; Loureiro, 2014; Sabet et al., 2014). However, these attempts have neglected other important aspects such as electors' perspective toward loyalty to party brand (Alkhawaldeh et al., 2015; Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013; Parker, 2012). Nevertheless, in the context of electors' behavior, there is a few studies that had attempted to discuss loyalty to political brand, but these attempts still fragmented, and isolated (Smith and Spotswood, 2013; Smith and French, 2011; Phipps et al., 2010; Parker, 2012). Schofield and Reeves (2015) pointed out that the loyalty to political brand is still under-research in the literature of political marketing. Inevitably, loyalty to the party implies backing it up continuously. Hence, "measuring brand loyalty cannot be accomplished without considering the constructs or influences that have a direct bearing on it" (Moolla and Bisschoff, 2013, p.2). Therefore, elector loyalty in this research consists of two wings (behavioral and attitudinal) (Wang, 2014) which can applied with electors (Smith and Spotswood, 2013; Needham, 2006; Mishra and Mishra, 2014) as an electors repeat vote for the one party over time more than recommended vote for the party to others.

2.2 Brand Image

Brand image is one of key building blocks in literature of commercial marketing (Aaker 1991). Brand image effects on the purchasing decision in time of the buying as well giving a chance to differentiation (Keller 1993), and it is expected that this will hold true for political brands (Mishra and Mishra, 2014). The images affect many parts of life; one of these parts is brand in politics. For instance, on polling day, the image of the leader/party provides a way of selecting among the alternatives available, where a negative or a positive brand image could make a difference (Smith, 2001). This goes in line with Peng and Hackley (2009) and Guzmán and Sierra (2009) who stated that the image plays a crucial role in decision making in the election time. Once again, brand image was considered a vital factor in creating, building and maintaining good relationships (Aaker, 1991; Hermantoet al., 2014; Keller, 1993). In brief, brand image is the first step in the mind of the electors (Parker, 2012).

Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) in particular have focused on the role of a brand’s image in creating value for customers; this value in politics takes many forms such as providing value to the politicians that lead to increase the loyalty to a party, giving them a competitive advantage, ultimately, loyalty and advantage that lead to increased partisanship among electors when voting. They also improve the information about the party, and increase confidence in the decision to vote. This is consistent with previous research suggesting that building brand image in politics is an important task in the strategic management of political parties (Kotler and Kotler, 1999; Smith, 2001).

Political parties/candidates should understand the importance of providing a united brand image to their constituents (Cwalina et al., 2010; Smith, 2001; Parker, 2012; Hermantoet al., 2014). Hence,
creating the party image requires advanced knowledge and research methodology in the domain of cognitive and emotional processes, in the course of communication between elector and candidate/party. According to Keller (1993) brand image is a set of associations usually organized in some meaningful way in the memory and represents perceptions that may or may not reflect objective reality. The brand image often referred to as brand associations (Yoo and Donth, 2001). In this research, party image refer to electors’ cognitive evaluation on the party image consistency and other of attractiveness attributes which represent a party image (Netemeyer et al., 2004; Smith, 2001).

In brief, brand image is antecedent of brand commitment (Tsang et al., 2011) as well as leading to brand loyalty (Hermantoet al., 2014), with some previous inconsistent results (Ramaseshanet al., 2013; Li et al., 2014). Thus, the relationship between party brand image and electors’ loyalty still left open to be examined and this relationship has not been studied with commitment in the political context. The present study proposes the following:

**H1:** There is a significant relationship between party brand image and elector’s loyalty to party brand.

**H2:** There is a significant relationship between party brand image and elector’s affective commitment.

### 2.3 Electors' affective commitment

Elector’s affective commitment to a party brand refers to elector’s psychological attachment to a party brand, the elector remains with the organization (party) because he wants it (Gullupunarand Gulluoglu, 2013). Affective commitment is an important element for the success of relationships of a long period (Amani, 2015), as well as a former significant issue that can be exploited to form customer/elector loyalty (Cwalianet al., 2010; Story and Hess, 2006). Hence, this can have an effect on the elector through driving the vote intention toward a party/candidate to be constant. In the same vein, it seems the role of relationship commitment is represented clearly through the organizational buying behavior which reduces the customer turnover (Porter, Steers et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1982; Allen and Meyer, 1990; Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Hilman and Hanaysha; 2015), Whereas, it seems to be there is a remarkable neglect of relationship factors in politics and in non-profit marketing (Henneberg and O'Shaughnessy, 2009; Hermantoet al., 2014). As a result, due to this gap in literature, the relationship factors require more investigation and focus, especially in the field of political marketing (Henneberg et al., 2009; Mahmud and Gray, 2011). Therefore, this study aims to examine elector’s affective commitment as antecedents of elector’s loyalty. However, due to previous argument, the present study proposes the following:

**H3:** There is a significant relationship between Elector’s affective commitment and elector’s loyalty to party brand.

Complementing the above, due to the inconsistent findings in the previous studies between brand loyalty and their antecedents, it appears the need for a mechanism to contribute in explain this relationship as Baron and kenny (1986) stated. Previous studies have examined the role of trust as mediator (Hermantoet al., 2014) satisfaction (Nam et al., 2011), image (Hermantoet al., 2014; Cheng and Rashid, 2013), perceived quality (Hameed, 2013) and perceived value (Saili et al., 2012) among others whereas the central mediation role of effective commitment in the loyalty model have been neglected, and it tested partially (Amani, 2015). Previous studies revealed a relationship commitment approach is a full mediator (Clugston, 2000; Maheshwari et al., 2014; Chang, 2013; Pi and Huang, 2011), partial mediator role in the development of loyalty (Gruen et al., 2000; Hasnizam et al., 2012), and it does not act as a
mediator (Zainoddin, 2009). Consequently, it can be concluded that the affecting factors of commitment may not be consistent. However, due to mixed results, the present study proposes the following:

**H4:** Elector’s affective commitment mediates the relationship between party brand image and elector’s loyalty to party brand.

### 2.4 Utilitarian reference group (tribe)

From another aspect of theoretical perspective, because of differences in the environments between countries as mentioned by Hofstede (2010), this highlights the need to focus on local cultural factors such as reference groups influence which strengthen or weaken the behaviors, attitudes and perceptions of electors (Al Shawi, 2002; Osuagwu, 2008; Winchester et al., 2014; Hasyimand Rachmat, 2013; Weir, 2013). In general, many social environment factors influence on personal behavior as stated by Shibutani (1955). According to Shibutani (1955), individuals follow the norms established by a reference group as guidelines for behaviors that are either expected or discouraged. Bearden and Etzel (1982) defined the reference groups as a group of people who influence an individual’s behavior in a significant way. Park and Lessig (1977) introduced three types of reference groups namely informational, utilitarian and value-expressive reference groups and the influence of these types have been identified in different settings (e.g., Park et al., 2015; Lin and Chen, 2009), with some timid attempts at political marketing (Hasyim and Rachmat, 2013). In brief, lack of researchers has examined the subtypes of utilitarian reference group as an individual’s go with others’ expectations to avoid punishment and seek to gain rewards (Park and Lessig 1977; Bearden and Etzel, 1982; Vinod and Sandeep, 2015). Among these types, the political marketing literature has examined the information sources of family, friends, and others that have the most influence on elector’s decisions.

Surprisingly, despite its importance in the relationship between elector and brand, the influence of “tribe” as the largest kind of social and political community (Godelier, 1977) in strength the relationship in this context has hardly been investigated. The tribe influence in Arab and local context is one area of future research should be to investigate (Al Shawi, 2002; Weir, 2013). Therefore, this study aims to investigate the role of social environment factors such as utilitarian reference group influence (tribe) in strengthen the relationship between elector’s attitudes and behaviors (Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013; Alkhawaldehet et al., 2015), in accordance with social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), whereas previous studies in role of reference groups revealed inconsistent findings (e.g. Lin and Chen, 2009; Vinod and Sandeep, 2015). Hence, the present study proposes the following:

**H5:** Utilitarian reference group (tribe) moderates the relationship between elector’s affective commitment and elector’s loyalty to party brand.

### 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Depending on previous theoretical linkages between constructs, the researcher designed a model, in order to interpret and understand the relationships between variables (see Fig. 1 below: Proposed model)
4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sampling procedure has used in this study (1) a multistage cluster sampling in the first step by dividing the Jordan into three regions (north, middle, and south). There are 15 constituencies recognized by (Jordan's Independent Election Commission, 2013). The northern region is divided into five constituencies, middle region to five, and southern region to five. Then on second stage due to time constraint, put numbers for the three regions for selecting one cluster from the northern region, one cluster from the middle region, and one cluster from the southern region randomly, and in second step (2) a mall intercept survey using systematic random sampling was employed. The samples used in the study are 87 electors who more than 18 years old in the three constituencies in three regions in Jordan that namely: Alzarqa in the middle, Almafraq in the northern, and Alaqaba in the southern regions, the number of final registered electors in the three constituencies that is (366,602) electors in 2013 ([J.I.E.C], 2013). This research has follow the approach that used by Mishra and Mishra, (2014) when examined Indian electors.

The questionnaire was a tool of research with 18 items, comprising 5 questions of party brand image (Netemeyer et al., 2004; Smith, 2001), 5 questions of elector’s affective commitment (Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010; Lai, 2014), 3 questions of utilitarian reference group (tribe) (Park and Lessig 1977), and 5 questions of elector’s loyalty to party brand (Zeithaml et al., 1996; Cater and Cater, 2010). Five-point Likert scale was utilized, ranging from "1" “strongly disagree” to "5" “strongly agree”, also, {back to back} translation had used according to Ozolins (2009) as well as a pre-test and pilot test.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Preliminary Data Analysis

The researcher carried out the descriptive analysis by using SPSS version 22 to describe the section of the socio-demographic characteristics and other relevant information (respondents’ profile). Table 1 below demonstrates the descriptive analysis for this section. The result among 87 respondents is in line with some of previous studies in voting behavior (Guzmán and Sierra, 2009; Gullupunar and Gulluoglu, 2013).

Also, preliminary tests were employed before implementing the final techniques of data analysis. The results ranged as follow: the mean (2.79-3.97); standard deviation (.697-1.360); skewness and kurtosis (-1 to 1); Levene's test for each of the four main research constructs (greater than the 0.05); eigenvalues greater than (1); common method variance from (0.52% - 40.4%); also, no value in correlation matrix 0.90 and above; VIF (1.021 to 1.557); tolerance (.642 to .980); and condition index (5.394 to 16.109). These results revealed that there are no problems with normality (Coakes and Steed, 2003; Kline, 1998); non-response bias (Pallant, 2010); multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2011; Hair et al., 2010); and single dominant factor (Podsakoff et al., 2012).

5.2 Testing the Measurement Model (Outer Model)

Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) has used to analysis the data. According to Hair et al. (2014) reliability and the validity are the two criteria which used for testing the measurement model (outer model). Hence, the researcher has applied confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) approach to assess construct validity (convergent and discriminate validity). To examine convergent validity Hair et al. (2014) suggested three tests for that; (A) Factor loading (Outer Loading) (should be .70 and a above), (B) Average variance extracted (AVE) (.50 and a above), (C) Composite reliability
(CR) as well as Cronbach’s Alpha to assess convergence validity (.70 and a above). To evaluate the discriminant validity; Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion employed, (the square root of the AVE for each construct) "this method states that the construct shares more variance with its indicators than with any other construct, to test this requirement, the AVE of each construct should be higher than the highest squared correlation with any other construct" (p.112). The results of convergent validity are shown in table 2, and the results of discriminate validity are shown in table 3.

From Table 2 and 3 it can be seen that all tests exceeded the criteria put by (Hair et al., 2014; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Therefore, in brief both of them (convergent and discriminate validity) were achieved.

5.3 Testing the Structural Model (Inner Model)

The next step after examined the measurement model' reliability and their validity is assess the structural model (Inner model). The results of analysis showed that coefficient of determination/ R Square ($R^2$) for EAC (0.347) and EL to PpB (0.568) this substantial according to Cohen (1988); also, cross-validated redundancy ($Q^2$) or predictive relevance of the model for EL to PpB (0.341> 0) and EAC (0.197> 0), according to Hair et al. (2014) "$Q^2$ value larger than zero for a particular endogenous construct indicates the path model’s predictive relevance for this particular construct"(p113-114). Table 4 and Table 5 show the bootstrapping and the path coefficient results of hypothesized relationships.

From Table 4 and Table 5, the results showed the hypotheses H1, H2, H3, and H5 are supported with statistically positive significant ($\beta = .24; p < .01$, $.58; p < .01$, $.57; p < .01$, and $.33; p < .01$, respectively), whereas no supported for H4 with ($\beta= -0.17; t= 1.14$). In sum, all the hypotheses (direct and indirect) were supported as well as the variance accounted for (VAF) (58% =\geq 20%) indicated partially mediating (Hair et al.,2013) and no moderating role presented.

6. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This research has examined the relationships between four constructs in the context of political brands (parties). The findings revealed that brand image has a positive direct relationship on brand loyalty, this finding is similar to earlier studies (e.g. Hermantoet al., 2014) as well as brand image has a positive direct relationship on affective commitment. The finding is supported by previous studies (e.g. Tsang et al., 2011) which found the same finding. In brief, to explain affective commitment, brand image seems to be a vital construct ($R^2= 0.347$). Also, affective commitment had a positive influence on loyalty. The result is supported by prior studies (Marshall, 2010; Strandberg et al., 2015) which found positive relationship between affective commitment and loyalty. As a result, affective commitment mediates the relationship between brand image and loyalty. This result supports the study of Amani(2015) which found affective commitment has a mediating effect between trust and loyalty. Ultimately, in term of moderating role of utilitarian reference group (tribe), there is no support between the relationship of affective commitment and loyalty. Despite this result go along with study of Lin and Chen (2009) in non-party brand, which found utilitarian reference group have no moderating effect between purchase intentions on repurchase decisions, it was a surprising result with the role of tribe in Arab context as source of information (Al Shawi, 2002; Weir, 2013). The most possible reasons may be influence of Arab spring in culture of society, where individuals under this case of such freedom started to shift from collectivism (Hofstedeet al., 2010) to individualism as well the role of social media in this shifting.
In sum, this study produced several theoretical contributions through expanding the concept of loyalty to political brand at the individual level of analysis; especially this subject is still under-research (Schofield and Reeves, 2015). Moreover, the study has expanded the knowledge base currently available in the political marketing field, through highlighting specifically few concepts, such as brand image, affective commitment and the influence of utilitarian reference group (tribe) as well linkages between them and with loyalty to fill these gaps. In addition, the central mediation role of effective commitment in the loyalty model has been neglected (Amani, 2015). The study helped to bridge this gap, as well as the central moderating role. In brief, the study has expanded social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), and reference group theory (Hyman, 1968) in the context of political brands (parties), especially in developing countries.

Furthermore, based on the practical perspective, it has been found that the gap between the parties and the public is widening. Therefore, this study is considered as a rare study about exploring the Jordanian electors. The findings highlighted the importance of the short term and long term relationship factors. Therefore, this empirical value can be exploited for planning the long-term relationship with electors as well as developing a marketing plan for the dissemination of partisan ideology by using competitive techniques. Briefly, the success of marketing campaigns and programs are key factors which determine the competition among political parties. It is hoped, through findings, to develop the political brands in the Arab region in general and Jordan in particular.

7. LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With interesting results on the relationships among constructs, it has several limitations, in term of sample size, cross-sectional and context. Ultimately, this study opened the door for scholars for future empirical studies by adding external factors that might include dimensions of brand equity, relationship marketing and other type of reference groups in developing and developed countries context.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Figures

Figure 1:
Proposed model

Appendix 2: Tables

Table 1: Profile of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and more</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and less.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s and more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From the list, identify the political party which voted for him before?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian nationalist</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab nationalist</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamist</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leftist</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many times did you vote this political party?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two times</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party brand image</td>
<td>BI 1</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI 2</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI 3</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI 4</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI 5</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electors’ affective commitment</td>
<td>EAC 1</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC 2</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC 3</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC 4</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAC 5</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian reference group (tribe)</td>
<td>URG1</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URG 2</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URG3</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electors’ loyalty to party brand</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL 2</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL 3</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL 4</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL 5</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: AVE=variance accounted for, CR=Composite reliability*

### Table 3: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Pp] BI</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL to [Pp] B</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URG [T]</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Path coefficient of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Std. Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>[Pp] BI -&gt; EL to [Pp] B</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>S***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>[Pp] BI -&gt; EAC</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>S***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>EAC -&gt; EL to [Pp] B</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>S***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>EAC * URG [T] -&gt; EL to [Pp] B</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: t-values > 1.65* (p < 0.10); t-values > 2.58*** (p < 0.01)/R= Relationship, SE= Standard error, D=Decision, S=Supported, NS=Not supported.

Table 5: Path coefficient of Mediation Hypothesis based on formula of Kock (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H4</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path a</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path b</td>
<td>0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>0.3357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.0633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>5.302***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAF</td>
<td>((a \times b)/(a \times b) + c^* = 0.583) (Hair et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Partially mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: t-values > 2.58*** (p < 0.01)/[Pp] BI= Political party brand image, EAC= Elector’s affective commitment, EL to [Pp] B= Elector’s loyalty to political party brand.

About the Authors
Abdelbaset Alkhawaldeh is doing a PhD in Marketing at Universiti Utara Malaysia. During his academic career, he did an MBA from Al al-Bayt University, Jordan. His research interest includes Business and Marketing especially research on Branding. Corresponding author can be reached at kh.abdelbaset@mail.com.

Salniza Md. Salleh is a Associate Professor in Universiti Utara Malaysia. She graduated from Universiti Sains Malaysia with a Doctor of Business Administration (Management). Currently, she is the Deputy Dean of School of Business Management. Her research areas are in Branding Management, Marketing Communication, and Relationship Marketing.

Fairol bin Halim graduated from Universiti Utara Malaysia with a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Political Marketing. Currently, he is a Chief Executive Officer, Uniutama Education and Consultancy SdnBhd and senior lecturer at School of Business Management. His research areas are in Political Marketing, Marketing Communication, and Consumer Behaviour.