

September 2017

Branding in the Liberal Party of Canada from 2006 to 2015

Elisha M. Corbett

The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor

Dr. Adam Harmes

The University of Western Ontario

Joint Supervisor

Dr. Andrea Lawler

The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Political Science

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Arts

© Elisha M. Corbett 2017

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [Other Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Corbett, Elisha M., "Branding in the Liberal Party of Canada from 2006 to 2015" (2017). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 4846.

<http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4846>

Abstract

This paper uses content analysis to define and measure the Liberal Party of Canada's brand from 2006 to 2015. The main research questions that this paper addresses are: 1) What was the Liberal Party brand in each federal election from 2006 to 2015? 2) To what extent has the Liberal Party used branding techniques in each of the four elections between 2006 and 2015? This paper has three main hypotheses. This paper first hypothesizes that the Liberal Party brand changed in each federal election. Secondly, this paper hypothesizes the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time. Lastly, this paper hypothesizes that a positive linear relationship exists between branding and time. These questions and hypotheses form this paper's overall argument that the Liberal Party has used branding in federal elections since 2006 and that it is a central part of their communications strategy. This paper used an inductive approach to create a branding dictionary to define the Liberal Party brand in each election from 2006 to 2015. This paper then used a deductive approach to measure the Liberal Party's branding techniques over time using the branding dictionary. This paper makes an original contribution to the political branding literature because it is the first quantitative indicator of branding and the first study of the Liberal Party's brand over time.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Dr. Adam Harmes for letting a random incoming M.A. candidate into his office to talk about political communication. Your agreement to supervise me was the deciding factor in me coming to Western University. Thank you for believing in my project from our first meeting and making my academic ambitions a reality. I appreciate your patience throughout this entire process.

I would also like to thank Dr. Andrea Lawlor for agreeing to be my co-supervisor and for answering all of my trivial LEXICODER and STATA questions. I am thankful beyond words for your continued support in helping me create and execute my methodology. This thesis would not be possible without your methodological advice and guidance.

Mom and Bart, thank you for your financial and emotional support. This thesis would not be complete without you both. Thank you for reminding me that education is the best investment because it is an investment in myself.

Dad and Audrey, thank you for bringing me back down to earth and reminding me to live in the moment.

To my amazing partner, Emilio, thank you for your continued support throughout my academic career. Thank you for always reminding me of my potential. Most importantly, thank you for making me coffee in the morning and for letting me turn our kitchen table into my desk for the duration of this thesis.

Dr. David Armstrong, I sincerely appreciate your methodological advice for this thesis and throughout my time as an M.A student. Thank you for not only teaching me how to do statistics, but how to critically think about them.

Dr. Jonathan Rose, thank you for helping me pursue my passion in academia. I am so fortunate to have you as a mentor and as a friend.

Dr. Mark Daku, thank you helping me with all my LEXICODER issues. Your kindness towards me has been much appreciated.

Dr. Alex Marland, thank you for speaking with me early on in this process. Our conversation on how to quantitatively operationalize branding has contributed greatly to my thesis.

Dr. Kyle Hanniman, thank you for helping me this summer with STATA. I am excited and eager to work with you as a Ph.D. student.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgments	II
Introduction	1
Literature Review	4
Theoretical Framework	29
Methodology	40
Results	61
Limitations	100
Future Research	103
Conclusion	104

List of Tables

Table 1. Branding Dictionary	51
Table 2. Liberal Party of Canada Most Common Branding Words in Manifestos	75

List of Figures

Figure 1. Branding Words and Total Words in Manifestos	74
Figure 2. Co-Occurrences of Branding Words and Election Issues in Liberal Party Manifestos by Year	87
Figure 3. Branding Words to Total Words in Manifestos from 2008 to 2015	90
Figure 4. Branding Words to Total Words in Press Releases from 2006 to 2015	91
Figure 5. Branding Words in Election Periods versus Non-Election Periods	95
Figure 6. Branding Words in Liberal Party Manifestos Compared to Press Releases	96

Introduction

November 4th, 2015 was a monumental election in Canada. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau was elected after a nine-year conservative rule under Stephen Harper. The political salience of the Liberal Party victory cannot be understated. Trudeau managed to both successfully rebrand the Liberal Party, after the 2003 Sponsorship Scandal, and brand himself as the antithesis to Stephen Harper. The Liberal Party framed Stephen Harper as the "wind's bluster" and Justin Trudeau as the "warm rays" that would prove more effective at governing than Harper's strong wind (Liberal Party of Canada "The Sunny Way"). However, the rebrand of the Liberal Party of Canada and the branding of Justin Trudeau is more than just a "sunny ways" approach to governing: it highlights the growing use of branding in political communication in Canada.

There is a plethora of literature on political branding; however, most of the Canadian literature has only studied the brand content of the Conservative Party and Stephen Harper, with the exception of one study on the New Democratic Party and one study on the Liberal Party. For example, quantitative studies on branding in Canada have coded images of Stephen Harper released by the Conservative Party to determine what values are promoted in these images and how they contribute to his brand (Marland, 2014). Similarly, qualitative studies on branding in Canada have examined Conservative Party logo changes to explain how conservative values were branded over time. These studies include the merged logo when the Reform Party and the Progressive Conservative Party amalgamated (Flanagan, 2014). There are also qualitative studies that have been conducted with Conservative Party elites. These studies examined how the Conservative party was rebranded when Stephen Harper was elected in 2004 (Flanagan, 2014; Marland, 2016), the content of the Stephen Harper brand (Flanagan, 2014; Marland, 2016), and how branding is meticulously controlled by the Conservative Party (Flanagan, 2014; Marland,

2016). The majority of political branding literature suggests that the Conservative Party, and conservative parties in general, have put more emphasis on the use of branding techniques compared to progressive parties because they are closer to the market (this will be discussed at length in the theory section). The consensus within the branding literature in Canada is that the Conservative Party has been using branding techniques more formally than other political parties (Flanagan, 2014; Marland, 2016).

However, there is a gap between the political branding literature in general and the branding literature in Canada. The general literature on political branding suggests that market branding strategies and tactics have been adopted by all the major political parties in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Scholars in this field attribute the rising use of branding to both modernization and the shift in the corporate world from a product approach to a branding approach (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005; Klein, 2000). Thus, the Canadian political branding literature does not adequately address the rise of political branding in Canada because it primarily focuses on the Conservative Party. The focus on the Conservative Party in the political branding literature creates a gap in the literature because it has not studied the Liberal Party's brand. There is also a methodological gap in the political branding literature. The majority of branding studies are qualitative. The political branding literature would benefit from quantitative studies. Quantitative studies would complement the existing qualitative studies and would provide a way to measure branding techniques.

The limited amount of branding literature on the Liberal Party and the limited amount of quantitative studies raises two important questions that need to be studied in Canadian political communication: 1) What was the Liberal Party brand in each federal election from 2006 to

2015? 2) To what extent has the Liberal Party used branding techniques in each of the four elections between 2006 and 2015 (when branding has been most prevalent in Canada)? This paper has three main hypotheses based on these questions. The first is that the Liberal Party brand changed over time because there was a new leader in each election. The second is that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time. Lastly, this paper hypothesizes that a positive linear relationship exists between branding techniques and time. This paper expects that the Liberal Party's use of branding techniques significantly increased over each election. These questions and hypotheses help to inform this paper's overall argument that branding is the dominant communication strategy used by the Liberal Party and has been used as a formal strategy in each election since 2006. It is important to note that this paper does not argue that branding is a new phenomenon in Canadian politics, nor is the use of political branding new to the Liberal Party. This argument challenges the current literature that narrowly focuses on the Conservative Party's use of branding. It also challenges the institutionalist approach that argues conservative parties are more likely to use branding techniques than liberal parties.

The objectives of this paper are twofold. First, this paper attempts to determine the Liberal Party brand in each election from 2006 to 2015 to bridge the gap in the Canadian political communication literature which narrowly focuses on the Conservative Party. This paper also aims to operationalize branding in a way that it can be quantitatively measured to bridge the quantitative gap in the current branding literature. This paper will use content analysis to determine and measure the Liberal Party brand from 2006 to 2015.

This paper consists of eight chapters including literature review, theoretical framework, methodology, results, limitations, future research, and conclusion. The literature review chapter explains how commercial marketing influenced political branding, the rise of political branding

in the United States and Canada, political branding in Canada, and a review of content analysis in political communication. The theory chapter explains how positioning theory, commercial marketing theory, the institutionalist approach, and modernization theory inform the hypotheses of this paper. Next, the methodology chapter explains this paper's methodological choices and operationalization of branding. The results chapter presents this paper's findings and discusses their meaning. The limitations chapter discusses the methodological limitations in this paper. Finally, the future research and conclusion chapters focus on how the findings in this paper provide opportunities for new research and how why these findings are important to the political branding literature.

1. Literature Review

A review of the literature which has attempted to answer this paper's research questions is necessary. This paper will first review the literature on branding in the private sector to explain the shift from a sales approach to a marketing approach in branding. Next, this paper will review the literature on political branding more specifically through an in-depth discussion of the strategies and tactics employed by parties, how branding has increased over time and, traditionally, which parties are studied in the literature. This paper will then discuss the literature on branding in Canada. It will conclude with how the study of the Liberal Party brand and its changes over time is a necessary and original contribution to the political branding literature.

1.1 Commercial Branding

Branding is an essential strategic process in the private sector (Randall, 2000: 2). Branding incorporates marketing as a tactic into a company's overall strategy, but it cannot be summarized

as marketing alone (Randall, 2000: 2). A strategy is a specific plan and the enactment of that plan, whereas tactics are the tools that are used to enact strategies (Coombs and Holladay, 2010: 58). Tactics make a strategy reality (Coombs and Holladay, 2010: 58). Thus, a brand is different than a product (Randall, 2000: 4). A brand is a distinct entity that incorporates products but has an identity of its own (Cormack, 2012: 209; Randall, 2000:4). A brand is a combination of a product and values; it is what a company is known for (Randall, 2000:5). A brand always has values associated with it, and these particular values must be defined in consumer terms so that there is a continuous relationship between the brand and the consumer (Randall, 2000: 2).

There have been several important changes related to branding in the private sector. The most important change being the shift from selling a product to selling a brand (Coomber, 2002: 4). Globalization and the increased use of media has forced corporations to create a corporate brand and to use branding as their formal market strategy (Coomber, 2002; Hatch and Schultz, 2001). Specifically, globalization has opened up myriad new markets that have resulted in unpredictable consumer and market trends (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). New media also has the same effect on corporations as globalization. The influx of new media forms and the availability of media to consumers has created more consumer choice (Marland, 2016). Corporations have adapted to the influx of media by creating a brand that consumers can identify with. Branding allows a corporation to stay relevant with the influx of media and globalization because they can continuously expand to meet consumer needs.

Another factor in the market's shift from branding a product to corporate branding is the difficulties corporations face from mass production. The introduction of mass production allowed for new products to emerge in the market and old products to be made into new forms (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). In the early 1940s, the market became dominated by uniform mass

production of the same product (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). Corporations responded to the homogenization of products by creating a corporate brand to differentiate themselves amongst competitors (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). Corporations realized that in order to be competitive in the new branded market place, their brand would have to promote specific values and feelings that voters could identify with (Hatch and Schultz, 2001). Companies shifted from selling a product that promoted a certain lifestyle to the company itself becoming a lifestyle that had specific values and emotions attached to it (Coomber, 2002). Corporations still manufacture products, but consumers are now buying a brand.

An example of the shift from branding a product to corporate branding is the Tim Horton's coffee chain. When Tim Horton's opened in the in 1960s it sold coffee and donuts. Now, Tim Horton's sells a specific lifestyle for middle class Canadians. Tim Horton's brands itself to the Canadian middle class by aligning itself with Canadian history, culture, and identity (Cormack, 2012: 215). The "Every Cup Has a Story" campaign used mundane everyday Canadian life to promote the values of Canadians (Cormack, 2012: 219). Tim Horton's manufactures the same products as other coffee chains, but sells a completely different set of values. The branding transition in the corporate world has influenced many other fields. The next section of this paper will discuss how market branding has evolved to political branding.

1.2 Adaptation of Branding in Political Parties

The replacement of selling products with brands in the corporate world has manifested itself in political parties. Like corporations, political parties no longer sell policies, they sell an entire party brand (Marland, 2016). Before the branding shift in the corporate world, policies made by a party were formed in a bottom-up process (Marland, 2016). The majority of negotiations about a

policy were about the policy itself: its design, its desired outcome, and its effects on the electorate (Marland, 2016). How the policy would be advertised to the electorate and the target audience was the last part of the policy-making process (Marland, 2016). In contrast, the shift from policy-making to policy branding reversed the process in which policies are made. Political parties now make policies in a top down process. Policy negotiations first focus on what policies will be attractive to a party's target electorate, how the policy will be branded using language and images to that portion of the electorate, and how the policy fits with the overall party brand (Cushman et al., 2012: 78; Marland, 2016).

A brand in the political realm has become synonymous with party labels, leader personalities, and campaign issues (Marland, 2013). However, a political brand cannot be summed up as one or as multiple tangible factors (Marland, 2013). A political brand is an intangible complex set of values and emotions that are attached to tangible factors like party labels and campaign issues (Marland, 2013). The purpose of political branding is to build loyalty with voters (Marland, 2013). Political branding occurs in two ways: party brands and leader brands. Consequently, there is a difference between what a party and what a leader controls in terms of the party brand. It should be noted that party brands and leader brands are not mutually exclusive and often influence the other. A party brand consists of the party name, colour scheme, logo, and the history of the party and its leaders (Marland, 2013). The party controls the funding, the general direction of the overall brand, and the selection of candidates in the party (Marland, 2013). The centrist position of the Liberal Party creates an overarching party brand that leaders must adhere to. Although leaders do have the ability to change the party brand slightly (this will be discussed at length in the theory section), they have to stay within the confines of the overall party brand (Flannagan, 2014). The Liberal Party's position on the political spectrum defines

what issues the party positions itself on, which in turn creates their brand (this will also be discussed in the theory section) (Flannagan, 2014). Leaders do not control the existing position of the party. Parties are also in control of the funding they receive. The financial support a party is able to gain affects their ability to brand. The more money a party has, the better able they are to conduct market based research on who their target voting base is and create a specific brand for their core voters (Marland, 2016). Further, the party selects the candidates in each riding and the leader of the party. The choice of party leader and candidates in each riding is a central part of the overall party brand. The leader is the face of the brand for voters and the candidates must adhere to the brand for it to be successful (Marland, 2016).

In contrast, a leader brand consists of the public image of a politician as it is presented to voters (Marland, 2013). The leader controls their performance in the leaders' debates and the presentation of themselves to the media. Voters perceptions of leaders based on their portrayal in the media is crucial to the overall party brand (Marland, 2016). The party leader is the face and the main advocate of the brand. A political brand is unsuccessful when the leader of the party does not adhere and promote the brand. Leaders also have the ability to slightly change the overall party brand (as mentioned earlier). Leaders are able to move the party's position slightly on the political spectrum within the confines of the overarching party brand.

Branding is not a new phenomenon to political parties. However, since the early 2000s the degree to which political parties have used branding and the way that political parties brand is significantly different than how parties have traditionally used branding. Political parties to some extent have always used branding as a part of their campaigning process. Parties have always used language to invoke emotions, values, and feelings in voters (Cushman et al., 2012: 77; Brader, 2006). However, political branding used to be one aspect of a party and the

campaigning process, whereas branding has now become the central aspect of the party's political communication strategy and their main method of campaigning (Marland, 2016). The adaptation of market branding techniques in political parties and the centralization of the party brand have contributed to the formal use of branding that political parties currently use.

It should also be noted that there is some discrepancy in the political branding literature as to when political parties officially began using branding. Some scholars (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005) argue that political branding originated in the early 2000s, whereas some studies indicate that branding has been used since the 1980s (Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008). This discrepancy is a gap in the literature. More research needs to be conducted on branding in all political parties of a country to define more clearly when parties began to use branding and when branding became the formal and dominant communication strategy.

1.3 Elements of a Political Brand

The next section of this paper will discuss the elements that constitute a political brand. The biggest factor of a party's overall strategy during campaigns is its brand. Branding is an important aspect of political communication during campaigns because it makes complicated ideas and events simple (Cosgrove, 2012: 107). A political brand represents a summary of a party for the electorate (Cosgrove, 2012: 107). Like a corporation, a political brand is unique from its opponents: it is a heuristic that tells voters what values are associated with that party and how that party is different and better than other parties. A party brand is an exclusive experience because it forms a relationship with voters on a certain set of values by contrasting the brand with other values in society (Conley, 2012: 125). It is also a key tool in political communication to have a smooth transition of leaders in political parties (Cosgrove, 2012: 112).

A brand also has its own strategy which requires a unique narrative and message. Brand narratives in politics are unique stories that link the values of the voters to the promises of a particular party or candidate (Cosgrove, 2012:125). In the latter case, a narrative is a short four to seven paragraph statement that acts as a rationale for a particular candidacy which links the candidate's personal story to the concerns and hopes of the voters (Cushman et al., 2012: 77). A narrative must use aspirational and emotive language, meaning that voters must be able to see their values and concerns in the campaign (Cushman et al., 2012: 78). A successful narrative follows a pyramid style with aspirations at the top of the pyramid and issues and policies at the bottom of the pyramid (Cushman et al., 2012: 78). Following the aspirational element of a narrative is its social and emotional appeal (Cushman et al., 2012: 78). The social and emotional aspect of a narrative is how and if voters identify with the candidate socially or emotionally (Cushman et al., 2012: 79). Following the social and emotional aspect, a narrative contains an element of contrast (Cushman et al., 2012: 77). Political parties must use language to portray contrast in their narrative about the differences between their candidate and the other parties' candidates. The last element in a narrative is policy and issues (Cushman et al., 2012: 79). The lowest priority in a campaign narrative should explain where a candidate stands on main issues (Cushman et al., 2012: 79). Political parties use the emotive and aspirational language to frame their policies (Cushman et al., 2012: 79). Voters identify with a party's policies when a party uses emotive and aspirational language to frame their policies. A message is similar to a narrative in that it states why a voter should vote for a particular candidate and not their opponent and follows the same hierarchy as a narrative (Cushman et al., 2012 77; O'Connell, 2010: 1). However, unlike a narrative, a message is a succinct statement. A successful message is emotional, authentic, repeatable, and build narratives (Cushman et al., 2012: 77).

Values are also at the core of a political party's brand strategy because studies have shown that citizens make political decisions based on emotions and values, not on their self-interest (Lakoff, 2004: 42; Lakoff, 2008:19; Brader, 2006: 3; Brewer, 2002: 404). A party's narrative and message must contain a specific and consistent set of values. It is important to note that market research (on who the target voters are in the overall party strategy) informs the narrative, message, and values of the party brand (Cushman et al., 2012). A brand can be created to attract that portion of the electorate once market research has been conducted on who the target voters are for a given party, (Cushman et al., 2012: 77).

Successful branding also requires the use of framing and language as a way to convey values and emotions to the electorate about the brand. Frames are cognitive tools in the human brain that communicate, construct, interpret, and evaluate information (Hallahan, 1999: 179; Stanbury, 2011: 1; Crigler, 1996: 134; Lakoff, 2014). Framing either emphasizes or deemphasizes particular aspects of information based on what is included or excluded in the frame (Hallahan, 1999: 179). For a fact to be perceived as truth by the electorate, it must fit a specific frame (Lakoff, 2014: 17). How ideas are presented to people and how those ideas are interpreted affects individual choice greatly. (Iyengar, 1990: 55). For the brain to make sense of facts, it must fit what is already present in the synapses of the brain (Iyengar, 1990: 55). Frames use the process of neural binding by the brain bringing together two neural activations in different parts of the brain (Lakoff, 2008: 25). In other words, frames create an idea in the brain by invoking two completely different and separate ideas. In essence, framing in politics is about how an issue, organization, party, or person is presented by its opponents or advocates (Stanbury, 2011:2). Framing is a powerful tactic in branding strategy because it allows for political parties

to persuade the electorate of their position on social and economic issues. The next section of this paper will discuss the rise of political branding.

1.4 The Rise of Political Branding

Political branding originated in the United States in the 1990s and has become the dominant political communication strategy (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). It has been argued that the Republican Party was the first party to bring commercial marketing techniques to politics and to create a specific political brand (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). The Republican Party has long used previous election results and polls to determine its platforms and its candidates to target its winning coalition and win elections (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). The long-term use of these marketing techniques has translated into the Republicans creating a well-defined party brand that is now their formal political communication strategy (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005).

Since the early 2000s, every aspect of the Republican Party is part of its overall brand (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). The choice of leader, party slogan, policies, use of language, party images, and media are all carefully selected to convey the party brand to the electorate (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). The Republican Party uses language, images, and other mediums to promote values and ideas that are specifically designed to create a relationship between the electorate and the party. For example, fiscal conservatism and social traditions are a part of the Republican's brand. Therefore, Republicans use language to frame gay marriage and taxes in their policies (Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008). Republicans view taxes as a negative cost (Lakoff, 2004:236). The Republicans use metaphors such as "tax-relief" and "tax-break" to frame their view of taxes to the American public. (Lakoff, 2004:236). These frames

equate taxes to financial loss and are consistent with the Republican brand of economic conservatism. Likewise, the framing of gay marriage by Republicans is consistent with their brand of social tradition. (Lakoff, 2004:148). Recall that frames take two different concepts and use them together; this is precisely why the Bush Administration refrained from using the words "gay-marriage" because it invokes a frame that makes gay marriage socially acceptable (Lakoff, 2004:148).

However, branding in the United States has become increasingly sophisticated and is now being used by all major political parties as the formal political communication strategy. Branding is no longer just a strategy used during election periods but has become a permanent tenant of political parties. The 2008 Obama Campaign is arguably the most sophisticated and well-known political brand. Obama's brand was simple: "Yes We Can" (Conley, 2012: 128). His brand embodied hope and change, both of which were appealing to core Democratic voters because of the previous eight-year Republican controlled government (Conley, 2012: 128).

Obama's brand during the 2008 campaign also highlights the permanent campaign. The permanent campaign is a party or leader brand manifesting itself in the government after the election (Esselment, 2017). The main reason the Obama campaign became a permanent campaign was its innovative use of grassroots mobilization (Coburg, 2011: 203). The extensive use of social media allowed the Obama campaign team to reach voters to turn online activism into on the ground activity (Coburg, 2011: 200). Obama's campaign message of hope and change used social media to create a virtual community where potential voters could discuss the campaign and meet up for fundraising events (Coburg, 2011: 200). The election campaign turned into a permanent campaign through volunteers becoming public servants, from campaign promises to pushing legislation, and a campaign blog to a weekly presidential address (Coburn

2011: 200). Relationship-Building has become a key part of branding through grassroots mobilization. Political parties use social media and other forms of media to maintain an ongoing relationship with supporters. Grassroots mobilization maintains the brand and the permanent campaign. The permanent campaign demonstrates how branding is becoming a fundamental aspect of governing in the United States, not just campaigning.

The literature on political branding in the United States is extremely beneficial to understanding how branding originated in political parties, how political parties have adapted branding techniques from the private sector, and how branding has become increasingly sophisticated over time. However, there is a gap in the political branding literature: the political branding literature focuses primarily on qualitative discussions of branding in political parties (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). The qualitative research in the current literature is beneficial to understand what branding is. However quantitative studies on a specific party's brand content need to be conducted to complement the existing qualitative research. There needs to be a shift in the literature from studying branding qualitatively to more quantitative studies to determine empirically how political parties and leaders differ in their brand contents. The literature on political branding in the United States has not compared different parties. Comparative studies need to be done to understand how the Liberal Party of Canada uses branding and how branding has changed in each federal election since 2006. Furthermore, the majority of the literature on branding is focused on conservative parties and does not compare the use of branding in conservative parties to liberal parties. The primary focus on conservative parties is a gap in the literature because, without comparing conservative brands to other party brands, the successful use of branding in conservative parties cannot be conclusive because parties create their brands based on their position in relation to other parties: this creates a research opportunity to study

how liberal parties brand themselves. The sophistication of Obama's 2008 campaign also raises important questions about how liberal parties brand and if there is a discrepancy or bias in the current literature towards conservative parties.

1.5 Political Branding in Canada

The majority of the literature on Canadian political branding focuses on the Conservative Party of Canada and Stephen Harper from 2003 to 2015 (Flanagan and Marland, 2013; Flanagan 2014; Marland 2012; Marland 2014; Marland 2016). The consensus among political scientists in this field is that the Conservative Party, and specifically Stephen Harper, have had a successful brand and have used sophisticated branding techniques (Flanagan and Marland, 2013; Flanagan 2014; Marland 2012; Marland 2014; Marland 2016). The next section of this paper will discuss the studies that have been done on the Conservative Party and Stephen Harper that attribute success to their brands.

The Conservative Party's use of triage (how a party targets the electorate) is one of the reasons their brand has been successful. The 2011 federal election results in Canada are surprising: Stephen Harper won a minority government, yet there was a huge economic deficit and myriad ideological differences between the Conservative Party and Canadians (Taras and Waddell, 2012: 72). Stephen Harper's ability to win the 2011 election is because of the Conservative Party's triage strategy. During the leader's tours, both Stephen Harper and Michael Ignatieff visited roughly the same amount of cities. However, the ridings they visited were different. Michael Ignatieff visited ridings where the Liberal Party had won in 2008, whereas Stephen Harper visited ridings that Conservative strategists knew they could win (Taras and Waddell, 2012: 78). The difference is that the Liberal Party campaigned in safe ridings where

their core supporters were, but the Conservative Party campaigned in battleground ridings where they could brand themselves to voters who could vote either Liberal or Conservative (Marland 2014).

Another reason that the Conservative brand was successful was its ability to integrate its brand into its imagery. A study done by Alex Marland in 2012 performed a content analysis of photos taken by Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Office and released on the Conservative Party website for 2010 (60). The study concluded that what was consistently presented in the Harper brand image was hockey, cats, and Tim Horton's coffee (Marland, 2012: 60). These images were carefully constructed to show hockey, cats, and Tim Horton's coffee because of the middle-class values they promote. As mentioned earlier, Tim Horton's coffee aligns itself with Canadian values, history, identity and culture (Cormack, 2012: 215). Therefore, the consistent use of Tim Horton's coffee in Stephen Harper's images promotes a brand that is aligned with Canadian values, history, identity and culture (Cormack, 2012: 215). Even more so, using Tim Horton's in Stephen Harper's image brand was also a way to target middle-class voters (which traditionally vote either liberal or conservative) because middle-class voters tend to drink coffee like Tim Horton's over more expensive brands (Cormack, 2012: 215). Likewise, the constant use of hockey and cats were used in the Stephen Harper brand imagery because of the research done in focus groups by Conservative strategists that suggest the public viewed Stephen Harper as too elitist (Marland, 2016). The Harper brand imagery promoted an image of Harper that was more like a middle-class person rather than a political figure to attract the median voter. However, a consistent image brand not only shows what is present in a leader's brand, but what is omitted (Marland, 2012: 60). For example, Stephen Harper's brand image did not show him at a gay

pride parade or addressing a labour union because these actions go against the conservative brand (Marland, 2012: 60).

The most commonly held belief in the Canadian branding literature is that the Conservative party has a successful brand because of its brand discipline (Marland, 2016). Brand discipline is all members of a party adhering the narrative and message of the brand (Marland, 2016). There are numerous reasons why the Conservative Party has meticulous brand discipline, the biggest factor being Stephen Harper's centralization of government (Marland, 2016). Stephen Harper had a tight control on all aspects of his brand (Marland, 2016). Interviews with Conservative Party elites show that all forms of communication coming from the Conservative Party had to be approved or go through the Prime Minister's Office: no Member of Parliament was free to comment on any issues about the party (Marland, 2016). Members of Parliament who did speak on issues freely and did not adhere to the brand were ostracized by the party (Marland, 2016). Stephen Harper's control of the Conservative Party was also evident prior him being elected Prime Minister in 2004. During the negotiations of the merging of the Progressive Conservative and Reform parties' logos, interviews with members of the Conservative Party articulated that Stephen Harper dominated the process and had the final say on all logo changes (Marland and Flanagan, 2013). Similarly, Stephen Harper used language to rebrand and control the party. Harper specifically removed the word "progressive" and changed the party name to The Conservative Party of Canada in 2004 (Marland and Flanagan, 2013). Similarly, when the Conservative Party was unpopular in 2006 and 2008, Stephen Harper insisted that the party was referred to as "The Harper Government" (Marland and Flanagan, 2013). The strict control that Stephen Harper had on the Conservative Party created a clear and consistent brand.

Although the Conservative Party tends to dominate the literature on branding in Canada, there has been one study on the branding and rebranding of the New Democratic Party of Canada (and one study of the Liberal Party brand which will be discussed later in this section). Wesley and Moyes identify an issue with branding in left parties: branding is a market oriented process whereby money is votes and consumers are voters (2014: 75). Treating voters like a consumer goes against the values of most left-wing parties (Wesley and Moyes, 2014: 75). However, due to the rising trend of branding in politics, the New Democratic Party has had to rebrand itself twice (Wesley and Moyes, 2014: 76). The rebranding of a party consists simplification of the party's platform, putting a fresh face on the party, and refining the most radical aspects of the party (Wesley and Moyes, 2014: 77). Through a quantitative study of coding the New Democratic Party's platforms, Wesley and Moyes determined that the New Democratic Party successfully rebranded itself away from the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation to a more inclusive party, and again in 2013 by removing the word socialism from their party platform (2014: 76-77). This study is an important contribution to the branding literature in Canada because it explains how parties on the left of the political spectrum brand differently than parties situated on the right. It is also an important contribution to the branding literature in Canada because of it a quantitative study of branding.

The existing literature on branding in Canada is important because it primarily explores how a particular political party in Canada has used branding. However, the main scholars of Canadian political branding have noted that the literature on branding in Canada is exceptionally narrow and that more research needs to be conducted on the role of branding in all Canadian political parties (Marland and Flanagan, 2014: 954). There is an enormous gap in the branding literature in Canada because it is mainly qualitative research that focuses predominantly on the

Conservative Party of Canada. Branding literature in Canada has attempted to answer in part how branding is used by political parties and how it changes across elections. However, the dominant focus on Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party is problematic in answering these questions. The literature that narrowly focuses on Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party only addresses Stephen Harper's brand content and, thus, cannot answer how branding has changed across different leaders. The literature in Canadian political branding is not complete without acknowledging how parties position themselves in relation to other political parties and leaders.

1.6 The Liberal Party of Canada

A review of the literature on the Liberal Party and its trajectory in Canadian politics is necessary to develop a study of its brand and how it may have changed over different elections. The Liberal Party of Canada is often referred to as Canada's "natural governing party" because it has tended to dominate Canadian politics, holding office for more than sixty-nine years (Carty, 2015). The Liberal Party is usually ideologically situated at the center of the political spectrum (Dyck, 2012). However, depending on electoral circumstances, the Liberal Party tends to move to the left of the spectrum on certain social issues, and to the right of the spectrum on certain economic issues (Dyck, 2015).

The political history of the Liberal Party has been met with many crises and challenges. However, it has been understood by many political scientists as the party in Canada that has the best ability to adapt to electoral change (Clarkson, 2005; Collenette, 2006: 242). One of the main reasons that the Liberal Party has been so successful is because of Canada's single member plurality electoral system (Clarkson, 2005: 270). Parties who win the plurality of votes in a

single-member plurality system form government. The single-member plurality system is advantageous to the Liberal Party because the Liberal Party has benefited the most from being given a plurality of votes in Canada (Clarkson, 2005: 270). Political branding thrives in first-past-the-post systems because parties can target the median voter successfully. It is argued that the Liberal Party would not be as successful if Canada had an electoral system that was based on the proportion of votes because it would be more difficult for them to create a brand that was attractive to all of the electorate (Clarkson, 2005: 271). Another reason that the Liberal Party has been able to adapt to electoral changes is its leaders (Clarkson, 2005: 272). Liberal leaders tend to govern from the centre which allows them to have a tightly controlled government (Clarkson, 2005: 272). Also, the proportional representation style of the Liberal Party's leadership selection has allowed the Liberal Party to have more candidates on the ballot, producing a wider selection of leaders to select from (Clarkson, 2005: 272).

However, the literature on the Liberal Party argues that the "death" of the Liberal Party occurred with Michael Ignatieff as the Liberal leader in 2008 (Newman, 2011: 240). Newman argues that Ignatieff's inability to respond to Conservative attack ads and his inability to connect with the values of patriotism held by Liberal Party's core voters were the reasons for his failure (Newman, 2011: 240). Given that brand success is often attributed to leaders, the recent success of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau creates an opportunity in the literature to explore how the Liberal Party regained its status as the natural governing party after its apparent "death".

The literature on the Liberal Party brand is minimal. The literature that does exist specifically on branding in the Liberal Party only focuses on Justin Trudeau's brand in relation to his father. The Justin Trudeau brand is deeply rooted in the name "Trudeau". Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Justin Trudeau's father, has a distinct brand associated with his Prime Ministry. Pierre

Trudeau's Prime Ministry was "Trudeaumania": Canada was infatuated with their Prime Minister (Marland, 2013). Pierre Trudeau was branded as a political celebrity (Marland, 2013). Liberal strategists surrounded Pierre Trudeau with female staffers to act as obsessed fans, contributing to his celebrity like appearance (Marland, 2013). Pierre Trudeau "was packaged as debonair anti-politician who drove sports cars and spent time with pretty women" (Marland, 2013: 7). Pierre Elliot Trudeau's brand includes his crude remarks to journalists and other Members of Parliament (Marland, 2013). However, the most important aspect of the Pierre Trudeau brand was French-English unity (Marland, 2013). National unity was the foundation of his election platforms and was continued into his policies, birthing official bilingualism and in his commitment to Quebec in the Meech Lake Accord (Marland, 2013).

Justin Trudeau's brand, in part, an extension of his father's brand. The name 'Trudeau' carries with it emotions and values that Canadians associated with his father. Both, live an open lifestyle to the public, have a similar casual sense of style, are attractive, and are exceptionally charismatic (Marland, 2013; Hamilton, 2011). Like his father, the core product of Justin Trudeau's brand is national unity (Marland, 2013). Visually, Justin Trudeau is often photographed near a Canadian flag or with minority groups in Canadian society (Marland, 2013). However, there are differences between the two leaders' brands. Justin Trudeau's brand has to be different than his father's brand because it needs to offer something unique to Canadians (Marland, 2013). The biggest difference between Justin Trudeau's brand and Pierre Elliot Trudeau's brand is the emphasis of "positive politics" in the Justin Trudeau brand (Marland, 2013). Unlike Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Justin Trudeau is branded as a "humble" celebrity who has a love and passion for Canada (Marland, 2013).

Although the existing literature on the Liberal Party is limited on their formal use of

branding, there is a plethora of literature on the Liberal Party's use of branding more informally in terms of how Canadians perceive the Liberal Party. Canadian's perceptions of the Liberal Party depend mainly on their geographic location in Canada (Blais et al., 2001; Blais, 2005). The social makeup in each geographic region of Canada is critical to voter's perceptions of the Liberal Party and their success (Blais et al., 2001; Blais, 2005). Liberal Party support is the strongest in Ontario and Atlantic Canada and is the weakest in Western Canada (Blais et al., 2001; Blais, 2005). Religion and ethnicity are a key part of the geographic Liberal divide (Blais et al., 2001; Blais, 2005). The propensity for Catholics to vote Liberal is thirty percent higher than it is to vote for other parties (Blais, 2005) However, in Western Canada, only twenty percent of Catholics are likely to vote for the Liberal Party (Blais, 2005). The difference between Liberal Catholic voters in Ontario and Atlantic Canada is exaggerated by the fact that Catholic voters only make up one-eighth of the population in the West, but they make up a large proportion of the population in Ontario and Atlantic Canada (Blais, 2005).

The biggest reason that Catholics systematically support the Liberal Party is that they have long-standing attachments to the Party (Blais, 2005; Stephenson, 2010). Thirty-seven percent of Catholics in Canada consider themselves Liberal, whereas only twenty-one percent of non-Catholics in Canada consider themselves Liberal (Blais, 2005). The literature provides many suggestions as to why Catholics have a tendency to vote Liberal. One of the most prominent theories as to why Catholics vote Liberal is that almost all Liberal leaders since 1965 have been Catholic (Blais, 2005). It is possible that Catholics consider themselves Liberal because the Liberal Party has been dominated by Catholic leaders (Blais, 2005). However, the religion of a leader in other parties does not seem to affect Catholic voter's perceptions of that party (Stephenson, 2010). For example, Catholics are still unlikely to support a leader in the

Conservative Party, even if that leader is Catholic (Blais, 2005; Stephenson, 2010). Catholic voters tend to vote Liberal, regardless of the religion of the leader.

Similarly, the propensity to vote Liberal is higher for Canadians that are of African, Asian, and Latino origin than it is for Canadians of European decent (Blais, 2005). The biggest factor for the strong ethnic-minority support of the Liberal Party is its long-standing history as Canada's governing party (Blais, 2005). The Liberal Party was in power for most of the influx of immigration in the 1960s and 1970s (Blais, 2005). Ethnic-minority support for the Liberal Party is likely due to their association of the Liberal Party as the governing party (Blais, 2005).

Although the literature on Canadian political behavior does not explicitly link Catholic and ethnic-minority support to the Liberal Party brand, the values that these voters identify with are by extension a part of the Liberal Party brand. The political behavior literature in Canada is beneficial to understand the perceptions that Canadians have about the Liberal Party. The literature suggests that the history of the Liberal Party and the leaders associated with the Party are more important to Liberal Party supporters than are Liberal Party policies. These findings are similar to the political branding literature which suggests that successful political brands elicit a mental response in voters, rather than inform voters of their substantive policies.

There is a significant gap in the literature on the Liberal Party of Canada. The ideology and the political history of the Liberal Party have been studied in depth by political scientists. However, there have been no studies that specifically focus on how the Liberal Party ideology contributes to its brand and visa verse. Likewise, the literature on the history of the Liberal Party has focused on its wins and losses but has done so without considering how branding may have played a role in both its failures and successes. One of the biggest reasons that scholars argue that the Liberal Party has remained Canada's "natural governing party" is because of the legacy

of its leaders (Clarkson, 2005). However, branding is largely omitted from the literature on the Liberal Party's successful leaders. The limited literature on the Justin Trudeau brand about his father is narrow in its applicability to Liberal Party branding. Justin Trudeau's brand cannot be extended to other Liberal leaders. Furthermore, the literature on Justin Trudeau's brand is mainly qualitative. The current branding literature on the Liberal Party cannot be easily measured or applied to other leaders because it is not quantitatively operationalized.

1.7 Content Analysis in Political Communication

This paper will review political communication studies that use content analysis methodology because content analysis is the methodology used in this paper. The lack of content analysis studies on branding represents a critical gap in the Canadian branding literature. Content analysis is frequently used research method in social science. It focuses on the frequency of specific words and concepts within a larger set of text. It most commonly uses the verbal elements of a given message (the actual ideas expressed in words) (Benoit, 2015: 270). Content analyses rarely focus on the literal description of the content being studied (Krippendorff, 1980: 404). Its primary role is to quantify the frequency of word usage (Benoit, 2015:270). The data set for content analysis are texts that can be a transcribed verbal discourse as well as written documents (Krippendorff, 1980: 404). The data produced from content analysis research have the capacity to have larger conclusions when studied about things like the media, source, and context (Krippendorff, 1980:404).

Content analysis is a useful research method for studying branding in Canadian political parties because it is an objective form of studying branded political texts (Krippendorff 1980, 404). Researchers studying political texts can be subjective when reading them because they may

be searching for their specific hypothesis within a given text (Krippendorff, 1980: 404). Researchers can be selective in what they conclude from their research using other research methods (Krippendorff, 1980: 404). Content analysis avoids researcher bias because units of analysis receive equal treatment (Krippendorff, 1980: 404). Inferences can be made after the data has been collected using content analysis, whereas other research methods can allow inferences to be carried out before data is collected.

There are currently no studies on political branding that use content analysis as a methodology. This paper will be an important contribution to the use of content analysis in political branding studies because it will be an objective measure of political branding in Canada. The next section of this paper will outline three different studies in the field of political communication that use content analysis as their methodology. Content analysis studies in political communication were chosen to examine because political branding is a form of political communication. It is important to review content analysis in political communication because content analysis is the methodology used in this paper. The first two content analysis studies that this paper will explore are based in the United States. There are differences between Canadian political communication and political communication in the United States; however, these studies are useful to understand how a content analysis would be conducted on Canadian political branding because political branding originated in the United States.

A study done by Patrick Stewart in 2015 used a content analysis to measure the speaking time given to candidates and the audience response they elicit in six of the 2012 Republican primary debates (361). Using a content analysis software called ANVIL (367), Stewart downloaded the debates and divided them into smaller sections to code. To perform his study, Stewart used ANVIL to perform a content analysis on the following variables: the total candidate

speaking time in seconds; the number of laughter events per candidate; the total number of laughter events; the number of applause events per candidate; the total number of applause events; and the percent each candidate spoke (369). He then compared these to the election results. His study concluded that candidates who had more pauses between speaking elicited more audience laughter and applause; this correlated with their winning elections (Stewart, 2015:375).

Another content analysis study by Claremont Graduate University in 2013 examined the rhetoric in the 2008 Presidential elections in the United States (Schroedel et al., 2015:112). The goal of the study was to look at the content of charismatic rhetoric and how it varied across candidates (Schroedel et al., 2015:120). The study collected samples from each of the candidate's speeches, debates, and interviews (Schroedel et al., 2015:102). The samples were then transcribed and put into a content analysis software program called DICTION 5.0 to examine the difference between charismatic and non-charismatic rhetoric (Schroedel et al., 2015:112). From the data set, the study looked at the mean amount of each candidate's use of inactive and active rhetoric through specific words searches in DICTION 5.0 (Schroedel et al., 2015:117). The study concluded that Obama used charismatic rhetoric more than McCain.

In Canada, Blake Andrew, Lori Young, and Stuart Soroka tested the use of sentiment bearing words in election news during the 2008 Canadian federal election using a content analysis methodology. The study used a content analysis software called LEXICODER. Every story, from the main news sections of each of the seven daily newspapers in Canada, was put into LEXICODER (Andrew et al., 2015:81). Additionally, their study used LEXICODER to determine the tone of each news' coverage. The data were entered into LEXICODER to

determine how many negative and positive sentiment bearing words were used for each party. From there, the study created a "net-tone" for each party (Andrew et al., 2015:81).

The use of content analysis in these studies provides an objective measurement of different mediums of political communication in the United States and Canada. The methodological choice of operationalizing political communication is a useful framework for how this paper will seek to operationalize indicators of political branding objectively.

1.8 Contribution to the Existing Literature

Thus far, this paper has reviewed the literature on the history and ideology of the Liberal Party of Canada and the Conservative Party of Canada, branding in the private sector, branding in political parties, and branding in Canada. Gaps and limitations have been recognized about the Liberal Party brand, and how it has changed over time in the discussion of the existing literature. These gaps and limitations in the literature allow for an original contribution to be made to political branding literature.

First, a contribution can be made to the literature of the Liberal Party of Canada. This paper has demonstrated that there is extensive literature on the ideology of the Liberal Party and its political successes and failures. However, the current literature on the Liberal Party omits branding from its analysis of its ideology and political trajectory; this creates a research opportunity to study how the extensive use of branding in political parties could impact the Liberal Party's ideology and visa versa. Likewise, this paper has confirmed that branding plays an important role in a party's electoral success. There is a gap in the current literature of the Liberal Party on how branding may have contributed to its electoral success or failure.

A contribution can also be made to the political branding literature. First, the majority of the current literature on branding tends to analyze brands through a public relations lens, rather than viewing branding as a distinct entity. Public relations and branding are both important in the study of political communication; however, they need to be studied individually. A political brand is the overall strategy of a party during election periods whereas public relations is a tactic that parties employ to fit their brand. The differences between a political strategy and a tactic in elections are important to the study of political communication because they serve different purposes. The questions raised in this paper would provide an opportunity to study branding without using public relations as a framework, providing more information about branding as a distinct entity to the existing literature. Moreover, the current literature on political branding tends to focus mainly on conservative parties only and does not compare the brand content of different parties. The omission of a comparison of conservative to liberal parties creates a research opportunity. Furthermore, the implication of Obama's brand as the Democratic Party brand contradicts the current political branding literature and raises important questions about whether or not branding literature has been biased towards conservative parties.

Most importantly, an original contribution can be made to the existing literature on branding specifically in Canada. The most noticeable gap that exists in the current literature on branding in Canada is the primary focus on the Conservative Party. More branding research needs to be conducted on the Liberal Party to have an accurate representation of the branding that exists in Canadian political parties. Moreover, the limited focus on Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party in the Canadian literature is internally inconsistent: without studying the brand of other parties, brand success cannot be attributed to one party if its position about other parties is not addressed. How the Liberal Party has used branding across elections and how the

brand content has changed in each election would be an original contribution on branding in Canada by providing answers to some of the issues that exist within the current literature.

Lastly, there is a gap in political branding literature regarding the dominant qualitative methods used by political scientists. The branding literature in Canada needs more quantitative research that can complement the current qualitative literature on branding. The majority of the literature on political branding is qualitative. This qualitative research provides a useful framework for understanding how branding became at the forefront of political communication strategies and how political parties use branding. However, more quantitative research needs to be conducted to empirically determine specific brand contents of different leaders and how political parties have used branding. The quantitative operationalization of branding in this paper will contribute to methodological gap in the current literature.

2. Theorizing the use and Content of Political Branding

This paper will use positioning theory and commercial market theory to answer its first question:

What was the Liberal Party brand in each federal election from 2006 to 2015? The institutionalist and modernization approaches will be used to answer the second question of this paper: **To what extent the Liberal Party used branding techniques in each of the four elections between 2006 and 2015 (when branding has been most prevalent in Canada)?**

2.1 Positioning Theory in Political Branding

This paper attempts to determine how the brand of the Liberal Party changed from 2006 to 2015. Positioning theory explains how political parties in Canada create their brand content. Overall,

political parties need to position themselves ideologically to establish a brand that voters can identify. The most common way that political parties position themselves is on the political spectrum (Flanagan, 2014: 46). The political spectrum is comprised of the left, centre-left, centre, centre-right and the right. The left on the political spectrum has the most progressive position on social and economic issues, whereas the right on the political spectrum has the most conservative position.

Parties create their brand content based on how they place themselves on the political spectrum. Political parties use positioning as a branding tactic because focusing on the electorate as a whole is not effective (Dufresne and Marland, 2012: 24; Marland 2016; Flanagan 2014). Positioning is how a policy, candidate, or party differentiates itself from another policy, candidate, or party as a better alternative (Cosgrove, 2012: 109; Tringali, 2009: 114). Political parties need to position their brand because it helps the electorate identify what their brand is and how it is different from another party's brand (Cosgrove, 2012: 107). Political parties need to adhere to the following hierarchy: values, benefits, and attributes to position themselves successfully (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). Parties need to position their values with the values of their target voters (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). An example of a value that parties could position themselves on could be security or equity. Likewise, parties need to position benefits for their target electorate (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). These advantages could be things like lower taxes or extended health care. Lastly, parties need to position themselves on specific attributes that support benefits (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). For example, to support the benefit of lower taxes, political parties would create specific tax cuts (Cosgrove, 2012: 109). The positioning hierarchy allows voters to easily identify how a political party is different than their opponents and how that party will benefit them in a way that is superior to any other party (Cosgrove, 2012: 109).

However, there is often little ideological distinction between political parties when in office. Therefore, political parties will position themselves ideologically on the political spectrum during elections as a heuristic for voters (Flanagan, 2014: 46, 48). Parties use the political spectrum to position themselves because they want their brand to appeal to their base voters and to the median voter (Flanagan, 2014, 48). The median voter is one whose ideal point on the political spectrum is in the middle (Flanagan, 2014: 48). To gain support from the median voter, parties that form government need to create the perception of conflict in the voter's mind and occupy the position of the median voter along the spectrum on those issues (Flanagan, 2014: 67). Political parties who are in opposition need to create a new perception of conflict that dismisses the governing party's perception of conflict to position itself and gain support from the median voter (Flanagan, 2014: 67). In contrast, marginal parties that are either radically left or radically right that want to become dominant need to align themselves closer to the middle, while still positioning themselves as different from the parties that they most closely resemble to gain support from the median voter (Flanagan, 2014: 54).

Traditionally in Canada, the Conservative Party positions itself on the right, the Liberal Party positions itself in the centre, and the New Democratic Party positions itself on the left. Marginal parties tend to also position themselves from the to the far right or far left of the political spectrum. However, during campaigns, leaders can slightly move their position on the spectrum, depending on where other parties position themselves on particular social and economic issues (Cosgrove, 2012; Dufresne and Marland, 2012: 24; Marland 2016; Flanagan 2014; Tringali, 2009). Political parties need to position themselves differently from other parties for voters to be able to understand their party and how it contrasts to other parties (Cosgrove, 2012; Dufresne and Marland, 2012: 24; Marland 2016; Flanagan 2014; Tringali, 2009). For

example, if the Conservative Party positioned itself to the far right on the political spectrum on economic issues, then the Liberal Party would have room to position themselves to the centre right on the political spectrum. In contrast, if the Conservative Party positioned itself to the centre right on economic issues, the Liberal Party would have to position themselves to the left of centre on economic issues. There would not be enough room for both parties to position themselves to the centre right on economic issues while differentiating themselves to voters. The long-term party determines a range on the spectrum and the short-term candidate can move somewhat left or right within that overarching party range.

In essence, the party's traditional position on the political spectrum is source of their brand. The party leader influences the overall party brand based how they position themselves in relation to other parties as well as their own policy preferences. A leader has the ability to move slightly right or slightly left on the political spectrum, while still maintaining the overarching party brand (Cosgrove, 2012; Dufresne and Marland, 2012: 24; Marland 2016; Flanagan 2014; Tringali, 2009). For example, the Liberal Party brand as a whole must retain their centralist position to appeal to their core voting base; however, each Liberal leader tailors the Liberal Party brand so the brand can resonate specifically to what Liberal voters want in each election. This paper will use the theory of positioning to determine how different Liberal leaders have positioned themselves on the political spectrum during elections and how this influences their brand.

2.2 Brand Content in the Commercial Market Literature

Market segmentation theory is useful to explain how parties decide what portion of the electorate they will target, once they have positioned themselves. As mentioned in the literature review,

corporations no longer sell a product, but instead, they sell a set of values and a lifestyle (Randall, 2000: 5). Corporations must decide what portion of the population to target based on values and lifestyle that fit with the company and product. Thus, corporations use market segmentation to determine what type of values and lifestyles they will be the most successful at selling (Moschis et al., 1997).

Market segmentation begins with the subdivision of the entire population into smaller groups of the population who are similar to one another but significantly different from other segmented groups of the population (Moschis et al., 1997). Corporations can segment the market based on the geography or demographics of the population (Moschis et al., 1997). Once the market is segmented, corporations can then sell their values and lifestyle to the group or groups of the population that are most likely to identify with the corporation (Moschis et al., 1997). For example, Starbucks, which sells an extravagant lifestyle with upper-middle class values would target a different geographic and demographic part of the population than Tim Hortons, which sells Canadian middle-class values (Cormack, 2012). Further, clothing stores Banana Republic, the Gap, and Old Navy are all owned by the same company, but they are segmented for different consumer demographics. Market segmentation theory is a successful strategy for corporations to employ because it creates defined segments of where they should and should not be selling their products (Moschis et al., 1997).

Triage in politics is akin to market segmentation. Like a medical triage of patients, political triage is a hierarchy of the electorate: it prioritizes voters from high to low for any given party (Flanagan, 2014). The goal of a triage in politics is to build a minimum winning coalition during elections (Flanagan, 2014: 71). Political parties want to win elections with the bare minimum amount of votes because the fewer voters they win with, the fewer electoral promises

they must fulfill (Flanagan, 2014: 71). Therefore, political parties must triage the electorate into three categories: safe ridings, hopeless ridings, and battleground ridings (Flanagan, 2014: 71). Safe ridings are ridings in which a party knows that they will win whereas hopeless ridings are ridings in which a party knows they will lose. In contrast, battleground ridings are ridings where they have an equal chance of winning as they do losing. The most common examples of battleground ridings/states would be the 905 suburbs around Toronto in Canada and Ohio in the United States. Battleground ridings/states are where the majority of elections are fought (Flanagan, 2014: 80). Parties must keep their core supporters in their safe ridings happy, so they will not deviate to another party, while simultaneously expanding their coalition by persuading target voters in battleground states (Flanagan, 2014: 80).

Political parties triage the electorate even further through demographic triage and geographic triage to determine who their target voters are in battleground ridings. For branding to be effective, a political party's target audience must be known so that they can focus their brand message specifically to their desired audience (Flanagan, 2014: 81). Geographic triage uses quantitative analysis of previous electoral results and assessments of a candidate's strength in a particular riding (Flanagan, 2014: 75). Demographic triage uses qualitative research through surveys and focus groups (Flanagan, 2014: 75). Parties triage geographically to determine where their battleground ridings are and then triage demographically to target voters that would likely vote for them (Flanagan, 2014: 83). Triage helps to create brand consistency because a party narrows their message to a specific audience. Triage is a useful tactic in branding because it allows a party to determine ridings and voters where their brand would resonate the most; it is an efficient way for parties to campaign in a branded world. Market segmentation and triage will

help to inform this paper's operationalization of brand consistency and how the Liberal Party positions itself on the political spectrum to triage its winning coalition.

2.3 Institutional Approach

The next section of this paper will use the institutionalist approach and modernization theory to analyze the use of branding techniques in the Liberal Party from 2006 to 2015. What can be termed the 'institutionalist approach' argues that political branding is related to a unique party structure, with conservative parties being more likely to use branding techniques (Lakoff 2004; Lakoff 2008; Conley, 2012; Marland, 2016). Specifically, this approach argues that the internal top-down party structure and the centralization of power in conservative parties allow for better brand discipline (Conley, 2012; Marland, 2016). Similarly, the institutionalist approach argues that the close ideological relationship, and interchange of personnel, shared between conservative parties and the business community, translates into conservative parties being more likely to use branding techniques (Wesley and Moyes, 2014). Scholars in this camp further argue that conservative parties, which have this type of unique internal party structure and ties with the market, are more likely to employ sophisticated branding techniques than are progressive parties (Lakoff 2004; Lakoff 2008; Conley, 2012; Marland, 2016). As a consequence, the institutionalist approach argues that conservative parties use branding techniques more than other parties.

Reflecting this view in the United States, the Republican Party uses sophisticated branding techniques because of their internal party structure (Conley, 2012: 126). The Republican Party has a top-down party structure that results in tight party control (Conley, 2012: 126). The tight party control has successfully allowed the Republican Party to create a unique brand that voters can identify with because all facets of the party convey the party brand

(Conley, 2012: 126). The successful Republican Party brand is based on a core set of values that appeal to their base voters (Conley, 2012: 126). The core values that the Republican brand consists of are so tightly controlled by the party's structure that it has transcended leaders (Conley, 2012: 126).

Many academics in Canada make a similar argument. Canadian scholars argue that the Conservative Party uses sophisticated branding techniques successfully because of centralization of power (Marland, 2016). Marland argues that the centralization of power in the Harper Government resulted in strong brand discipline because all images, press releases, and interviews had to be approved by the Prime Minister's Office (2016). The tightly controlled and consistent messages that the Harper Government released created a sophisticated brand because all members of the Conservative Party adhered to the party brand (Marland, 2016). Interviews with Conservative Party elites reveal that party members were ostracized by the party when they did not conform to the Conservative Party brand (Marland, 2016).

Furthermore, the institutionalist approach argues that conservative parties employ sophisticated branding techniques more than other parties because of the close ideological relationship that they have with the business community. Branding and political marketing inherently have a more economic view of politics (Wesley and Moyes, 2014). Political branding assumes that elections are markets, political parties are profit maximizers, and the electorate are consumers (Wesley and Moyes, 2014). Conservative parties use market branding techniques to create policies that target specific segments of the electorate because they view voters as consumers. Conservative policies are designed to meet the needs and wants of voters similar to how corporations design products to meet the needs and wants of consumers. As a consequence, the institutionalist approach argues that progressive parties are less likely to use sophisticated

branding techniques because of their ideological differences with the market (Wesley and Moyes, 2014). Progressive parties do not view voters as consumers and are therefore less likely to use sophisticated branding techniques when creating their policies (Wesley and Moyes, 2014). This paper challenges the institutionalist approach in its hypotheses and arguments. This paper's argument that the Liberal Party has used branding as a central part of its political communication strategy does not accept that political branding is unique to internal party structures found in conservative parties.

2.2 Modernization Approach

In contrast to the institutionalist approach, modernization theory argues that all the main parties in Western democratic countries use branding techniques (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005; Coomber, 2002; Klein, 2000). This theory holds that all political parties in Western democratic societies use branding. Modernization theory and political marketing theory are closely linked. Political marketing is the use of market-based techniques and concepts in politics (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Similar to how companies adjust their behaviour towards their customers, political institutions and actors adapt their behaviour towards citizens (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Political marketing theory holds that political agents and organizations have adopted sophisticated marketing techniques and concepts from the corporate world (such as product design and market research) (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Scholars of modernization theory argue that the modernization of technology and the shift in the corporate world from a product-oriented approach to a market-oriented approach has manifested itself in political parties and has contributed to the rise of political branding (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005; Coomber, 2002; Klein, 2000).

Modernization theory explains that political parties have evolved from a product orientation to a sales orientation to a market orientation including the adoption of political branding and other political communication techniques. The Lees-Marshment party model explains the modernization approach of branding as a shift from product orientation, to sales orientation, and finally to market oriented. A product oriented party sells itself as a product and is unwilling to change to adapt itself to the electorate (Omrod, 2011). This type of party does not change its platform or its values, even if it means losing electoral support because it assumes that voters will realize the worth of the party (Omrod, 2011; Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). A sales oriented party is similar to a product oriented party in that it does change its behaviour; however, it attempts to change the behaviour of the electorate to want what it offers (Omrod, 2011). A market oriented party is unlike both a product oriented party and a sales oriented party in that it purposely designs its platform and behaviour for the electorate (Omrod, 2011). A market oriented party is like a sophisticated corporation in that it does not attempt to change the electorate. Rather a market oriented party changes itself for the electorate (Omrod, 2011). A market oriented party works like a corporation in that it first researches to understand public concerns and priorities before designing its platform and values (Omrod, 2011; Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005).

The modernization approach argues that all parties in Western democratic countries have or will evolve from product oriented and adopted a market oriented approach (Omrod, 2011; Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Scholars in this camp believe that all political parties, not just conservative parties, have been influenced by market techniques and are employing them to target their winning coalitions (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Academics of the modernization approach argue that market oriented parties are more likely to be successful in

elections because they are catering themselves to the electorate (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2001; Omrod 2011). Market oriented parties use marketing techniques to create a succinct brand that targets their winning coalition. The modernization approach accounts for the use of political branding as a global trend towards market oriented parties, rather than internal party structures.

Furthermore, the modernization theory argues that the modernization of the media is the biggest factor contributing to political parties adopting branding and other political marketing techniques (Stromback, 2007; Schaffere, 2006; Scammell, 1998; Scheindlin, 2009). Social media and 24-hour news have made media readily accessible for citizens. Political parties have responded to the accessibility of the news by branding. Parties use branding to differentiate themselves for voters in the media, similar to how corporations adopted branding to distinguish themselves after mass factory production (Stromback, 2007). Political parties have also used branding to respond to media fragmentation (Stromback, 2007). The influx of media has created smaller and more media outlets that target smaller niche audiences. Branding has allowed political parties to target these media outlets by having a unique brand.

A few valid critiques of the Lees-Marshment party model should be noted. Some scholars argue that the Less-Marshment model is only applicable in single member plurality electoral systems where the winner of 50 percent or more of the votes forms government (Omrod, 2011). A market oriented party works well in a single member plurality system because it can effectively target the majority of the population to win the majority of votes (Omrod, 2011). In contrast, in a proportional representation system, where the amount of representation a party has in government is proportional to the number votes it receives, a market oriented party is less successful (Omrod, 2011). A market oriented party cannot target all portions of the electorate while maintaining a consistent brand. Since the objective for parties in proportional

representation is not to win the majority of votes, sales oriented parties and product oriented parties are more successful at creating a unique brand for voters (Omrod, 2011). However, for this paper, the Less-Marshment model is useful to assess if political parties use branding in Canada because Canada has a single member plurality system.

Similarly, some academics argue that the difference between sales oriented, product oriented, and market oriented parties are just a reflection of the institutionalist approach (Stromback,2007). These scholars argue that the differences between the three party orientations are a result of internal party structures. Parties that are market oriented are more likely to be conservative parties because of their party structure and close relationship to the market, whereas progressive parties are more likely to be product oriented parties. However, modernization theory responds to this critique by arguing that the difference between a sales oriented approach and a market oriented approach is an inevitable evolution that occurs in all party types because of the modernization of the media and the corporate world.

Despite its criticisms, this paper uses modernization theory to inform its main arguments and hypotheses. This paper argues that branding has been a central part of the Liberal Party's political communication strategy and has been used in their elections since 2006. This argument accepts modernization theory, which states that all political parties will use branding and applies it to Canada's political landscape.

3. Methodology

The methodological objectives of this paper are twofold. First, this paper attempts to identify the Liberal Party brand in each federal election since 2006. Secondly, this paper aims to measure the use of branding techniques over time in each election studied (2006, 2008, 2011, 2015).

Identifying the Liberal Party brand in each federal election from 2006 onwards will help bridge the gap in the Canadian political communication literature that primarily focuses on the Conservative Party. The next section of this paper will explain the methodological choices used to achieve these objectives.

This paper's methodology is modeled after the methodologies found in Lawlor (2015) and Albaugh et al. (2013). Lawlor's study proves an excellent model for this paper because she uses an inductive and deductive approach to measuring how the media frames immigration in Canada and Britain. Lawlor uses an inductive approach to extract the most common substantive words to determine the frames that the media uses (Lawlor, 2015: 339). She then uses a deductive approach to measure how frames have changed over time by searching for the frequency and use of the established frames. Additionally, this paper borrows the dictionary based approach found in the 2013 study by Albaugh et al. Albaugh et al. create dictionaries of policy agenda topics to perform a content analysis on the dictionaries in policy agendas in the United States, Britain, and Belgium.

I first took an inductive approach to determine the Liberal Party brand in each election from 2006 to 2015 by drawing out the most common branding words from the corpus of the Liberal Party manifestos. I then inductively determined the most common substantive words that related to branding in the Liberal Party manifestos. I then created a branding dictionary that consisted of the most common branding words in the Liberal Party manifestos and words that are described quantitatively as branding words in the political branding literature. A branding word is defined as a word that is used by a party to invoke emotions, values, and feelings in voters (Cushman et al., 2012). The full explanation of branding words and how I collected and defined branding words will be discussed later in this section. To further illustrate the Liberal Party brand

in each election, I created dictionaries based on election issues to analyze the co-occurrences between branding words and a subset of words relating to different election issues.

Secondly, I used a deductive approach to analyze the use of branding over time once branding language was established. Branding words and the election issues that were branded in the Liberal Party manifestos were deductively measured in Liberal Party press releases in each federal election since 2006. The operationalization of branding in this paper will attempt to bridge the quantitative gap in the current branding literature by creating reliable branding indicators that can be tailored for future studies on different parties. This list of branding words in this paper is the first attempt in the political branding literature to operationalize and measure branding based on words quantitatively.

3.1 Hypotheses

This paper has five main hypotheses that work together to argue that the Liberal Party of Canada has used branding in federal elections since 2006 and that branding is a central political communications strategy used by the Liberal Party. My first hypothesis (**H1**) is that the Liberal Party brand changed in each election. I expect that the most common branding words, some branding words, and how election issues were branded all changed. Positioning theory argues that parties create their brand based on their position on the political spectrum. It is expected that the Liberal Party will have a core set of values in their brand that will transcend leaders because the party traditionally positions itself on the centre of the political spectrum. However, in each election leaders position themselves differently on the political spectrum based on their policies and in relation to other party leaders. A Liberal Party leader will move slightly centre-right or slightly centre-left in each election on different issues. Further, a leader's brand is often different

from a party's brand. The political branding literature suggests that a leader's brand influences the party's brand. Therefore, I hypothesize that there is an overarching Liberal Party brand, but I expect that the brand changed regarding particular issues depending on the leader. I hypothesize that each Liberal leader from 2006 to 2015 would position themselves differently on the political spectrum and that they would each have a unique leader brand that is different than the party brand. The difference in leader brand would result in a change to the Liberal Party brand because the leader's brand influences the overall party brand (Marland, 2013).

Furthermore, I hypothesize (**H2**) that the Liberal Party brand would become more consistent over time. This paper operationalizes brand consistency as one succinct message used to brand by a political party. The political communication literature and commercial marketing theory inform this definition. The literature states that brand discipline and brand consistency is all members of a party, all party documents, and all images released by a party adhering to one particular message (Marland, 2016). This hypothesis is rooted in the political communication literature that suggests political parties develop from a product or sales-oriented approach to a market-oriented approach (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Market-oriented parties have a clear and succinct message and brand (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Similarly, commercial marketing theory argues that political parties segment the electorate to create one consistent message. I expect that the Liberal Party would have a more consistent brand in the later elections being studied in this paper (2011 and 2015) because branding has only emerged as the dominant political communication strategy in Canada since the early 2000s (Flanagan, 2014, Marland, 2016). I hypothesize that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time by having a smaller set of issues that are branded to create a narrower message, as they became more market-oriented and began to use more commercial market branding techniques.

I also hypothesize (**H3**) that the use of branding techniques by the Liberal Party increased from 2006 to 2015. This hypothesis accepts the argument in modernization theory that political parties that are market oriented use branding and that branding techniques are steadily growing in the 2000s. Therefore, I hypothesize that a positive linear relationship exists for the use of branding in the Liberal Party over time. It is expected that the later elections studied in this paper (2011 and 2015) will use more branding techniques than the earlier elections being studied (2006 and 2008).

Additionally, I hypothesize (**H4**) that the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in the month before a federal election and the month of an election (the campaign period), compared to the use of branding techniques in the rest of the months in an election year (the non-campaign period)¹. This hypothesis is rooted in the political branding literature. The political branding literature explains that political parties create a "permanent campaign" by using branding in non-election periods (Esselment, 2017). Permanent campaigns are a sophisticated branding technique that resulted from the influence of market branding in the political sphere. The purpose of the permanent campaign is to create brand consistency. However, the political branding literature strongly asserts that branding is still used more frequently in election periods than in non-election periods. Political parties need a sense of competition between themselves and other parties during elections (Flannagan, 2014). Political parties have a strong and unique brand to create competition and differentiate themselves from other parties. Branding is used in non-election periods for brand coherence rather for strong branding to win an election. Therefore, it is expected that branding techniques are used the entire year of an election.

¹ From now on, the month before a federal election and the month of an election are referred to as campaign periods, and the rest of the months in an election year are referred to as non-campaign periods.

However, I hypothesize that more branding techniques are used in the month before an election and the month of an election.

Lastly, I hypothesize (**H5**) that the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in their party manifestos than in their press releases from 2006 to 2015. Positioning theory informs this hypothesis. Similar to (**H4**), it is expected that more branding techniques are used in Liberal Party documents during election periods than documents in non-election periods. Both press releases and manifestos are used in election periods. However, party manifestos are the primary document that expresses the party's position on issues during elections. Positioning theory states that political parties create their brand based on their position on the political spectrum. It is expected that the Liberal Party would use more branding techniques in documents like manifestos that define their ideological position (and by extension their brand) than in documents like press releases that do not have to define their position or may only reflect their position.

3.2 Data Collection

The dataset for this study consists of press releases and party manifestos in each Canadian federal election since 2006 (2005, 2006, 2008, 2011, 2015)². Press releases from December 2005 were included in this paper because it was the month before the 2006 federal election. The press releases were collected using the Wayback Machine, an online archive of websites. The Wayback Machine uses random sampling to screenshots of websites. The screenshots of a website are then archived on the Wayback Machine. This paper used systematic random sampling to collect the press releases. Every fifth press release in each month was used to create

² From now on, all mentions of the 2006 election period include press releases from December 2005.

a sample of all the Liberal Party's press releases in 2006, 2008, 2011, and 2015. The party manifestos were collected using the website POLTEXT. POLTEXT is an online archive of Canadian political texts created by Laval University specifically for content analysis.

I used a program called LEXICODER to perform content analysis as the methodology of this paper to determine the brand content and the use of branding techniques in the Liberal Party from 2006 to 2015. LEXICODER is a multi-platform software for automated analysis of various texts. Content analysis focuses on the frequency of specific words and concepts within a larger set of text. The primary role of LEXICODER in this project is to quantify the frequency of word usage. Automated content analysis was chosen as the methodology of this paper instead of manual content analysis because it is more objective. Automated analysis works by a software program deductively collecting specific elements in a body of text. A researcher can then reach a general conclusion about the data produced from automated analysis. This type of analysis avoids bias and partisanship when collecting data because it helps to mitigate researcher bias.

A drawback of using an automated approach is that it is more reliable in larger bodies of text (Albaugh et al., 2013). This could be seen as problematic for this paper's content analysis on press releases because some of the press releases consisted of only fifteen words. However, the drawback of automated analysis does not apply to this paper because this paper is concerned with the general trends of branding in press releases in election periods compared to non-election periods. This paper is not concerned with the results of automated analysis in individual press releases. Analyzing general trends in a large sample consisting of smaller individual samples can be highly reliable, even if the coding of each item is noisy (Albaugh et al., 2013).

Another drawback of using automated content analysis is that it removes the context of the text being studied. Content analysis only looks at the frequency of words and not the context

they are used in. The lack of context in content analysis can make it difficult to draw larger observations about the data collected. To mitigate this problem, I provide a summary of the context of each election being studied in the next section. I will use the context of each election to make conclusions about the branding words that the Liberal Party uses.

3.3 Creating the Branding Dictionary

I inductively created a branding dictionary that consisted of branding words to define the Liberal Party brand and measure the use of branding techniques over time. I operationalized branding words as words that invoke feelings, values and emotions. This definition is rooted in the political branding literature which suggests successful brands use aspirational and emotional language to convey their message to voters (Cushman et al., 2012: 77) Branding words signify a mental response in a voter.

The process of creating the branding dictionary was two-fold. I first created the branding dictionary using branding words that are described in the literature. The majority of the words that I included in the branding dictionary were words from successful political campaigns and brands in the United States and in Canada. I included branding words from campaigns in the United States, although this study is based in Canada, because political branding originated in the United States. A lot of the words that I included in the branding dictionary were from Obama's 2008 campaign because it is arguably the most sophisticated liberal political brand (Conley, 2012). The Obama 2008 brand repeatedly used the word "hope" and the phrases "change we can believe in" and "yes we can" (Conley, 2012: 128). The words and phrases the Obama campaign used embodied hope and change, both of which were appealing language to the core Democratic voters because of the previous eight-year Republican controlled government (Conley, 2012:

128). Obama's choice of language to create his brand invoked emotions and feelings in Democrats. Words like "hope" and "change" (as well as many other words used in the Obama campaign) were included as a part of the branding dictionary. I also incorporated words that related to the words in the Obama campaign. For example, I included the word "future" because it is synonymous with "change". I used synonyms of all the words that I extracted from the political branding literature to create a more complete account of branding words in the branding dictionary.

Similarly, I incorporated branding words from other successful political campaigns in the United States. I specifically extracted branding words from Republican Party campaigns because the literature suggests that they have used branding more formally than the Democratic Party (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). Although the Republican Party positions itself differently than liberal parties, the branding language they use is applicable to liberal parties. Branding words are used by all parties. Branding language is not specific to one party or one issue. Political parties use similar branding language to brand their specific policies. Branding language is one of the fundamental components of the Republican Party brand that has allowed them to create a strong overarching Republican Party brand (Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008). I extracted words from the Republican Party's campaigns from 2000 onwards, when branding became their formal political communication strategy. I included phrases like "tax-relief" and "tax-break" which have been used among all leaders in Republican campaigns (Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008). I also included branding language found in specific Republican campaigns like the phrase "nation building" and the word "clear" from the Clear Skies Act in the Bush campaigns (Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008).

In Canada, the majority of the words I included in the branding dictionary were from the Conservative Party campaigns. I primarily included branding words from the Conservative Party in the branding dictionary because the majority of the literature focuses on the Conservative Party. I did include some words from the qualitative study on the New Democratic Party's brand by Wesley and Moyes (2014), and the qualitative study on the Trudeau brands by Alex Marland (2014). However, the majority of the branding language I included in the branding dictionary were extracted from the Conservative Party campaigns from 2006 to 2015. Words found in Conservative Party campaigns like "leadership", "strong", "Canada", "safe", and "reliable" were all included in the branding dictionary.

The second part of the dictionary creation consisted of extracting the most common branding words from the Liberal Party manifestos from 2006 to 2015. I coded the most common branding words in the manifestos using LEXICODER. The purpose of including the most common branding words from the Liberal Party manifestos in the branding dictionary was to tailor the branding dictionary specifically for the context of the Liberal Party. To code the manifestos in LEXICODER, I converted them to plain text documents. I then inputted the manifestos in each election into LEXICODER. The most common word command in LEXICODER was used to identify the most common words in each party manifesto. Pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and determiner words were removed from the party manifestos when analyzing the most common words. The word count command (with the above words removed) was recorded for each manifesto.

I extracted the five most common branding words in each Liberal Party manifesto to be included as a part of the branding dictionary. A word had to be mentioned over fifty times for it to be included in the five most common branding words to help mitigate researcher bias when I

was selecting which most common words to include in the branding dictionary. The numerical cutoff of the most common words ensured that I could not include a branding word like "growth" in the branding dictionary just because it occurred in the Liberal Party manifesto. The branding words had to be frequently used to be chosen as a most common branding word because I was only interested in the most common branding words, not all the branding words in the manifesto.

It should be noted that the top five most common words I used to create the branding dictionary were specifically branding words. I did not include words that were not branding words in this paper's analysis. For example, if the most common word in a manifesto was "table" it would not be considered a branding word and would therefore not be included in the branding dictionary. There are legitimate reasons why "table" may have been the most common word in a manifesto; the party manifesto may have included a lot of tables to illustrate their platform. However, "table" is not considered a branding word and would therefore be excluded from this paper's analysis.

The final branding dictionary consisted of the most common branding words found in the Liberal Party manifestos as well as established branding language in the literature. The dictionary count command in LEXICODER was then used to determine the number of branding words in each Liberal Party manifesto and press release. Table 1 contains the full list of words in the branding dictionary.

Table 1. Branding Dictionary

Branding Dictionary			
acceptance	fairer	opportunity	trusted
accepting	fairness	optimism	trusting
achieved	faith	optimistic	truth
achievement	families	passion	truthful
achievements	family	passionate	value
believe	family values	power	valued
believed	fight	powerful	values
belonging	fighting	proactive	vision
better	firm	proficiency	visions
bettering	firmness	proficient	
bright	flexible	promise	
canada	focus	promised	
canadian	focused	promises	
canadians	focusing	promising	
capable	freedom	prosper	
change	freedoms	prosperous	
changed	future	real	
changes	genuine	reality	
changing	genuineness	reliability	
commit	give	reliable	
commitment	grow	resolution	

competence	grows	resolutions	
competency	growth	resolve	
confidence	help	resolved	
confident	helped	respect	
conservative	helping	respectful	
consistency	honest	success	
consistent	honesty	successful	
credible	hope	support	
credibility	hoped	supported	
decisive	hopeful	supporting	
decisiveness	hopes	team	
depend	integrity	teams	
dependable	knowledgeable	teamwork	
dream	liberal	together	
dreams	logic	togetherness	
efficient	logical	tradition	
efficiently	loyalty	traditions	
fact	open	transparency	
facts	openness	transparent	
fair	opportunities	trust	

I operationalized branding (the dependent variable) as a set of branding words. Operationalizing branding this way has high concept validity. Concept validity occurs when the operationalization

of variables in a study fit the overall theoretical framework of the study (Gerring 2016, 195). Concept validity ensures that the operationalization of variables measure what they are intended to measure. The design of the branding dictionary was built to be a valid indicator of branding based on the political branding and communication literature. This paper inductively coded the most common branding words in Liberal Party manifestos to create the branding dictionary. The political branding literature states that repetition of specific words creates consistent messages that are associated with high levels of branding (Brader, 2006; Brewer, 2002; Conley, 2012; Cosgrove, 2012; Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008; New Organizing Institute; O'Connell, 2010). Branding can reliably measure the Liberal Party brand using the branding dictionary because it is in part created from the corpus of the Liberal Party manifesto. Furthermore, the branding dictionary only consists of branding words that are already qualitatively defined as branding words in the literature as invoking emotions, values, and feelings. The words that were used from the most common branding words and the other words in the branding dictionary were specifically selected because they match the literature's definition of branding words. Branding can be soundly quantitatively operationalized as a branding dictionary because its design reflects the political branding and communication literature.

There are multiple different ways that branding could be quantitatively measured. However, a set of branding words remains a good proxy for this paper. The primary purpose of this paper is to bridge the quantitative gap in the political branding literature. The operationalization of branding in this paper is a reliable quantitative indicator of branding because consistent messages and strong branding language are the main tenets of political branding (Brader, 2006; Brewer, 2002; Conley, 2012; Cosgrove, 2012; Lakoff, 2004; Lakoff, 2008; New Organizing Institute; O'Connell, 2010). Therefore, this paper's goal is not

compromised by operationalizing branding as a set of branding words. The operationalization of branding in this study can also be replicated in other political parties in Canada and other countries that use political branding. The branding dictionary in this paper can be tailored to the political landscape and context of a different party. The same methodology of inductively extracting branding words can be applied to other party manifestos.

Additionally, I used the key word in context command in LEXICODER to determine specifically how each of the most common branding words were used in each manifesto. The key word in context function outputs the phrases or sentences that include the key word. This command provided the context of branding words in Liberal Party manifestos. The context of how branding words were used helped to determine how the brand content changed over time and if branding became more consistent. I only used the most common branding words in manifestos as a sample of all the branding words. The use of all branding words would offer a complete understanding of the brand content of the Liberal Party. However, this process is meant to represent a broader technique that could be applied more widely for qualitative research on branding.

I also measured the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues to further illustrate the Liberal Party brand in each election and how the Liberal Party used branding language. The election issues I analyzed were: the economy; social issues; social services; multiculturalism; and security, international relations, and the government. I inductively chose these issues based on the issues mentioned in the Liberal Party press releases. The relationship between branding words and election issues is important to have a complete understanding of the Liberal Party brand. Positioning theory states that political parties create their brand based on their position on issues. To accurately describe the Liberal Party brand, the co-occurrences

between branding words and election issues is necessary. The hierarchical dictionary command in LEXICODER was used to determine the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues. Hierarchical dictionaries in LEXICODER are forms of hierarchical clusters or dendrograms. Dendrograms are tree-like structures with clusters of words and phrases forming the branches. Clusters are formed when words or phrases are mentioned in the same paragraph. For example, "jobs" and "the middle class" are branches that correspond to overarching tree "economy". The purpose of using hierarchical clusters is to further define the Liberal Party brand in each federal election studied.

The hierarchical branding dictionary in this paper consisted of branding words. The secondary dictionaries in this paper were election issue dictionaries. This paper used five election issue dictionaries. The election issue specific dictionaries were categorized by different election issues and words that relate to those issues. The election issue dictionaries were created using the dictionary count in LEXICODER. Each election issue dictionary consisted of words that relate to that particular issue. I defined these words based on the 2013 study by Albaugh et al. which used similar issue dictionaries; however, I modified some of the words and issues to fit Canada's political landscape. Researcher bias can exist in the creation of dictionaries, however, is unlikely to occur in this study because election issues are easily identifiable by a finite set of key words (Albaugh et al., 2013).

The hierarchical dictionary count command was then used to assess how branding words were used in election issues qualitatively. For example, the hierarchical dictionary count command would measure how many times "future" (a word in the branding dictionary) co-occurred with the word "tax" (a word in the economic dictionary). Below is a summary of the issue specific dictionaries this paper used. The list of words in the issue dictionaries and the

branding dictionary can be found in Appendices 1 to 5. The following is a summary of the issue dictionaries³:

1. *Economy*: Includes discussions about employment, jobs, and class divisions in society
2. *Multiculturalism*: Includes discussions about diversity, inclusion, visible minorities, and ethnicity
3. *Social Issues and Values*: Includes discussions about women's rights, Aboriginal and Indigenous Peoples, human rights, immigration, refugees, the environment, and values
4. *Social Services*: Includes discussions about health care, education, public pensions, public transit, and infrastructure
5. *Security, Government, and International Relations*: Includes discussions about national security, international security, federal government, domestic security, trade agreements, crime, and terrorism.

Party Manifestos (independent variable) were operationalized as the dataset to determine the brand content of the Liberal Party because they have high construct validity. Construct validity occurs when a research design remains true to the theoretical framework that it is based on (Gerring 2016, 125). It ensures that a study's methodology is composed of factors that are defined in study's theory. Positioning theory maintains that parties create their brand based on their traditional ideological position on issues and how leaders influence the party's position of issues. The operationalization of party manifestos to determine the Liberal Party brand has a high level of construct validity because party manifestos are the party's official position on issues during an election. It is expected that high levels of branding would exist in party manifestos.

³ Some words appear in multiple dictionaries. For example, "trade" appears in both the economy dictionary and the security and international relations dictionary.

It is important to note that operationalizing branding as a branding dictionary has some limitations. The inductive approach of creating the branding dictionary from the most common words is dependent on researcher intervention and is therefore exposed to human error and bias, and therefore can have multiple interpretations. Furthermore, quantitatively measuring political brands is difficult because they are intangible and psychological. A large part of a political brand is the response it elicits from voters. The values and emotions invoked by political brands are difficult to analyze by words themselves.

These limitations could affect the second question of this paper because the brand that is established by the branding dictionary is what will be used to quantitatively measure branding techniques. Although there are limitations to operationalizing branding this way, it remains a good proxy for this study because it still measures the substantive aspects of the Liberal Party brand, regardless if the psychological aspects of the brand are not measured.

3.4 Measuring the use of Branding Techniques from 2006 to 2015

I used a deductive approach to measure the use of branding techniques in the Liberal Party from 2006 to 2015. The branding dictionary that I defined from the Liberal Party manifestos was applied to Liberal Party press releases. The dictionary count command in LEXICODER was used to determine the number of branding words in each Liberal Party press release. The proportion of branding words to total words was then used to establish how branding techniques changed over time. The hierarchical dictionary count command was also used to measure the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues in the press releases. This command was used to determine the substantive changes in the Liberal Party brand over time. It was also

used to establish if the Liberal Party used consistent branding between their manifestos and their press releases over time.

I chose press releases to measure the use of branding techniques over time by the Liberal Party from 2006 to 2015 because they have high concept validity. Press releases are the primary documents that a party presents to the media. It is expected that high levels of branding would exist in press releases because political parties must successfully convey their brand to the media so voters can receive it. Press releases were also chosen to measure the use of branding over time because they are released frequently and consistently by parties which should be generalizable. The expected high level of branding in press releases combined with its consistency establishes high concept validity because it is an effective medium to measure branding.

3.4 Data Analysis

To test **H1**, that the Liberal Party brand changed this paper descriptively analyzed the changes in the Liberal Party brand in each manifesto. The most common words in each manifesto were analyzed to interpret why words were used and why they may have changed over time. The key word in context results was used to illustrate how the Liberal Party used branding words and their context. The measures of co-occurrences between branding words and election issues was also analyzed descriptively to determine what issues were branded the most in each manifesto.

To test **H2**, that the Liberal Party's use of branding techniques increased from 2006 to 2015, I used a two-sample measure of proportions tests. A two-sample measure of proportions was used to determine the proportion of branding words to total words in the 2006 manifesto to each subsequent manifesto individually. The same method of two-sample measure of proportions for branding words to total words in manifestos was used in the Liberal Party press releases. The

measure of proportions tests was used to assess whether the proportion of the total amount of words in each press release and party manifesto was statistically different than the branding words in each document. The p-values from the measure of proportions tests were then used to determine if a positive linear relationship existed between branding techniques and time⁴.

This paper also used pairwise correlation tests between the 2006 press releases to each subsequent year individually. The measure of proportions tests was used to determine what co-occurrences between branding words and election issues were significant. These tests helped to quantitatively analyze the changes of the co-occurrences of branding words and election issues in the press releases. The p-values in the pairwise correlation tests were analyzed to determine the statistical significance between branding words and election issues. The results from the pairwise correlation test were also analyzed in comparison to the co-occurrences in the manifestos to determine how brand consistency in the Liberal Party changed over time.

A two-sample measure of proportions was also used to test **H3** that the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in election periods versus non-election periods. A two sample measure of proportions was used to determine if the proportion of the most common words used in non-election periods were statistically different than the most common words in the election periods. Additionally, a pairwise correlation test was used to determine if the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues in election periods were statistically different than the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues in non-election periods. The p-values of the measure of proportions tests and the pairwise correlation test were analyzed to determine if branding techniques were used statistically more in election periods compared to non-election periods.

⁴ All p-values in this paper that were less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

A two-sample measure of proportions test was also used to test **H4** that the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in their manifestos than in their press releases. A two-sample measure of proportions was used to determine if the proportion of branding words in all manifestos were statistically different than the proportion of branding words in all press releases. Possible confounding variables in this paper could be the motivations, abilities, and personal characteristics of the writers of the press releases and party manifestos in each election studied. These variables are unmeasurable, but could potentially impact the operationalization of branding. However, the effects of the confounding variables are expected to be marginal because branding is the central strategy used in political parties. It is expected that all members of the party would strictly adhere to the brand and would use branding techniques in documents that the party primarily uses for the media. If press release writers or party manifesto writer did not adhere to the Liberal Party brand in their writing, it is expected that the documents would be changed to reflect the brand by the Liberal Party.

3.5 Case Justification

I chose Canada as the case study for this paper for myriad reasons. The first is that this paper's study of the Liberal Party brand is an original contribution to the political communication literature in Canada. There are currently no quantitative studies on the Liberal Party brand and limited qualitative studies. By extension, there are no comparisons between brand contents of parties in Canada. The study of the Liberal Party brand can facilitate future comparative research in Canadian political communication. Additionally, Canada makes an excellent case study for political branding because it conforms to the Lilleker and Lees-Marshment (2006) model of countries in the literature that have adopted branding. This study would contribute to the Lilleker

and Lees-Marshment model by either confirming or denying its applicability to Canadian political parties.

I chose the period of 2006 to 2015 because of the limited availability of data. I only used the data that was available for the Liberal Party that could produce a large enough systematic random sample. Liberal Party press releases on the Wayback Machine were scarce and inconsistent before 2006. Therefore, the press releases from 2006 onwards were used to determine branding techniques in the Liberal Party. As a result, party manifestos from 2006 onwards were used in this study for consistency.

It is important to note that images were also not used in this study because of limited data. Images are a fundamental part of a party's brand. However, the Liberal Party did not have online access to archived images released by the party, nor did they have access for the public to view previously published images. Only official images released by the Liberal Party would be a reliable indication of the use and change of branding of the party. Images used by the media can be taken at liberty, whereas official party images are specifically created to reflect the party brand. Therefore, images released by the media would not be a good indication of branding. If more resources were available, this paper would have conducted the study from the 2001 election onwards, when branding became the dominant political communication strategy in Canada (Marland, 2016). Similarly, images would have been included in this study if there were access to images released officially by the Liberal Party.

4. Results

The next section of this paper will present the results of this paper. First, a summary of the history, the Liberal Party leaders, central issues, and campaign strategies in each election is

necessary to provide contextual information about each election studied. This paper will then identify the Liberal Party brand in each election since 2006 and discuss its changes qualitatively and quantitatively. Next, this paper will present the results of the Liberal Party's use of branding techniques in federal elections from 2006 to 2015. Further, this paper will discuss the results of the use of branding techniques in election periods in comparison to non-election periods. Lastly, this paper will discuss the comparison of branding in the Liberal Party manifestos and press releases from 2006 to 2016.

4.1 Election Summaries

2006

The 2006 election marked the beginning of the Stephen Harper era. The Liberal Party lost its minority government and became the official opposition with 102 seats. The results of the 2006 cannot be understated. The Liberal Party lost the election to the newly formed Conservative Party after being in power consecutively since 1993. The main reason that the Conservative Party was able to change voting behaviour in the 2006 election was its use of market techniques to create a sophisticated brand (Pare and Berger, 2008). The Conservative Party spent all its energy and money into branding (Pare and Berger, 2008). Patrick Muttart, a private marketing strategist, was hired to establish the Conservative Party's voting base and create a brand that would appeal to them (Pare and Berger, 2008). Although the Liberal Party, and the media, criticised the ability for the Conservative Party to form government because of its newness, the Conservative Party used this to their advantage to create an entirely new and a strong brand (Pare and Berger, 2008).

In contrast, the Liberal Party had a weak brand and a leader that did not resonate with Canadians. The Liberal Party's brand and message compared to the Conservative Party's strong brand and succinct message were the biggest factors in the Liberal Party's demise. The Liberal Party's 2006 platform heavily relied on previous Liberal Party's successes. The platform consisted of five main sections: "Meeting Canada's Demographic Challenge"; "Succeeding in a New World of Giants"; "The New Liberal Plan for Growth and Prosperity"; "Building the Canada we Want"; and "Accountable and Efficient Government" (Clarkson, 2006). The 2006 platform followed Liberal tradition that positioned itself in the centre on issues to balance both the left and right of the political spectrum (Clarkson, 2006). However, the 2006 Liberal Party platform did not deliver any new messages or ideas to the Canadian public (Clarkson, 2006). There was little difference between the Liberal Party's 2004 platform and their 2006 platform. In contrast, Stephen Harper rebranded the Progressive Conservative Party to the Conservative Party and rejuvenated the party's overall brand with new logos and a new message (Clarkson, 2006). Stephen Harper offered the Canadian public a strong brand and a new message. The Canadian public was able to identify with Stephen Harper and the Conservative party because it had a strong message, unlike Paul Martin and the Liberal Party (Clarkson, 2006).

The Liberal Party's defeat was also a result of the Liberal Party leader, Paul Martin (Clarkson, 2006). Paul Martin was the "messenger without a message" (Clarkson, 2006). Paul Martin's performance in the leaders' debates and throughout his campaign was received poorly by Canadians because he appeared agitated and anxious, unlike Stephen Harper who was calm and efficiently delivered the Conservative Party's message (Clarkson, 2006). Martin stuttered on his delivery in the debates, and his temper often resulted in incoherent speech (Clarkson, 2006).

Paul Martin's inability to deliver a sound message in the leaders' debates and his campaign resulted in his failure to deliver a strong brand to Canadians (Clarkson, 2006).

In contrast, the Conservative Party focused their brand primarily on Stephen Harper (Pare and Berger, 2008). Not only was Stephen Harper rebranded as being more down to earth than in the previous election, but the Conservative Party specifically tailored aspects of his brand to appeal to Quebec (Pare and Berger, 2008). The Conservative Party had an opportunity to gain support from Quebec because the Liberal Party lost its traditional voting base in Quebec in 2004 (Clarkson, 2006; Pare and Berger, 2008). The Conservative Party focused their energy on improving Stephen Harper's French language skills and tailoring their policies to appeal to Quebec voters. Stephen Harper promised Quebec "open federalism" in which Quebec would have a larger global presence, have more autonomy, and the Conservative government would correct the fiscal imbalances between the provinces (Clarkson, 2006). This policy was welcomed by Quebecers, particularly in light of the Liberal Sponsorship Scandal (Pare and Berger, 2008). Stephen Harper's strong presence in Quebec, in comparison to the Liberal Party's weak brand and Ignatieff's poor performance, resulted in Quebec's support for the Conservative Party (Clarkson, 2006).

2008

The Liberal Party lost the 2008 election to the Conservative Party on October 14th, 2008. Up to this date, this was one of the Liberal Party's worst defeats in Canada's electoral history. The Liberal Party retained only twenty-six percent of the popular vote (Jeffrey, 2008). The Conservative Party formed a minority government, and the Liberal Party retained their opposition status with 103 seats and thirty-percent of the popular vote. Paul Martin's resignation

after the 2006 election gave the Liberal Party an opportunity to create a new strong brand and choose a leader that would deliver a strong message to Canadians in the 2008 election (Jeffrey, 2008). However, the Liberal Party failed to provide a leader, brand, or platform that resonated with Canadians.

The Liberal Party's 2008 campaign was both ineffective at resonating with Canadians and was bland in its message and delivery. Stéphane Dion was portrayed as down-to-earth family man (Jeffrey, 2008). The Liberal Party released images of Dion with his family engaging in sports and other outdoor activities (Jeffrey, 2008). The similar compassionate image of Stephen Harper that the Conservative Party portrayed was necessary because Canadians viewed him as too elitist (Jeffrey, 2008). However, Stéphane Dion was viewed by Canadians as the antithesis to Stephen Harper. Dion was framed by the Conservatives and the media as awkward and inexperienced (Jeffrey, 2008). The Liberal Party's portrayal of Dion as a family man added to the public's perception that he was inexperienced (Jeffrey, 2008). Unlike Stephen Harper, a more politically competent image of Stéphane Dion in a suit and in political spaces would have benefited the Party's brand.

The 2008 Liberal Party platform was radically different than its predecessors. *Richer, Fairer, Greener: An Action Plan for the 21st Century* focused entirely on the environment. Dion's Green Shift platform outlined economic and environmental issues as compatible, rather than disconnected (Jeffrey, 2008). The 2008 platform sought to reduce Canada's dependence on fossil fuels by using environmentally friendly technology, introducing a carbon tax, and providing tax breaks to ensure the shift to a greener economy that Canadians would not see as disadvantageous (Jeffrey, 2008). The initial launch of the platform was received favorably by the media because it provided a new message than the previous Liberal platforms (Jeffrey, 2008).

However, the Green Shift did not resonate with Canadians (Jeffrey, 2008). The detailed economic and environmental platform could not be summarized to voters during the campaign because it was too complex (Jeffrey, 2008). Furthermore, an intertwined economic and environmental policy was not the most important issue to Canadians in 2008 (Jeffrey, 2008). The economic crisis put jobs and pensions as paramount importance to the Canadian electorate, both of which the Green Shift did not prioritize (Jeffrey, 2008). A similar trend of defeat in 2006 occurred again in 2008: The Liberal Party leader and their platform did not resonate with Canadians. Although the 2008 Liberal Party brand was strong, its message was not useful.

The underlying reason that the Liberal Party was unable to provide a strong leader and a strong brand was because of the candidate selection process (Jeffrey, 2008). After Paul Martin's resignation, the Liberal Party faced multiple challenges deciding on their new leader (Jeffrey, 2008). There was a plethora of candidates, many of which were marginal candidates who wanted to improve their future opportunities to run for leadership or gain cabinet positions (Jeffrey, 2008). Michael Ignatieff and Bob Rae were seen as the star-candidates of the leadership race (Jeffrey, 2008). However, support for the two candidates was divided within the party (Jeffrey, 2008). The party was in turmoil because there was no clear consensus as to what candidate the party supported (Jeffrey, 2008). Further, the numerous candidates in the leadership race posed difficulty in having candidate debates (Jeffrey, 2008). Instead of having clear focused debates, the candidate debates were unorganized, bland, and were seemingly unrelated (Jeffrey, 2008). The incoherent candidate debates and lack of firm support for one candidate by the Liberal Party resulted in the Canadian public being disinterested in the future Liberal leader (Jeffrey, 2008). The lack of strong Liberal Party support for one candidate did not allow the Liberal Party to fully develop one specific candidate's brand, unlike the Conservative Party and Stephen Harper

(Jeffrey, 2008). The Canadian public was unsure about Stephane Dion, in the same way the Liberal Party was unsure about him (Jeffrey, 2008). Without strong support, and the clear brand for their future leader, the Liberal Party was left with a leader that did not resonate with Canadians (Jeffrey, 2008).

2011

The 2011 election began with Liberal leader Michael Ignatieff declaring a motion of no-confidence against the Harper Government on March 23rd, 2011. The no-confidence motion resulted in a federal election on May 2nd, 2011. In the early stages of the election, the Liberal Party was confident that if they did not win a majority government that they would win a minority government (Jeffrey, 2011). Liberal Party strategists believed that Michael Ignatieff and his message of defeating the Harper Government's abuse of power would resonate with Canadians (Jeffrey, 2011). The Liberal Party believed that they could create a credible campaign against Stephen Harper (Jeffrey, 2011). Initially, the Liberal Party had reason to believe that a minority government was possible (Jeffrey, 2011). In the early stages of the campaign, Ignatieff was seemingly performing well, and the Liberal Party platform had received positive reviews from the media (Jeffrey, 2011). However, public opinion polls did not reflect the Liberal Party's confidence in their campaign (Jeffrey, 2011). Midway through the election, all three dominant party's numbers had not significantly changed. It appeared that Ignatieff's no-confidence motion and the resulting election was meaningless as the Conservatives still had widespread support, the Liberal Party was second in the polls, and the New Democratic Party third (Jeffrey, 2011). The public polls were correct that the Conservative Party would win the 2011 election. However, the public polls did not predict the massive Liberal Party defeat. The 2011 election resulted in the

Liberal Party losing their opposition status and becoming the third party, the first time in electoral history (Jeffrey, 2011; Fournier et al., 2014).

The indecisiveness of Ignatieff and the party itself was the biggest reason for the Liberal Party defeat in 2011 (Jeffrey, 2011). Ignatieff, and as a result the Liberal Party, lacked conviction in his position on policies and was unable to communicate his position on policies (Jeffrey, 2011). Ignatieff's lack of confidence made the Liberal Party seem disorganized and without a firm plan of action in the House of Commons and the election campaign (Jeffrey, 2011). Ignatieff had a broadly defined vision of the Liberal Party and a Liberal Canada with no strong, unique brand (Jeffrey, 2011). His ambiguous vision and brand were mirrored in Ignatieff's lack of focus on Liberal Party values and excessive criticism of the Harper Government during the campaign (Jeffrey, 2011). Ignatieff's visionless brand and campaign could not resonate with the Canadian public (Jeffrey, 2011).

The Liberal Party manifesto echoed Ignatieff's ambiguity. The 2011 Liberal Party manifesto was positioned to the centre-left on most issues and retained traditional Liberal values (Jeffrey, 2011). The platform focused on demonstrating the difference between the Conservative approach to Canadian families and the Liberal approach to Canadian families with themes of equality and opportunity (Jeffrey, 2011). Initially, the 2011 manifesto was positively received by the Canadian media and was cited as being similar to the Red Book platform in 1993 (Jeffrey, 2011). However, the 2011 platform proved to be inadequate at reaching Canadians (Jeffrey, 2011). Unlike Chretien's Red Book, Ignatieff did not use the platform as an election prop, and he rarely referenced the platform in his campaign (Jeffrey, 2011). Ignatieff's inability to reference the 2011 platform may have contributed to the weak Liberal Party brand. One of the major factors of successful political branding is consistency (Marland, 2016). Had Ignatieff repeatedly

referenced the 2011 platform it may have been received more positively by Canadians, simply for the fact that it would have symbolized that he had a clear brand. Furthermore, in contrast to the 2008 platform which radically departed from Liberal traditions, the 2011 platform was too analogous with Liberal values (Jeffrey, 2011). There were no new or fresh ideas in the 2011 manifesto. The Liberal Party did not offer any policies that Canadians could identify with (Jeffrey, 2011). The lack of new policies in the 2011 platform in part resulted in no Liberal Party brand for Canadians to identify with.

The Conservative Party used Ignatieff's lack of conviction in his policies and platform in their attack ads (Jeffrey, 2011). The Conservative Party presented a series of advertisements called "just visiting" criticizing Ignatieff living outside of Canada for his adult life and not understanding the needs and wants of Canadians (Jeffrey, 2011). Instead of responding to the attack ads by explaining Ignatieff's return to the country, and thus his vision for a Liberal Canada, the Liberal Party failed to dismiss the ads with stating that his experience in other countries did not make him any less Canadian (Jeffrey, 2011). The Conservative attack ads amplified the image that Ignatieff was disconnected from Canadians and the Liberal Party response did not mitigate this effect (Jeffrey, 2011). The initial inability for Canadians to resonate with Ignatieff and the Liberal Party platform was amplified by the Conservative Party (Jeffrey, 2011). Michael Ignatieff's lack of conviction paired with the Conservative attack ads affected his ability to create a strong brand that Canadians could identify with (Jeffrey, 2011).

In addition to the Liberal Party unable to deliver a brand to Canadians, the NDP created a successful brand that attracted many Liberal Party supporters (Fournier et al. 2014). The NDP gained the most support in Quebec out of all the provinces, a traditionally Liberal province (Fournier et al. 2014). Changes in vote support from Liberal to NDP were the greatest in Quebec

(Fournier et al. 2014). Jack Layton and the NDP had a strong and clear brand that resonated with Quebec voters (Fournier et al. 2014). The first sign that Jack Layton resonated with Quebecers was after his television show appearance in April 2011 on “Tout le Monde en Parle” (Fournier et al. 2014). Quebecers had a higher propensity to vote for the NDP because of Jack Layton’s successful ability to connect with Quebec voters and present the NDP brand clearly (Fournier et al. 2014). NDP support in Quebec, and elsewhere, became more significant as the election unfolded (Fournier et al. 2014). Specifically, both the Bloc Quebecois and the Liberal Party were unable to deliver a message that resonated with Quebecers; thus Quebecers shifted their traditional support to the NDP. The strong performance of Jack Layton and the NDP in Quebec exacerbated the poor performance of Michael Ignatieff and the Liberal Party (Fournier et al. 2014). The “orange wave” in Quebec made it difficult for the Liberal Party to brand to their target voting base.

2015

The Canadian electorate desired change in 2015 (Dornan, 2015). Almost two-thirds of Canadians did not want the Harper Government in power (Dornan, 2015). Conservative strategies believed that Stephen Harper’s unpopularity would actually aid them in the election (Dornan, 2015). Thus, the Harper Government framed the election as an election about choices (Dornan, 2015). The Harper Government framed both the NDP and the Liberal Party as inept to form government (Dornan, 2015). If the 2015 election was about choices, the Harper Government ensured that the alternative choices to their party were seen as inadequate (Dornan, 2015).

However, 2015 marked the resurgence of the Liberal Party of Canada after losing three consecutive elections. The Liberal Party's road to success was challenging and unexpected. The

Liberal Party was projected as first in the polls for the majority of 2014 and early 2015. Despite this, in August 2015, two months before the election, the Liberal Party became third-place in the polls (Jeffrey, 2015). Liberal Party support was significantly and steadily declining since the spring of 2015. The 2015 election was a contest between the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party, with sixty-five percent of Canadians determined to replace the Conservative government (Jeffrey, 2015). For much of the election, it appeared that the New Democratic Party had won the contest (Jeffrey, 2015). However, by September 2015 the Liberal Party made a remarkable comeback, and by October 2015 they were firmly first place in the polls (Jeffrey, 2015). On October 19th, 2015 the Liberal Party formed a majority government, the Conservative Party became the official opposition, and the NDP retained its third-party status (Jeffrey, 2015).

The 2015 Liberal victory was an exceptional win in Canadian electoral history (Jeffrey, 2015). The previously mentioned 2011 election disaster left the Liberal Party with only nineteen-percent of the popular vote in Canada and resulted in them having third-party status for the first time (Jeffrey, 2015). Many academics believed that the 2011 election would be the “death” of the Liberal Party or the start of an NDP and Liberal Party merge (Jeffrey, 2015). 2011 left the Liberal Party with only thirty-four seats (Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party had lost its traditional voting base in Quebec, Atlantic Canada, and Ontario (Jeffrey, 2015). There was no strong support for the Liberal Party in any region (Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party’s declining support was worsened by their inability to respond to the Conservative Party’s fiscal plan in 2011 (Jeffrey, 2015). Canadians did not have confidence in the Liberal Party (Jeffrey, 2015). Further, the Liberal Party was close to bankruptcy (Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party suffered monetary losses from the numerous elections within a short time-period and the multiple leadership races (Jeffrey, 2015). The monetary issues the Liberal faced were exaggerated by the Conservative

Party's plan to reduce public subsidies for election campaigns (Jeffrey, 2015). It seemed unlikely that the Liberal Party would be able to run a credible campaign that would resonate with voters based on their monetary struggles and Canada's perceptions of the party (Jeffrey, 2015).


The context of the 2011 failures makes the 2015 Liberal campaign and victory remarkable (Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party victory was a result of their exceptional election campaign and their ability to completely rebuild and modernize the party brand (Jeffrey, 2015). Justin Trudeau's likeability and popularity amongst Canadians was a huge part of the effort to rebrand the Liberal Party brand (Jeffrey, 2015). Previous Liberal Party leaders did not resonate with the Canadian public in the same way Justin Trudeau did (Jeffrey, 2015). The name "Trudeau" itself has values and emotions that Canadians resonate with (Marland, 2014). "Trudeau" reminds Canadians of the Charter era and the long reign of the Liberal Party. Choosing Justin Trudeau as the leader in 2015 created the clear and alternative choice to Stephen Harper (Jeffrey, 2015). Justin Trudeau symbolizes open government, transparency, multiculturalism, and most importantly Canadian values (Marland, 2014). The association that Canadians have with the name "Trudeau" was essential to creating the 2015 Liberal Party brand. Likewise, the reorganization of the The Liberal Party's election strategy assisted in their win. The Liberal Party began using sophisticated branding, fundraising, and outreach tactics similar to the Conservative Party. The Liberal Party used market research techniques to design a brand that appealed to the change that Canadians wanted (Jeffrey, 2015) The fresh face of the Liberal Party in conjunction with their efforts to modernize their campaign tactics resulted in a modern campaign strategy and brand that led them to victory (Jeffrey, 2015).

Another reason that the Liberal Party was able to create a brand that resonated with voters was its positioning. The Liberal Party did not stray too far from their centrist position (as

they did in 2008), but did position themselves slightly left to create a brand that offered the change Canadians wanted (Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party positioned itself to the centre left on the political spectrum on the majority of issues discussed in their manifesto. Economic incentives for the middle-class, higher taxes on the wealthiest Canadians, and strong Canadian values were the foundation of the 2015 manifesto. The 2015 platform was unique to previous Liberal Party manifestos because it was specific to its position on issues yet it retained core Liberal Party values, unlike the ambiguity in the 2011 manifesto and complete departure from Liberal traditions in 2008. The biggest difference between the 2015 Liberal Party manifesto and previous Liberal Party manifestos is that there was no discussion of a budget and how the Liberal Party planned on executing their platform promises (Jeffrey, 2015). Regardless of their lack of budget, The Liberal Party's manifesto, leader, and brand resonated with many Canadians and ultimately led to their recovery and victory (Jeffrey, 2015).

4.2 Liberal Party Brand from 2006 to 2015

This paper first used an inductive approach to define the Liberal Party brand from the most common branding words in Liberal Party manifestos. The most common branding words in each manifesto were used in combination with a larger set of branding words to create the branding dictionary. The branding dictionary is how branding was operationalized in this paper and was used to define the Liberal Party brand. Figure 1 shows the number of branding words to total words in each Liberal Party manifesto.



This paper hypothesized that the Liberal Party brand would change in each election and that branding would become more consistent over time. The data for this hypothesis was descriptively analyzed to determine how the most common branding words changed in the Liberal Party manifestos using the key word in context function. The co-occurrences between the branding dictionary and election issues were also analyzed to determine the Liberal Party brand and how it changed over time. There were commonalities in the most common branding words used in each year, but the majority of words were different. Table 2 shows the most common branding words in each Liberal Party manifesto.

Table 2. Liberal Party of Canada Most Common Branding Words in Manifestos

Liberal Party of Canada Most Common Branding Words in Manifestos from 2006 to 2015			
2006	2008	2011	2015
Liberal (N=423)	Richer (N=622)	Family (N=1522)	Growth (N=808)
Canada (N=300)	Fairer (N=308)	Future (N=1181)	Help (N=119)
Success (N=218)	Canada (N=272)	Canada (N=736)	Canadian (N=116)
Building (N=115)	Liberal (N=168)	Liberal (N=416)	Families (N=108)
Strength (N=108)	Prosperous (N=111)	Better (N=54)	Fair (N=89)

Source: LEXICODER via The Liberal Party of Canada Manifestos 2006 to 2015

The word "Canadian" or "Canada" appears in all the Liberal Party manifestos most common branding words from 2006 to 2015. The word "Liberal" also appears in all of the most common branding words in manifestos except the 2015 manifesto. The repeated use of the words "Canadian" and "Canada" suggests that the Liberal Party is branding their traditional role as "Canada's natural governing-party" by invoking a sense that the party is inclusive to all Canadians. The words "Canadian" and "Canada" create a sense of inclusivity and togetherness. The word "Liberal" invokes a set of values that are associated with the Liberal Party and how the party positions itself on issues. It could be argued that the word "Liberal" was merely used to mention "the Liberal Party" and that the word "Canada" or "Canadian" was frequently used because the Liberal Party is in Canada. However, as will be discussed in more length in the next section, the words "Liberal" and "Canadian" were used to brand. The repetition of the words "Canadian" or "Canada" and "Liberal" support this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party

would have some similarities in the most common branding words in their manifestos creating an overarching party brand.

An interesting observation is that the word "Liberal" is missing from the most common branding words in 2015. The 2015 election was markedly different because of Justin Trudeau's strong leader brand (Jeffrey, 2015). Rebranding a party is most successful when the party has a new leader because it allows for that leader to create their candidate brand and change the party's position on election issues (Marland, 2013). "Liberal" could be missing from the Liberal Party's most common branding words in 2015 because the party focused the election on Justin's Trudeau's brand over the party's brand. The removal of the word "Liberal" in the Justin Trudeau brand is similar to how Stephen Harper removed the word "Progressive" from the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada when he became leader (Marland and Flanagan, 2013). Stephen Harper purposely removed the word "Progressive" as a part of his rebranding process (Marland and Flanagan, 2013). Further, when the Conservative Party of Canada was unpopular in 2006 and 2008, Harper rebranded the party again to the "Harper Government".

Although there were commonalities in the most common branding words, the majority of most common branding words in manifestos were different. The key word in context command in LEXICODER was used to determine the context of most common branding words in Liberal Party manifestos and if they changed over time. As mentioned in the methodology section, this paper is only using the most common branding words in the manifestos to illustrate the brand content of the Liberal Party. The use of all branding words would offer a complete understanding of the brand content of the Liberal Party. However, this process is meant to represent a broader technique that could be applied more widely for qualitative research on branding. The next

portion of this paper will analyze how the most common branding words were used in each manifesto to explain the brand content of the Liberal Party.

2006

The Liberal Party brand was inconsistent in 2006 because the most common branding words were used to brand many different issues. Recall that the most common words in the 2006 manifesto were: "Liberal", "Canada", "success", "building", and "strength". The key word in context command was performed in LEXICODER to determine how each of the most common words was used. "Liberal" was used most frequently in the context of "Liberal government". The word "Liberal" was also used often in the context of Liberal plans, strategies, and approaches regarding the economy and social services. The frequent mention of a "Liberal government" and "Liberal strategies" could have simply been used because it is the Liberal Party's manifesto. It could also be argued that the Conservative Party would also use the word "Conservative" and "government" together frequently and thus "Liberal government" should not be considered branding. However, the word "Liberal" does invoke a specific set of values and is thus a branding word. "Liberal" represents the party's position on the political spectrum. The Liberal Party's centrist position on the political spectrum signifies that the Liberal Party is positioned in the centre of the political spectrum to the left of the Conservative Party, and to the right of the New Democratic Party. The Liberal Party's centrist position acts as a heuristic for voters to understand the Liberal Party's position on issues and consequently how the Liberal Party does not position itself. Positioning theory upholds that political parties create their brand based on their position on the ideological spectrum. "Liberal" is a way for the Liberal Party to create an

overarching Liberal Party brand easily. Therefore, the repeated use of "Liberal government" invokes a consistent message about what a "Liberal government" is.

"Liberal government" and "Liberal" also appeared frequently with other branding words such as "vision" and "build". "Liberal government" appeared with the branding word "build" in sentences like: "a Liberal government will build on Canada's innovation performance"; "a Liberal government will build on our established foundation of support for commercial innovation"; "a Liberal government will build on its substantial set of existing financial and program commitments"; and "a Liberal government will build on the international reputation earned through Canada's prominent initiatives". These phrases suggest that the branding words "Liberal" and "build" were used primarily to brand the economy. Further, the word vision was used with "Liberal" in phrases such as: "The Liberal government's vision of the North is a place where self-reliant individuals live in healthy, vibrant communities" and "the Liberal government's vision for an accessible and inclusive Canada".

"Vision" and "build" are effective branding words. "Build" paired with "Canada" and "Liberal" to brand the economy creates a message of strengthening and improving Canada's economy through a Liberal plan. For something to be "built", like the economy, it has to be in a worse state than it would be if it were not "built". "Building" also creates a feeling of upward motion. For something to be "built" it has to progress from its original state. Building the economy invokes a sense of optimism in voters because it indicates that economy will be improved. Additionally, the word "vision" paired with "Canada" and "Liberal" to brand different election issues creates a message that the Liberal Party has a strategy to achieve their election goals. The word "vision" is akin to the word "idea". Using "vision" to brand election issues creates a feeling of security in voters because it indicates that the Liberal Party has a strong plan.

"Vision" also invokes a feeling of moving forward, like the word "build". For a party to have a "vision" means that they have an idea for the future. In this sense, "vision" also creates a feeling of optimism in voters. These findings suggest that the word "Liberal" paired with branding words like "vision" were used to brand many issues, not just one consistent issue. However, the context of the word "Liberal" and "Liberal government" with other branding words strongly implies that the word "Liberal" was intended to brand.

Furthermore, the words "Canada", "secure", and "success" were frequently paired together to brand the 2008 campaign message: "Securing Canada's Success". The words "securing" and "success" used almost exclusively in this context. "Secure" creates a sense of stability and confidence because it means protection from harm. "Success" invokes a feeling of prosperity, achievement, and advancement. For something to be successful, like Canada, it means that it will achieve its goals. Pairing the words "secure" and "success" with the word "Canada" invokes the idea that the Liberal Party's 2008 message means a stable and prosperous Canada. This message invokes a feeling of reassurance in voters because it provides a sense of certainty for Canada's immediate future as well as its advancement. However, the word "Canada" was branded in many different contexts. "Canada" was used in the context of promoting Canadian values abroad, the economy, and social services. Consequently, "securing" and "success" were used in a variety of contexts because they were frequently paired with "Canada". Although "securing" and "success" are effective branding words, they were not used consistently to brand one issue. The multitude of contexts that 2006 branding words were used in indicates that the Liberal Party brand was inconsistent in its messages and issues they branded.

2008

The 2008 most common branding words were markedly different than the most common branding words in 2006 and were used consistently to brand the Liberal Green Shift. The word "richer" in the 2008 manifesto was used almost exclusively in the context of "Richer, Fairer, Greener", the Liberal Party 2008 campaign message. Similarly, the word "fairer" was also used primarily in the context of the 2008 message. The words "richer" and "fairer" paired with the word "greener" indicates that the Liberal Party used the branding words "richer" and "fairer" to brand the Green Shift. The word "richer" invokes the feeling of prosperity in voters whereas "fairer" invokes a feeling of equality and impartiality. "Richer" and "fairer" paired with "greener" sends a message that the Green Shift will lead to a more prosperous and equal Canada.

The word "Canada" was also used in the context of the 2008 campaign message. "Richer", "fairer", and "greener" were frequently paired with the word "Canada". "Canada" was used the most in the context of the 2008 message "Richer, Fairer, and Greener Canada". Other mentions of the word "Canada" were used to brand the environment. The 2008 manifesto repeatedly used "Canada" in the context of a "Canada specific comprehensive footprint calculator". The branding words "richer", "fairer", and "Canada" all had the purpose of branding the environment, creating a very consistent and clear message of a "Richer, Fairer, Greener, Canada".

Additionally, the word "Liberal" was used in the context of "Liberal government", similar to the 2006 manifesto. However, the branding of the word "Liberal" and the phrase "Liberal government" were used more consistently than they were in 2006. The branding of "Liberal" in 2008 was primarily used in the context of the "the Liberal Green Shift". The 2008 manifesto also used the word "Liberal" in the context of a "strong Liberal environmental

strategy" and other environment policies. Like the other most common branding words, "Liberal" was used consistently to brand the 2008 Liberal Party message.

Furthermore, the word "prosperous" was also used to brand the Green Shift. "Prosperous" was frequently used in the context of "a more prosperous sustainable and fair Canada". Pairing the words "prosperous" and "sustainable" together indicates that the Liberal Party did not brand the economy and environment as mutually exclusive issues. The Liberal Party used the word "prosperous" to brand the Green Shift and their economic policies as being compatible.

The 2008 most common branding words were notably different than the most common words in 2006 and were used more consistently than the words in 2006. All of the most common branding words in 2008 were used in context with one another to brand the Green Shift. Further, other policies and issues were paired with environmental policies to brand the Green Shift. These findings indicate that the Liberal Party had a more consistent brand in 2008 than in 2006.

2011

The most common branding words in 2011 were different and were used less consistently than the most common branding words in 2008. Recall, that the most common branding words in 2011 were "family", "future", "Canada", "Liberal", and "better". The word "future" was primarily used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policies and to brand the Liberal Party's environmental policies. "Future" was used in the context of "emerging economies are shaping the future" and "smart investments are building a future" to brand the economy. Environmental issues were branded using the word "future" as "the future means investing in clean energy" and "the low carbon economy is the future". "Future" is a particularly useful branding word because it invokes the idea of moving forward. The Liberal Party creates a sense of inevitability by

branding the economy with the word "future". The word "future" also invokes a sense of security for voters because the "future" is imminent and expected. The upward motion of "future" also creates optimism in voters because growth and prosperity are usually associated with moving forward. "Better" was also used primarily in the context of environmental issues and the economy. Environmental issues were branded using the word "better" in the context of "to better manage the environmental footprint" and the economy was branded using the word "better" as "the [economy's] better choices and new directions". The word "better" is also an effective branding word because it signifies upward motion. To brand the economy and the environment as "better", it creates the idea in voter's minds that the economy and the environment will prosper under the Green Shift.

The words "future" and "better" were used to brand both the economy and environmental issues, similar to how the most common branding words in 2006 were used. However, "better" and "future" were not used in the same context. The economy and the environment were not branded as compatible entities the same way they were in 2006. The Liberal Party did use economic words like "investing" to brand the environment, but environmental words were not used to brand the economy. The Liberal Party branded the environment and the economy as separate entities, and thus as two different messages. These findings suggest that the Liberal Party brand was not as consistent in 2011 compared to 2008.

Interestingly, "families, finances and the future" was the most frequent use of the word "future" and the most common use of the word "family". The word "family" was used primarily to brand the economy. "Family" was used in the context of phrases like "helping families with the cost of college" and "the gap between [the richest families] and average families is getting wider". However, "future" was used in a variety of contexts to brand many issues. "Future" was

used in the context of phrases like "Canada's future: economic competitiveness, environmental responsibility, the fight against climate change, the cost of living for consumers at home, and our contribution on the international stage". "Future" was used to brand the economy, environmental issues, and Canada's international presence. "Future" was not exclusively branded about the economy in the same way "family" was. The frequent pairing of "future" and "family" with the word "finances" and other economic words indicates that the Liberal Party intended to brand the words "future" and "family" to primarily brand the economy. However, these findings suggest that the Liberal Party brand was less consistent than the 2011 brand. The many contexts of the word "future" and its frequent pairing with "family", which was primarily economically branded, creates multiple and inconsistent messages.

Similarly, the word "Canada" and the word "Liberal" were both used in myriad contexts. "Canada" was used in the context of Canada's international position in phrases like "Canada has fallen more ambitious competitors", "Canada has demonstrated longstanding leadership", and "Canada should once again matter". However, Canada was also used in the context of technological advances in phrases like "the digital Canada" and used in the context of domestic issues like "a bilingual, diverse and more equal Canada". "Canada" was not used as consistently as it was in 2008 because it was used to brand many different messages. Additionally, the word "Liberal" was used almost exclusively in the context of the phrase "the Liberal approach". However, "Liberal" was paired with many different Liberal policies and strategies. Like the use of the word "Canada", "Liberal" was not consistently branded because it was used to brand many different issues. The context of the most common branding words in 2011 indicate that the Liberal Party did not brand one consistent and clear message. The economy was the most branded issue, but it was not consistently branded.

2015

The 2015 Liberal Party brand used similar words to previous manifestos, like "Canadian" and "families", and "fair", however, the 2015 branding words were used in a different context than previous manifestos, and they were consistently used to brand their economic policies for the middle-class. Recall that the 2015 most common branding words were "growth", "help", "Canadian", "families", and "fair". The word "growth" was used to brand the economy in the context of "boost Canada's economic growth" and "combining fiscal prudence with investments to create economic growth will end the Harper legacy". It is noteworthy that "growth" was used the most frequently and usually in the context of "growing the middle-class" and "growth for the middle-class". Similarly, "family" was used in the context of the economy in the same way "growth" was. "Single parent families and low-income families", "middle-income families", and "real change for working modern Canadian families" are all synonymous with how "growth" was used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policies for the middle-class. The word "help" was also used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policies for the middle-class and was frequently paired with the word "families". "Help" was used in the context of "help that works for modern Canadian families" and "help for low and middle-class families".

"Canadian" was used in a similar way to "family", "help", and "growth" in that it was branded for the Liberal Party's economic policies to a specific demographic. "Canadian" was used in the context of "income splitting benefits only 15 percent Canadian households", "economic security for Canadian families", and "more opportunities for Canadian workers". Like the word "help" "Canadian" was used the most consistently in the context of "help that works for modern Canadian families". "Family" was exclusively branded as the Liberal Party's economic

policy for the middle-class. Therefore, the word "Canadian" paired with other most common branding words like "family" suggests that the Liberal Party branded one specific and consistent message about their economic policies.

"Grow" is a particularly effective branding word. "Grow" invokes the sense of upward motion. For something to grow, like the economy, it has to evolve. The Liberal Party's use of "grow" to brand their economic policies creates a message for voters that their economic policy is both different and superior to the Conservative Party's economic policy. "Grow" indicates that the Liberal Party's economic policy is different than the Conservative Party's policy because their policy will evolve and change from the current Conservative policy. "Grow" also indicates that the Liberal Party's economic policy is superior to the Conservative Party's economic policy because for the policy to evolve and "grow" it must become better.

"Fair" was used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policies; however, it was the only branding word that was used in more than one context. In addition to the economy, "fair" was used in the context of "fair and open government" and "fair and open elections". However, "fair" was still used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policy for the middle class. "Fair" was used in the context of "making taxes more fair", "reinstating a modernized and inclusive fair wages policy", and "efficient and fiscally responsible fair tax-breaks to make taxes more fair". "Fair" invokes equality and impartiality. The word "fair" used to brand the economy sends the message to voters that the Liberal Party's 2015 economic policy was equal and would benefit all Canadians.

The most common branding words in 2015 were used to brand the economy like previous manifestos, but they were used more consistently because they were used to brand economic policies for the middle-class. The use of the 2015 most common branding words created a

narrower and more consistent message. The most common branding words in 2015 were used specifically to brand the Liberal Party's economic policies for the middle class, not just the economy.

The key word in context command helped to support this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party brand would change in each manifesto. However, the findings from the key word in context command do not support this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time. This paper accepts the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between brand consistency and time.

An interesting observation can be made about the most consistent brands being in 2008 and 2015. The political branding literature argues that the 2008 and 2015 brands had the most succinct and unique messages (Jeffrey, 2008; Jeffrey, 2015). The literature attributes the successful brand of 2008 because it had a strong and unique brand that was consistently used by the leader, even though the brand did not resonate with voters. Similarly, the literature attributes the success of the 2015 brand to Justin Trudeau's strong leader brand. The consistency of the 2008 and 2015 brands could be a result of the leader of the Liberal Party. Another interesting observation can be made about the difference of times the word "Liberal" was used in each manifesto. In both 2008 and 2015, which had the most consistent brands, the word "Liberal" was used less frequently than it was in other manifestos. The use of the word "Liberal" could have been used less frequently because the Liberal Party did not need to focus on the overarching Liberal Party brand because they had a strong and consistent leader brand.

Co-Occurrences of Branding Words and Election Issues

This paper also coded the co-occurrences between all branding words and election issues in LEXICODER to further illustrate Liberal Party brand in the manifestos and how it changed in each election. Figure 2 shows the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues in each manifesto.




Figure 2
Source: LEXICODER via Liberal Party of Canada Manifestos 2006 to 2015

The co-occurrence between branding and the economy was used the most in all manifestos. This result is supported by the use of the most common branding words in all the

Liberal Party manifestos to brand the economy. Similarly, 2015 had the most co-occurrences between branding and the economy out of all the manifestos, and 2008 had the least co-occurrences. This result is supported by all of the 2015 most common words being used to brand the Liberal Party's economic policy for the middle-class, and the 2008 brand focusing on the Green Shift exclusively. This finding is also supported by 2008 having the highest co-occurrence between branding words and social issues. Furthermore, the co-occurrence between branding and multiculturalism was used the least in all manifestos.

The co-occurrences between branding words and election issues in 2006 and 2011 varied. The co-occurrences indicate that the 2006 and 2008 brands did not focus primarily on one specific issue, but rather they focused on all issues similarly. These results help to support the findings that the 2006 and 2011 brands were less consistent and narrow than the 2008 and 2015 brands.

The use of most common branding words in the Liberal Party manifestos and the co-occurrences between all branding words and election issues supports this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party brand would change in each manifesto. Further, these results strongly support this paper's argument that branding is an integral part of the Liberal Party's political communication strategy and has been used formally in their election since 2006. These findings also help to generalize the use of most common branding words to analyze changes in the Liberal Party brand and its consistency over time because the co-occurrences of the branding dictionary and election issues reflect the same findings.

4.4 The Liberal Party's use of Branding Techniques from 2006 to 2015

Manifestos

This paper hypothesized that branding techniques used by the Liberal Party would have a positive linear relationship over time and that their brand (defined as use of branding words) consistency would increase over time. To test this hypothesis, a two-sample measure of proportions test was used to determine the proportion of branding words to total words in the 2006 manifesto to each subsequent manifesto. The p-values of each two-sample measure of proportion of branding words to total words were all statistically significant ($p < 0.5$). These findings support this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party's use of branding techniques would have a positive linear relationship over time. These results also help to support this paper's argument that the Liberal Party brand changed in each election. These results do not specifically explain how branding changed over time, but they do suggest that the Liberal Party increased their branding in each election. Figure 3 shows the relationship between branding words and total words over time in Liberal Party manifestos.




Figure 3
Source: LEXICODER via Liberal Party of Canada Manifestos 2006 - 2015

The descriptive analysis of the brand content and co-occurrences in the previous section suggests that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time in their manifestos. The co-occurrences between branding words and election issues demonstrated that the Liberal Party brand became more focused on one or two election issues over time. The Liberal Party's use of their most common branding words followed this pattern and was also used in the context of one or two election issues in the later elections. This pattern suggests that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent by narrowing what issues they branded and using branding words to reflect one specific message. This analysis supports this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party brand would become more consistent over time.

Press Releases

A two-sample measure of proportions was used between branding words and total words in 2006 press releases to each subsequent year. This test was used to determine if the proportion of branding to total words in Liberal Party press releases increased over time. The two-sample measures of proportion between branding words and total words in the 2006 press releases to each subsequent year were insignificant (2006-2008: $p > 0.5$; 2006-2015: $p > 0.5$) except the proportions tests between 2006 and 2011 (2006-2011: $p < 0.5$). These results indicate that the proportion of branding words in Liberal Party press releases did not have a positive linear relationship over time. Figure 4 shows the relationship between press releases and time.




Figure 4
Source: LEXICODER via Liberal Party of Canada Press Releases 2005 - 2015

A pairwise correlation test was used between the number of branding words and election issues in 2006 to each subsequent year to determine if the Liberal Party's brand was consistent over time in press releases. None of the pairwise correlation tests were statistically significant. These findings confirm that there was no statistical difference between what election issues the Liberal Party branded in press releases.

The discrepancy between the consistent use of branding words between Liberal Party manifestos and press releases is an interesting observation. Branding words may have been used consistently on specific issues in manifestos because political parties write manifestos advance of an election with predefined positions on issues. The Liberal Party controls what issues are included in their manifestos and therefore what specific issues they want branded. Furthermore, based on modernization theory it is expected that the Liberal Party brand would become more consistent in their manifestos over time as they transform from a product-oriented party to a market-oriented party. The more market-oriented a party becomes the more likely they are to have a consistent brand (Lilleker and Lees-Marshment, 2005). In contrast, press releases cover a variety of issues that the Liberal Party does not control or predict. Regardless of how market-oriented the Liberal Party becomes over time, they may not be able to include only issues they want to brand in press releases. It is interesting that the Liberal Party still branded issues that they did not include as a part of their brand content in their manifestos. These results could indicate that the Liberal Party is using branding as their primary communication strategy.

This paper does not accept the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between branding over time because a positive linear relationship does exist between branding and the Liberal Party manifestos over time. Similarly, the co-occurrences between branding words and election issues became more consistent over time in Liberal Party manifestos. However, this

paper's hypothesis is not fully supported because branding did not have a positive linear relationship over time in press releases and did not become more consistent in press releases. Although these findings do not fully support this paper's hypothesis, they do contribute to this paper's overall argument that branding is the dominant political communication strategy used by the Liberal Party.


4.5 The Use Branding Techniques by the Liberal Party in Election-periods Versus Non-Election Periods

This paper hypothesized that the Liberal Party would use more branding techniques in election-periods versus non-election periods. To test this hypothesis, a two-sample measure of proportions test was used to determine the proportion of branding words in election periods to non-election periods. The p-values from the measure of proportions tests were statistically insignificant except for 2008 (2006: $p > 0.05$; 2008: $p < 0.05$; 2011: $p > 0.05$; 2015: $p > 0.05$). An aggregate two-sample measure of proportions test was used between the aggregate total of branding words in election periods compared to non-election periods, to determine if the 2008 statistical significance was an anomaly. The results from the cumulative measure of proportions test were also insignificant ($p > 0.05$). These results suggest that there is no statistically significant relationship between branding words in election periods compared to branding words in non-election periods.

A pairwise correlation test was also used between the frequency of branding words and election issues in election periods and non-election periods. All of the pairwise correlation tests were statistically insignificant. These findings indicate that there was no difference between how issues were branded in election periods and how issues were branded in non-election periods.

These results do not support this paper's hypothesis that the Liberal Party would have a more consistent brand in election periods compared to non-election periods.

This paper accepts the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between branding techniques in election periods compared to non-election periods. This paper rejects its hypothesis that the Liberal Party would use more branding techniques in election periods versus non-election periods. The lack of statistical difference between branding techniques and brand consistency in election periods and non-election periods could indicate that the Liberal Party is using the permanent campaign. Recall that the permanent campaign is a sophisticated branding technique where parties use branding techniques at all times, not just during election periods. Although the data does not suggest that the Liberal Party is using more branding in election periods compared to non-election periods, these findings help to confirm this paper's argument that the Liberal Party is using branding techniques formally and that branding is a central part of their communication strategy. Figure 5 shows the comparison of branding words in election periods and non-election periods.



4.6 Comparison of Branding Techniques in Liberal Party Manifestos and Press Releases

This paper hypothesized that the Liberal Party would use more branding techniques in their manifestos than in their press releases. A two-sample measure of proportions test was used between branding words in manifestos compared to branding words in press releases in each year, to determine if this hypothesis was correct. The p-value of the two-sample tests in 2006 and 2011 were not statistically significant (2006: $p > 0.05$; 2011: $p > 0.05$). However, the p-values for 2008 and 2015 were statistically significant (2008: $p < 0.05$; 2015: $p < 0.05$). These results suggest that the Liberal Party used more branding words in their 2008 and 2011 manifestos compared to their press releases. Further, a two-sample measure of proportions test was used to determine if the amount of branding words to total words in all manifestos aggregately compared

to the aggregate amount of branding words in press releases was statistically significant. The aggregate p-value suggests that there is no statistical difference between the use of branding words in Liberal Party manifestos and press releases ($p > 0.05$). No analysis was done on the brand consistency in manifestos compared to press releases to test this hypothesis because all previous results in this paper reveal that the Liberal Party had a more consistent brand in manifestos compared to press releases. Figure 6 shows the comparison of branding words in Liberal Party manifestos to press releases.




Figure 6
Source: LEXICODER via Liberal Party of Canada Press Releases 2005-2015, Liberal Party of Canada Manifestos 2006-2015

■ 2006 ■ 2008 ■ 2011 ■ 2015

This paper accepts the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the amount of branding words in manifestos and press releases, based on these results. The proportion of

branding words in manifestos compared to press releases does not support this paper's hypothesis that more branding techniques would be used in manifestos than in press releases. An interesting observation can be made about the lack of statistical significance between branding words in manifestos and branding words in press releases. Branding words were likely used in both manifestos and press releases because the Liberal Party wanted to use branding words initially in their manifestos and over time in their press releases to invoke emotions and values in voters. Therefore, these results support this paper's argument that the Liberal Party used branding as an integral part of their communication strategy from 2006 onwards. The lack of difference between branding words in manifestos and branding words in press releases could also indicate that the Liberal Party is using the techniques common to the permanent campaign. There could be no statistical difference between branding in manifestos (election periods) and press releases (non-election periods) because they are using branding at all times. The lack of statistical difference between the proportion of branding words in manifestos and press releases does support this paper's argument that branding is an integral part of the Liberal Party's political communication strategy, although these findings do not support this paper's hypothesis.

Further, an interesting observation can be made about the variation of statistical significance of branding words in the 2008 and 2015 manifestos compared to press releases. The literature on the Liberal Party argues that both the 2008 and 2015 manifestos had a strong and unique brand compared to 2006 and 2011 manifestos (Jeffrey, 2008; Jeffrey, 2015). The Liberal Party strongly branded the 2008 Green Shift, although it, unfortunately, failed to resonate with voters. In contrast, the 2015 Justin Trudeau brand was unique, strong, fresh, and resonated well with Canadians. It is likely that the significant use of branding words in the 2008 and 2015 press releases is a result of the strong brands in both manifestos. Further, an interesting observation

can be made about the variation of statistical significance of branding words in the 2008 and 2015 manifestos compared to press releases. The literature on the Liberal Party argues that both the 2008 and 2015 manifestos had a strong and unique brand compared to 2006 and 2011 manifestos (Jeffrey, 2008; Jeffrey, 2015). The 2008 Green Shift was strongly branded, although it unfortunately failed to resonate with voters. In contrast, the 2015 Justin Trudeau brand was unique, strong, fresh, and resonated well with Canadians. It is likely that the significant use of branding words in the 2008 and 2015 press releases is a result of the strong brands in both manifestos.

4.7 Conclusion of Results

The results in this paper help to support its overall argument that branding is a central part of the Liberal Party's communication strategy and that the Liberal Party has used branding formally in its elections since 2006. This paper had five main hypotheses to support its argument: **H1** the Liberal Party brand changed over time; **H2** the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time; **H3** branding techniques in the Liberal Party had a positive linear relationship over time; **H4** the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in election periods compared to non-election periods; and **H5** that the Liberal Party used more branding techniques in their manifestos compared to their press releases. Although not all of the hypotheses in this paper were true, the findings in all hypotheses helped to support this paper's argument and offered insight into the Liberal Party's use of branding techniques.

This paper found that the Liberal Party did use branding in each manifesto and that branding changed over time in each manifesto. These results support this paper's overall argument that the Liberal Party uses branding as a central part of its communication strategy and

that they have used branding formally in their elections since 2006. However, this paper's hypothesis **H2** that branding would become more consistent over time was not fully supported. This paper found that branding became more consistent in Liberal Party manifestos but not in Liberal Party press releases. Branding may have become more consistent in manifestos over time because they choose what issues to brand and how much branding they will use in their manifestos. In press releases, parties do not have a choice if their branded issues will align with the issues that press releases need to cover. The Liberal Party may not have been able to brand as much in press releases as they did in their manifestos. Still, these results support this paper's overall argument. Branding did become more consistent in Liberal Party press releases, indicating that the Liberal Party uses branding as a part of their central communication strategy.

Similarly, this paper's hypothesis **H3** that branding would have a positive linear relationship over time was not fully supported. This paper found that a positive linear relationship existed in Liberal Party manifestos but not in Liberal Party press releases. This paper attributes the difference between the relationship of branding in manifestos and press releases to the same reasoning as in **H2**. These results help to support this paper's argument because a positive relationship between branding and time did exist in manifestos, indicating that the Liberal Party used branding as a central communications strategy and that they have used branding since 2006.

This paper also found that there was no statistical difference between the amount of branding in election periods compared to non-election periods (**H4**). The lack of difference between branding in manifestos compared to press releases could indicate that the Liberal Party is using the permanent campaign. The use of the permanent campaign supports this paper's argument that branding is a central part of the Liberal Party's communication strategy.

Lastly, this paper found that there was no statistical difference between the use of branding in Liberal Party manifestos compared to Liberal Party press releases. This finding did not support (H5); however, it did help to support this paper's overall argument. These results could indicate that the Liberal Party is using the permanent campaign, similar to the finding that there was no difference between branding in election periods compared to non-election periods.

6. Limitations

The branding dictionary that this paper created to define and measure the Liberal Party brand is an original contribution to the political branding literature. This paper was the first attempt to operationalize branding quantitatively, and it was the first study of the Liberal Party of Canada's brand over time. Future researchers can use the branding dictionary and refine it based on the party and country they are studying. Additionally, future researchers can use this paper's findings on the Liberal Party brand and create a comparative study to other political parties. However, as this is the first study to operationalize political branding quantitatively and study the Liberal Party's brand, there are some limitations. The next section of this paper will discuss its limitations.

6.1 Operationalization of Branding

The operationalization of branding in this paper is its biggest limitation. Defining and measuring branding in any capacity is particularly challenging because brands are intangible. It is difficult to determine the intent of a word, image, or colour, and how they are received by voters.

Operationalizing branding as branding words has some limitations because I had to use my judgment as a researcher as to what constituted a branding word. I used the political branding

and communication literature to create the branding dictionary; however, this process was not impartial to researcher bias and error. I tried to mitigate this limitation by inductively using the most common branding words in the manifestos as the starting point in the creation of the branding dictionary.

Further, this paper only measured what constituted the Liberal Party brand. This paper did not measure how voters receive the Liberal Party brand. Branding is as much a part of what forms the brand as how it received by its intended audience. Research would need to be conducted on how Canadians respond to different brands to mitigate this problem in the future.

Although the operationalization of branding is a limitation, it still provides a useful contribution to the literature. The branding dictionary can be replicated in other parties and in other countries that use political branding. Further, the methodology of this paper provides an opportunity for future research to include quantitative and qualitative methods to study branding.

6.2 Data

The choice of manifestos to inductively create the branding dictionary limited the ability to perform statistical analysis on the Liberal Party brand in manifestos. It was impossible to statistically analyze the Liberal Party's brand in manifestos because there was only one observation in each dictionary. I could not statistically demonstrate that branding words co-occurred more with the economy than with social issues. As a result, I had to descriptively analyze the branding words and the co-occurrences of branding words and election issues in Liberal Party manifestos. Descriptive analysis is subjected to research bias and error because it is qualitative.

Similarly, another limitation is the choice of press releases to measure the Liberal Party brand over time. The results of this paper suggest that press releases may not contain the most branding because parties do not have a choice if press release issues align with the issues they want to brand. This limitation may have impacted the results of branding over time because press releases were used as the primary document to measure branding over time.

Furthermore, a limitation in this paper is that I only used text documents to define the Liberal Party brand and measure it over time. Political branding literature states that party images and logos are a central part of a party's brand. This paper only used text documents because it was hard to find consistent official party images released by the Liberal Party. However, the use of only text documents to analyze the Liberal Party brand does not offer a complete explanation of their brand and its changes. Future studies should include official party images and logos in conjunction with the branding dictionary to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Liberal Party brand.

6.3 Party Brand versus Leader Brand

This paper only analyzed the Liberal Party brand and not the individual leader brand. The political branding literature states that the leader's brand often influences the party's brand and vice versa. The results of this paper could have been different based on the leader's brand. Future research should include documents that are unique to the leader (like speeches and debates) to compare the Liberal Party brand and the leader brand. An understanding of the leader brand would offer a more comprehensive understanding of the Liberal Party brand.

6.4 Dictionary Creation

A smaller limitation is this paper is that the words in the election issue dictionaries consisted of words that are commonly associated with those election issues more broadly. Positioning theory argues that the content of election issues changes with each leader, although the election issues remain the same. For example, in 2008 the Liberal Party focused primarily on the environment as a social issue, whereas in 2015 the environment was not highly prioritized as a social issue. The election issue dictionaries could have changed the results of the co-occurrences between branding words and social issues in this paper. For future research using this paper's branding dictionary, an inductive approach could be used to create the dictionaries for each particular manifesto.

7. Future Research

The findings in this paper and the branding dictionary offer myriad new research opportunities. Most importantly, the contribution of the branding dictionary can be used for future research. The branding dictionary can be tailored for the context of other political parties in Canada and in countries that have adopted political branding. The replicability of the branding dictionary will help close the quantitative gap in the branding literature. The branding dictionary can also be applied to different text documents. Any branding document could use the branding dictionary to define a party's brand. For example, leaders' debates, social media posts, speeches, and question periods could all use the branding dictionary to define and measure a party's brand.

Furthermore, the findings on the Liberal Party brand can be used comparatively to other parties in Canada. The Liberal Party brand could be compared to the Conservative Party's brand, helping to close the gap in the literature that focuses only on the Conservative Party. This type of

research could also strengthen positioning theory if its analysis focused on how parties create their brand in relation to how other parties position on the political spectrum. The branding dictionary could also facilitate comparative research in other countries that have adopted political branding. Studies using the branding dictionary on liberal and progressive parties in other countries could help to determine if the institutionalist or modernization theory best describes political branding.

8. Conclusion

Political branding dominates the Canadian political landscape. However, the current literature narrowly focuses on the Conservative Party of Canada and is primarily qualitative. The remarkable victory of the Liberal Party in 2015 federal elections raises two important questions that need to be studied in the political branding literature. **1) What was the Liberal Party brand in each federal election from 2006 to 2015? 2) To what extent has the Liberal Party used branding techniques in each of the four elections between 2006 and 2015 (when branding has been most prevalent in Canada)?** This paper had three main hypotheses that stemmed from the above questions. The first hypothesis of this paper was that the Liberal Party brand changed over time because there was a new leader in each election. Secondly, this paper hypothesized that the Liberal Party brand became more consistent over time. Lastly, this paper hypothesized that a positive linear relationship existed between branding techniques and time. These questions and hypotheses help to inform this paper's overall argument that branding is an integral component of the Liberal Party communication strategy and has been used by the Liberal Party in each federal election from 2006 to 2015.

Content analysis was used to create the branding dictionary that defined and measured the Liberal Party brand over time. This paper used an inductive approach to determine the Liberal Party brand and a deductive approach to measure their brand. Although not all of this paper's hypotheses were true, the results of this paper support its overall argument. The arguments in this paper are important because they challenge the current literature and the institutionalist approach that argue branding is a result of internal party structures found in conservative parties. Further, the arguments in this paper help to confirm the applicability of modernization theory in Canadian political parties.

As this is the first quantitative study of branding in the Liberal Party, there can be no consensus about how the Liberal Party uses branding. The elections in this paper could have been an outlier compared to previous elections. Similarly, more comparative research needs to be conducted to offer a complete analysis of party brands. The relationship between parties on the political spectrum is necessary to understand how parties create their brands. This paper provides a starting point for future quantitative research and comparative studies on political branding in Canada.

Overall, this paper was an original contribution to political branding and communication studies, as well as Canadian political studies. The branding dictionary was the first quantitative indicator of branding, and it was the first study conducted on the Liberal Party's brand over time. Although it has some limitations, the branding dictionary offers many future research opportunities. The quantitative operationalizing of branding as a set of branding words is important. Words matter because brands require succinct and consistent messages. Language is essential to branding because it is difficult for people to separate the words that constitute a party

brand and the party's policies. If "words do the work of politics" (Graham, 2015) this research is a first step in understanding how words do the work of politics in branding.

REFERENCES

- Albaugh, Quinn, Julie Sevenans, Stuart Soroka, and Peter John Loewen. 2013". The Automated Coding of Policy Agendas: A Dictionary-Based Approach," paper presented at the 6th Annual Comparative Agendas Conference, Atnwerp, Belgium.
- Andrew, Blake, Lori Young and Stuart Soroka. 2015. "Back to The Future: Press Coverage of the 2008 Canadian Election Campaign Strikes Both Familiar and Unfamiliar Tones". *Policy Options*. 79-84.
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2007. "Estimating Party Policy Positions: Comparing Expert Surveys and Handcoded Content Analysis." *Electoral Studies*. 26.1: 90-107
- Blais, Andre. 2005. "Accounting for the Electoral Success of the Liberal Party in Canada". *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 38.4: 821-840.
- Blais, Andre, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2001. "Measuring Party Identification: Britain, Canada, and the United States". *Political Behavior*. 23.1: 5-22.
- Brader, Ted. 2006. *Campaigning for Hearts and Minds: How Emotional Appeals in Political Ads Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Brewer, Paul R. 2002. "Framing, Value Words, and Citizens' Explanations of Their Issue Opinions." *Political Communication*. 19 303-16.
- Carty, Kenneth. 2015. *Big Tent Politics: The Liberal Party's Long Mastery of Canada's Public Life*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Clarkson, Stephen. 2005 *The Big Red Machine: How the Liberal Party Dominates Canadian Politics*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Clarkson, Stephen. 2006. "How the Big Red Machine Became the Little Red Machine" in Pammett, Jon, and Christopher Dornan *The Canadian Federal Elections of 2006*.

- Toronto: Dundurn Press Toronto, pp. 24-58.
- Cogburn, Derrick, L. 2011. "From Networked Nominee to Networked Nation: Examining the Impact of Web 2.0 and Social Media on Political Participation and Civic Engagement in the 2008 Obama Campaign". *Journal of Political Marketing*. 10: 189-213.
- Collenette, David. 2006. "Politics Is About Winning: Stephen Clarkson on the Success of the Liberal Party of Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies*. 40.1: 239-43.
- Coombs, Timothy and Sherry J. Holladay. 2010. *Public Relations as Strategic Communication. Public Relations Strategy and Application: Managing Influence*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Coomber, Stephen. 2002. *Branding*. Oxford: Capstone Publications.
- Conley, Brian. 2012. "The Politics of Hope: The Democratic Party and the Institutionalization of the Obama Brand in the 2010 mid-term Elections" in Jennifer, Lees-Marshment (ed.). *Routledge Handbook of Political Marketing*. London: Routledge, pp. 124-134.
- Cormack, Patricia. 2012. "Double Double: Branding, Tim Hortons, and the Public Sphere" in Alex Marland, Thierry Giasson and Jennifer Lees-Marshment (eds.) *Political Marketing in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 209-223.
- Cosgrove, Kenneth M. 2012. "Political Branding in the Modern Age: Effective Strategies, Tools and Techniques" in Jennifer Lees-Marshment (ed.). *Routledge Handbook of Political Marketing*. London: Routledge, pp. 107-123.
- Crigler, Ann N. 1996 *The Psychology of Political Communication*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Cushman, Joy, Susan Markham, Doug Hattaway, RJ Bee, Karen Hicks, and Judith Freeman. 2012. "Campaigning to Engage and Win" in *New Organizing Institute*, pp. 75-98.
- Daku, M., Soroka, S., and Young, L. 2015. Lexicoder, version 3.0. Available at:

www.lexicoder.com.

- Dornan, Christopher . 2015. "The Long Goodbye: The Contours of the Election" in Pammett, Jon, and Christopher Dornan *The Canadian Federal Elections of 2015*. Toronto: Dundurn Press Toronto, pp. 7-23.
- Dufresne, Yannick and Alex Marland. 2012. "The Canadian Political Market and the Rules of the Game" in Alex Marland, Thierry Giasson and Jennifer Lees-Marshment (eds.) *Political Marketing in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 22-38.
- Dyck, Rand. 2012. *Canadian Politics: Concise Fifth Edition*. Nelson Education.
- Esselment, Anna. 2017. "Canada's Embrace of the Permanent Campaign". *Policy Options*.
- Flanagan, Tom. 2014. *Winning Power: Canadian Campaigning in the Twenty-First Century*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Fournier, Patrick, Fred Cutler, Stuart Soroka, Diertlind Stolle, Eric Belanger. 2013. "Riding the Orange Wave: Leadership, Values, Issues, and the 2011 Canadian Election". *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 46:4. 863-897.
- Gerring, John. 2011. *Social Science Methodology: Second Edition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A. Nosek. 2009. "Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 96.5: 1029-046.
- Hallahan, Kirk. 1999. "Seven Models of Framing: Implications for Public Relations". *Journal of Public Relations Research*. 11(3): 205-242.
- Hamilton, Graeme. 2011. "For Justin Trudeau, Like Father Like son." *National Post*. April 4.
<http://news.nationalpost.com/2011/04/04/for-justin-trudeau-like-father-like-son/>

- Hatch, Mary Jo and Majken Schultz. 2001. "Bringing the Corporation into Corporate Branding".
European Journal of Marketing. 37:7-8. 1041-1064.
- Iyengar, Shanto. 1990. "Framing Responsibility for Political Issues: The Case of Poverty."
Political Behaviour. 19: 40.
- Jeffrey, Brooke. 2008. "Missed Opportunities: The Invisible Liberals." in Pammett, Jon, and
Christopher Dornan *The Canadian Federal Elections of 2008*. Toronto: Dundurn Press
Toronto, pp. 63-98.
- Jeffrey, Brooke. 2011. "The Disappearing Liberals: Caught in the Crossfire" in Pammett, Jon,
and Christopher Dornan *The Canadian Federal Elections of 2011*. Toronto: Dundurn
Press Toronto, pp. 44-77.
- Jeffrey, Brooke. 2015. "Back to the Future: The Resurgent Liberals" in Pammett, Jon, and
Christopher Dornan *The Canadian Federal Elections of 2015*. Toronto: Dundurn Press
Toronto, pp. 57-85.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Beverly
Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lawlor, Andrea. 2015. "Framing Immigration in the Canadian and British News Media".
Canadian Journal of Political Science. 48:2.
- Lakoff, George. 2004 *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate:
The Essential Guide for Progressives*. White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green
Publications.
- Lakoff, George. 2008. *The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-century Politics with
an 18th-century Brain*. New York: Viking.
- Lees-Marshment, Jennifer. 2006. "Political Marketing Theory and Practice: A Reply to Omrod's

- Critique of the Lees-Marshment Market-Oriented Party Model”. *Politics*. 26(2): 119-125.
- Marland, Alex. 2012. “Amateurs versus Professionals: The 1993 and 2006 Canadian Federal Elections” in Alex Marland, Thierry Giasson and Jennifer Lees-Marshment (eds.) *Political Marketing in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 59-75.
- Marland, Alex. 2013. “What is a Political Brand? Justin Trudeau and the Theory of Political Branding.” Paper presented at the 2013 annual meetings of the Canadian Communication Association and the Canadian Political Science Association.
- Marland, Alex. 2014. “The Branding of a Prime Minister: Digital Information Subsidies and the Image Management of Stephen Harper” in Thierry Giasson, Alex Marland, and Tamara Small (eds.) *Political Communication in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Marland, Alex. 2016. *Brand Command*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Marland, Alex, and Tom Flanagan. 2013. “Brand New Party: Political Branding and the Conservative Party of Canada”. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 46 (4): 951-972.
- Mochis, George, Lee Euechun and Anil Mathur. 1997. “Targeting the Mature Marget: Opportunities and Challenges”. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 14:4.
- Newman, Peter. 2011. *When the Gods Changed: The Death of Liberal Canada*. Random House Canada.
- O’Connell, Shannon, Smoot, Samantha and Sally Abi Khalil. 2010. Module 6 “Message Development: Creating Powerful and Persuasive Messages”. *National Democratic Institute Campaign Skills Handbook*., pp. 1-34.
- Pare, Daniel and Flavia Berger. 2008. “Political Marketing Canadian Style: The Conservative

- Party and the 2006 Federal Election”. *Canadian Journal of Political Communication*. 33: 36-63.
- Randall, Geoffrey. 1993. *Principles of Marketing*. London: Routledge.
- Scammell, Margaret. 1998. The Wisdom of the War Room: US campaigning and Americanization. *Media, Culture & Society*. 20: 251-275.
- Schafferer, Christian. 2006. “The Globalization of Political Marketing”. In Schafferer, C., (ed.): *Election Campaigning in East and Southeast Asia: Globalization of Political Marketing*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Scheindlin, Dahlia and Israel Waismel-Manor. 2009. “Falafel and Apple Pie: American Consultants, Modernization and Americanization of Electoral Campaigns in Israel” in Dennis W. Johnson (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Political Management*. London: Routledge, pp. 317-331.
- Schroedel, Jean, Michelle Bligh, Jennifer Merolla, and Randall Gonzalez. 2013. "Charismatic Rhetoric the 2008 Presidential Campaign: Commonalities and Differences." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 43.1: 101-28.
- Stanbury, W.T. 2011. “Strategic Approach to Framing in Lobbying”. *The Hill Times Online*. 21. pp. 1-4.
- Stephenson, Laura. 2010. “The Catholic-Liberal Connection: A Test of Strength” in Anderson, Cameron, and Laura Stephenson *Voting Behavior in Canada*. UBC Press, pp. 86-107.
- Stewart, Patrick A. 2015. “Polls and Elections: Do the Presidential Primary Debates Matter? Measuring Candidate Speaking Time and Audience Response during the 2012 Primaries.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 45.2: 361-81.
- Stromback, Jesper. 2007. Political Marketing and Professionalized Campaigning. *Journal of*

Political Marketing. 6 (2-3): 49-67.

- Taras, David and Christopher Waddell. 2012. "The 2011 Federal Election and the Transformation of Canadian Media and Politics" in David Taras and Christopher Waddell (eds.) *How Canadians Communicate IV: Media and Politics*. Athabasca University Press, pp. 71-107.
- Tringali, Brian. 2009. "Message Testing in the Twenty-First Century" in Dennis W. Johnson (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Political Management*. New York: Routledge, p. 113-125.
- The "Sunny Way". 8, 2016 January. Liberal Party of Canada. Web. 3 Nov. 2016.
- Wesley, Jared J. and Mike Moyes. 2014. "Selling Social Democracy: Branding the Political Left in Canada" in Thierry Giasson, Alex Marland, and Tamara Small (eds.) *Political Communication in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Appendices

Economy Dictionary
1%
austerity
boom*
budget*
consume*
contract*
credit*
debt*
deflation
dollar*
economy*
employ*
expenditure*
finance*
GDP
global economy
globalization
GNP
grow*
income*
industry*
inflation
infrastructure*
invest*
job*
job creation
market*
market forces
middle-class*
money
national debt
national income
one-percent
poverty
poverty line
prosper*
recession
sector*
spend*
stagflation
supply*
tax*

trade*
upper-class
wealth*
wealth creation
welfare
work*
world economy

Appendix 1

*indicates that all forms of the word were searched for in LEXICODER

Social Issues Dictionary	
aboriginal*	
aboriginal people	
aboriginal peoples	
abuse*	
abuse of power	
addiction*	
afghanistan	
afghanistan people	
afghanistan soldiers	
black *	
carbon-tax	
charter	
charter of abuse	
charter of rights	
charter of rights and freedoms	
child abuse	
climate*	
climate change	
crime	
disabled*	
disparity*	
domestic abuse	
emission*	
environment*	
environmentally friendly	
ethnic	
ethnic minority	
first nations	
fossil fuels	
global warming	
green*	

green shift
greenhouse gas
greenhouse gases
greenhouse gas emissions
harass*
homelessness
human trafficking
immigrant*
indigenous
indigenous people
indigenous peoples
inequality*
inuit
ISIS
ISLAM
mental health
métis
middle-east
minority*
nation*
native*
native people
native peoples
oil
oil spill
pipeline*
poverty
poverty line
quebec
race*
refugee*
region*
regional disparity*
right*
substance abuse
sustainable
syra*
union*
women*
women's rights*

Appendix 2

*indicates that all forms of the word were searched for in LEXICODER

Social Services Dictionary
child*
child care
community*
day care
doctor
education*
first responder
first responders
health care
hospital*
mayor*
municipal*
nurse*
pension
pension*
police*
police force
police officer
premier*
private
province*
public
public transit
RCMP
school*
student*
teacher*
transit
two-tier
university

Appendix 3

*indicates that all forms of the word were searched for in LEXICODER

Multiculturalism Dictionary
aboriginal*
aboriginal peoples
afghanistan
afghanistan peoples
afghanistan soldiers
charter
charter of rights and freedoms

charter rights
charter identity
cultural identity
culture*
difference*
diversity*
first nations
identity*
immigrant*
include*
indigenous
indigenous people
indigenous peoples
inuit
ISIS
ISLAM
métis
middle-east
minority*
muslim*
native*
native people
native peoples
refugee*
religion*
religious difference
respect*
syria*
together*
tolerant*
unite*

Appendix 4

*indicates that all forms of the word were searched for in LEXICODER

Security, International Relations, and Government Dictionary
afghanistan
afghanistan people
afghanistan soldiers
aid*
air attack
air strike
armed forces

army*
arms race
attack*
bomb
bomb threat
brave*
charter
charter rights
charter of rights and freedoms
civilian*
conflict*
defence
defense
diplomat*
duty*
federal
federal government
fight*
foreign*
freedom*
global affairs
international relations
ISIL
ISIS
islam
law*
law and order
mayor
middle east
military*
military personal
municipal government
municipal*
nuclear
ottawa
peace*
peace makers
peace making
premier*
prime minister*
protect*
province*
provincial government
resolve*

risk*
safe*
sanction*
secure*
soldier*
syria*
terrorist*
threat*
trade*
trade agreement
war*
weapons*
world

Appendix 5

*indicates that all forms of the word were searched for in LEXICODER

Elisha Corbett C.V.

EDUCATION

- Queen's University – Bachelor of Arts and Science- Political Studies - 2012-2016
- Western University- M.A. Political Science candidate- 2016-2017
- Queen's University- P.h.D Political Studies candidate- 2017

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Research Assistant, Professor Jonathan Rose – 2015- present

- Created the Queen's Political Studies Summer Institute program for the Political Studies Department
- Responsible for creating all promotional materials and a curriculum focused on Canadian politics for international students
- Developed my public relations skills by designing a logo that encompassed all the components of the summer institute
- Created a comprehensive budget for the program

Research Assistant, Queen's University Faculty of Engineering – Aug. 2015-Dec. 2015

- Overlooked the Faculty Board constitution to the Dean of Engineering
- Responsible for making policy recommendations based on previous versions of the Faculty Board constitution and in comparison to other Canadian engineering programs
- Improved my organizational and communication skills through learning how to effectively organize the research that I gathered and communicate it efficiently to the Faculty Board

CONFERENCES AND AWARDS

Queen's University - Graduate Entrance Tuition Award

- Awarded \$6414 for my P.h.D Program at Queen's University for academic excellence

Queen's University - P.h.D Entry Scholarship

- Awarded \$21,000 as an entry level scholarship for my P.h.D. program

Social Sciences Research Council of Canada- *Canadian Graduate Scholarships- Master's Program*

- Awarded \$17,500 for my M.A. program at Western University to continue my research in

political communication

Western University- M.A. Entry Scholarship

- Awarded \$17,800 as an entry level scholarship for my M.A. program

Western University- Dean of Graduate Studies Scholarship

- Awarded \$1500 for academic excellence

Nipissing University 9th Annual Undergraduate Research Conference - Speaker

- Selected out of a pool of applicants across Canada to present my undergraduate thesis
- My research was judged amongst a panel of other students as well as professors
- Engaged in academic discourse about my research as well as related research in my field

SKILLS

- Extensive knowledge of Excel
- Knowledge of content analysis program LEXICODER
- Knowledge of statistical analysis program STATA