

Celebrities' Parasocial Interaction and Relationships: Predictor of Voting Preference towards Endorsed Political Candidates

Dave De Guzman Centeno*

University of the Philippines, Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business, Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines
and Department of Marketing, City University of Hong Kong

This paper follows through a previous work ("Celebrification in Philippine Politics") in 2010 that investigates the role of celebrity endorsers' parasocial interaction and relationships (PSIR) in voting preferences towards the endorsed candidates of the 2007 Philippine senate elections. As a sequel, this current work confirms the paradigmatic relational approach on how celebrities affect voters' political behaviors in the context of the succeeding 2010 Philippine presidential elections. Furthermore, this study offers improvement of the parasocial scale by adopting recently developed scales and suggesting an additional dimension realized from an in-progress complementing qualitative study of the paper. More importantly, this paper develops and highlights a logit model of celebrity PSIR's effects to the odds of positive voting preferences towards the endorsed political candidates. The paper concludes that, in general, celebrity endorsers' PSIR significantly contributes to voting preferences of the public (i.e., a strong agreement to each PSIR item may lead voters to 1.089 times more likely to vote for the political endorsee of celebrity; with effect size $R^2 = .21$). However, when analyzing individual celebrity—political candidate pairs, the model estimates show that only two of four celebrity exemplars' PSIR coefficients are significant. Implications on political marketing, opinion leadership, and relational paradigm in celebrity endorsements are discussed.

Keywords: celebrity endorsements, Philippine national elections, parasocial interaction and relationships, logit model, voting preferences

1 Introduction

It is almost a standard component of political campaigns in the Philippines, as with product brand campaigns, to select and incorporate image personalities such as celebrities to attract and draw voters' attention to numerous integrated marketing communication appeals. The success of such personality involvement in political campaigns could be attributed to the eventual voting preference of voters towards the endorsed political candidate. However, such success of positive reinforcement from celebrities often remains assessed under speculations and uninformed judgments and decisions among political marketing strategists and analysts, thus, there is a need for an effect isolation strategy (Atkin & Block, 1983). This paper offers a socio-psychological mechanism through an audience/consumer psychological concept called parasocial interaction and relationships (PSIR) as an alternative descriptive and predictive variable to understand and systematically identify the contribution that celebrity endorsers might be carrying out on voters' political behavior such as voting preferences (positive or negative) towards a political candidate.

Following a previous work (Centeno, 2010) where celebrities' *parasocial interaction* (Auer & Palmgreen, 2000; Horton & Wohl, 1956) was studied through a survey of voting behavior in 2007 senatorial elections, this paper follows through and validates the findings of the demographic differences in parasocial interactions. Furthermore, this current paper moves forward by modeling PSIR in the voting preferences as a consequential behavior driven by celebrity endorsers.

Thus, this research aims to complement the said work on celebrity PSIR by asking the following research questions: (1) How does PSIR vary across demographic attributes of voters; and (2) How does parasocial interaction and relationship (PSIR) towards a celebrity endorser affect voters preference towards the endorsed candidate? The succeeding sections of the paper review the literature on celebrity endorsements and the theoretical anchorage of PSIR where the hypotheses are based on; then the methodology on survey design and procedure is described, followed by the results and discussions on PSIR's descriptive differences among respondents, and how PSIR affect voting

* Dave Centeno is currently a PhD (Marketing) candidate at City University of Hong Kong, and an assistant professor of marketing at Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business, University of the Philippines. Correspondence: Tel: +63 2 928 4571; Fax: +63 2 929 7991. Email: dave.centeno@upd.edu.ph

preferences through a logit model; the paper ends with conclusions, recommendations, and future research on celebrity-related political marketing, opinion leadership, and theoretical offering to a relational paradigm shift in celebrity studies.

Political marketing communication and its tools need prime understanding of the public's political and civic needs and desires for political marketers to come up with valuable political offerings that appeal to the voters preferences and make successful political messages that eventually lead to positive behavior (Marland, 2003). Insights coming from the voters are used to increase political campaigning efficiency and design political communication to attract voters. Part of the entire political communication that effectively reaches voters is the use of celebrities to reach out to them, anchoring on the campaign principles utilized in brand endorsements. However, the understanding of the dynamics that undergo in the political context needs further study especially in the Philippine elections context where celebrities are a staple component of most political candidates' campaigns.

Celebrity endorsements are commonly dealt with in the marketing literature with products, brands, organizations, and political figures and events that happen typically in the Western perspective such as the USA (Schickel, 2000; Erdogan, 2001; Lin, 2001). Such substantial explorations on the area conclude that celebrity endorsement is valuable due to its ability to gain consumer (or voters') attention, create differentiated product images and penetrate through advertising clutter consumers are surrounded by everyday (cf. Erdogan & Kitchen, 1998; Choi, Lee & Kim, 2005). Amidst the presence of the most developed models of celebrity endorsements — source credibility, source attractiveness, and product match-up hypothesis that are briefly discussed in the succeeding section— there are still calls for research that is based on both pillars of marketing and political science (Butler & Collins, 1996; Dholakia & Sternthal, 1977; Kamins, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994; Sternthal, Dholakia, & Leavitt, 1978) and that offers alternative views of political marketing effectiveness. Also, because of the growing area of political marketing in consumer paradigm such as public opinion, political marketing scholars have made calls for understanding more cultural differences of campaign effectiveness that bring together general conclusions of key determinants of political marketing effectiveness (Harris & Lock, 2010). This paper aims to contribute to the said need for explorations in political marketing that is consumer/voter-based by looking at celebrities as social agents, which intertwines with campaign effectiveness among the populace in election campaigns.

In the recent decades, politics and endorsements have been increasingly intertwined especially in democratic societies embedded with popular cultures (e.g., United States). Actors, musicians, and other iconic individuals are publicly sharing their political views that implicitly influence opinions and behaviors of individuals (Jackson & Darrow, 2005; Wood & Herbst, 2007). In Asian countries, celebrity endorsements have been studied similarly but with emphasis on cross-cultural differences with the Western style (Choi et al., 2005). However, most have delved into commercial advertising and the underlying processes of culture in the effectiveness of celebrities. This suggests the dearth of research in celebrity endorsements in politics in the Asian perspective, more so, in the Philippine elections context.

This paper turns to the concept of PSIR's theoretical development where celebrities' effectiveness is seen through their relational personae through such media effects mechanism. The concept has been established in the media communication research and was defined as an "illusionary intimacy" that is being developed among viewers of a media persona (Horton & Wohl, 1956). The view that repeated parasocial interactions develops parasocial relationships with media personae such as celebrities have been argued in past explorations on PIR (e.g., Perse & Rubin, 1989; Vorderer, 1996). Recent research on PSIR in the context of advertisements investigated the effects of consumers' developed attachments to media characters such as sitcom characters (Russell & Stern, 2006), and fans' developed parasocial bond (fantasy and emotional bond) towards entertainment personae (Hung, 2014). This paper follows the stream of parasocial research in its behavioral aspect, specifically as a contributing factor to a political behavior in the democratic context of elections.

2 Theoretical Development and Hypotheses

2.1 Positioning PSIR as a relational model of celebrity endorsements

As the area of celebrity endorsements grows interestingly in the recent decades, scholars have been devoted to understanding the underlying consumer processes that eventually elicit effectiveness of campaigns. Dominant existing models of celebrity influence have become mature and much have been written on these models which serve as framework for celebrity selection — source credibility (Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953), source attractiveness (Kahle & Homer, 1985; Ohanian, 1990), meaning transfer (McCracken, 1989), and match-up or image congruence (Biswas, Biswas & Das, 2006; Misra & Beatty, 1990). These existing models suggest that celebrity endorsers affect attitudes and behaviors.

The presence of celebrities in brand managements impacts consumer behavior and company performance. Thus, a significant portion of celebrity research as previously mentioned (e.g., source credibility, match-up hypothesis, and or meaning-transfer) examines how celebrities function as effective endorsers, and these studies are typically framed with the *informational* social influence type of criteria that suit the celebrity effectiveness (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). It is posited in this paper that much of these informational type of celebrity research regard the celebrity as a distant ‘star’ that is evaluated and consumed as a *distant* communication source, rather than a *value expressive* type of social influence. Value expressive desire is the influence that makes a consumer enhance self-image by association with a referent other (Burnkrant & Cousineau, 1975). Therefore, it is motivated by the consumer’s desire to enhance or support self-concept through referent identification (Callcott & Phillips, 1996; Kelman, 1961). More importantly, value expressiveness operates through the process of wishful identification, which occurs when an individual adopts a behavior or opinion of another because the behavior or opinion is associated with satisfying a self-defining relationship (Brinberg & Plimpton, 1986; Price, Feick, & Higie, 1989). This theoretical frame separates PSIR from previous celebrity endorsement models. As previous studies have called for study of media effects in social relationship paradigm (Das, 2011; Royo-Vela, Aldas-Manzano, Kuster, & Vila, 2007; Uray & Burnaz, 2003) this research aims to contribute to such alternative, relational model of celebrity endorsement by anchoring on the value expressiveness concept in social influence. Value expressiveness is seen in this paper as the typical normative influence that is caused by celebrity PSIR operating in a collectivistic social culture in the Philippines.

2.2 Parasocial Interaction and Relationships (PSIR)

Celebrity endorsements in the marketing literature, as the preceding section points out, are often on the paradigm of looking at celebrities in as a distant persona to ordinary persons. PSIR is a perspective where celebrity distance is reduced for them to be perceived as closer to one’s social circle – thus the alternative paradigm through an ‘illusionary intimacy’ an individual feels towards a certain media persona.

Fifty-years after Horton and Wohl (1956) published their seminal paper on media-viewer virtual interaction, termed as ‘parasocial interaction’, a number of exploratory and explanatory research have been done to provide varying perspectives on this kind of media effect. Subsequent researches have followed through the idea by Horton and Wohl. Most of them are in the fields of psychology and mass communication. Elaboration on the observations of Horton and Wohl gave the parasocial interaction construct an evolution across the years. Some studies indicate, for instance, that viewers also recognize TV personalities much as they recognize ‘real’ people in their immediate social circle (Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rosengreen, 1985; Rubin & Perse, 1987). Moreover, media personae are perceived as ‘real’ persons, rather than artists performing scripted roles (McQuail, Blumber, & Brown, 1972). Their images and voices, are responded to, longed for, depended on, and taken for granted as well (Levy, 1979; Rubin & Rubin, 1985). Because of the number of concurring processes of parasocial interaction, it can be regarded as a *metaconcept* with some microcomponents such as attention, comprehension, knowledge activation, evaluation, social comparison, sympathy, empathy, and emotional contagion attached to it (Giles, 2002; Schramm, 2015). The idea of parasocial intimacy places a view of parasocial interaction as not merely as a synchronic watching and talking to media characters but as a consequence of the attachment developed through media consumption. Feelings of love, attachments,

and even hatred are carried on even after the actual experience of media consumption (Thomson, 2006). PSIR reimagines celebrities in a closer involvement thus creating their images into the 'reality' of consumers, making them less distant as opposed to typically studied celebrities as endorsers.

Retrieval of memory guided by schema on people activates some information that is related to what they know about the person (Srull & Wyer, 1989). Consumers are bounded by images of people whom they also know presently and in the recent past -- but only through the virtual media. They often say "I know this person, she is like a sister to me...", "I like him, I can see some of my friends in him", "I don't like her! She's a bad person!" This kind of television-viewing experience with media personalities are seemingly designed to 'talk' and 'socialize' with the audience. These generalized entity representations that are categorical in nature and provide stereotypical images (Wyer, 2007) might impact judgments of ordinary individual towards the media personality (celebrity), and could also implicate their judgments and behaviors towards the associated brand in the endorsement process.

2.3. Social cognition and social identity theories

To anchor the suggested paradigm in celebrity endorsement offered in this paper, social cognition and social identity theories provide substantial metatheoretical underpinnings of how celebrities are regarded as extended, relational 'others' in one's social network. Social cognition (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) is defined as "how ordinary people think about people and how they think they think about people" (p. 1). This paper follows how the theory emphasizes the motivational and intentional bases of perception and cognition. The approach is metatheoretical that explains how people see the "others" around them through social judgments derived from schemata and narratives in the mental construction and representations that are made through interaction.

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002) explains the overarching social structures that explain individual cognitions. These structures are composed of groups, organizations, cultures, and most importantly, individuals' identification with these collective units. These units guide the internal structures and processes of the individuals in socializations. The central heuristic tenet of the theory is social and cultural competence. This competence influences individual thoughts and behaviors through his/her surrounding group membership.

This paper anchors on these epistemological knowledge of the aforementioned theories, but extends on the idea of group membership in the context of perceiving relational others in the virtual media experience, as well as relating to celebrities as similar to 'significant others' who are flesh-and-blood to the individual.

The concept of social identity looks on "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1974, p. 69). It explores the premise of knowing whether others can be seen as representing 'us' or 'them' (e.g., social categorization process); and how this premise affects people's feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. The roles of celebrities in the social world of individuals is proposed in this study to also possess the emotional significance and 'othering' representations of whether they are perceived as belonging to the 'us' or 'them' of consumers. This is primarily manifested in the social categorization, social comparison, and social identification psychological processes that operate in the judgments and decisions of consumers in celebrity endorsement evaluations. The context of celebrities extends the special characteristics of the social contexts where analyzing and explaining social relations even in the virtual, mediatized personae are developed.

From the preceding discussion on celebrity effects and PSIR's potential to describe and guide such behaviors effects, this paper offers an operationalized empirical testing through two basic hypotheses (one is an affirmation from previous work (Centeno, 2010), and the other is a mathematical follow through). More formally, the hypotheses are:

- H1:** Celebrity parasocial interaction and relationship (PSIR) is positively related to a voter's voting preference towards a political endorsee
- H2:** Celebrity PSIR is a significant predictor of voter's probability of voting preferences for a political candidate
 - H2a:** Celebrity Kris Aquino's PSIR predicts voting preference towards candidate Noynoy Aquino
 - H2b:** Celebrity Manny Pacquiao's PSIR predicts voting preference towards candidate Manny Villar

- H2c:** Celebrity Sarah Geronimo's PSIR predicts voting preference towards candidate Loren Legarda
- H2d:** Celebrity Sharon Cuneta's PSIR predicts voting preference towards candidate Noynoy Aquino

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Approach

The research is set through a self-report descriptive survey of PSIR towards celebrity endorsers and the consequent effect of PSIR towards voting preferences to an endorsed political candidate. It gathered evidence that celebrity parasocial influence is a factor that contributes to the behavior of individuals. Also, demographic information items were asked among respondents in order for the study to confirm the differences PSIR make among social groups.

3.2 Focal Celebrity Exemplars

Four celebrities were purposively selected by the researcher based on their number of product endorsements and presence in the 2010 national elections campaign. The celebrities taken as cases were selected by the researcher in consideration with the number of product endorsements they had in the year before the election period (The Top 20 Endorsers of 2010, 2011) with the assumption that such criterion reflects more frequent exposure of these celebrities in the persuasive context and that they have more audience appreciation as implied by the number of advertisements they were engaged in. More importantly, these celebrities were selected because of their prominent participation in the national elections campaign activities such as endorsing candidates in various media platforms. The celebrities systematically selected to be exemplars were: Sharon Cuneta, Kris Aquino, Sarah Geronimo, and Manny Pacquiao.

3.3 Sample Collection and Survey Procedure

To investigate the above propositions on celebrity parasocial influences, the study used survey data collected in the last quarter of 2010 from voters residing in a district in Metro Manila, The Philippines. Through purposive sampling, 296 voters were recruited through snowball sampling following a sole criterion of being able to cast vote during the May 2010 elections. Firstly, the survey asked about their performed voting preference (whether they voted for the candidate or not) towards the political endorsees of the four celebrities. Then, it asked respondents to rate all four celebrities using the 28-item parasocial scale. Also, a set of demographic information of the respondents was asked in the survey: gender, family monthly income, educational attainment, place of origin, and their current occupation.

3.4 Measuring Parasocial Distinctions

The parasocial scale used in this study adopted most updated version by Auter and Palmgreen (2000)¹. These scale versions were developed and validated in analyzing favorite characters on television programs such as soap operas. *Norms and social value appreciation* dimension was added in the present study as a result of a prior qualitative investigation of PSIR in the Philippine setting. Overall, the parasocial scale used was composed of 28 items capturing the following seven dimensions of PSIR: attraction and personality interest, task attraction, identification, emotional interaction, attachment, group identification, and norms and values ($\alpha = 0.82$ in this study)¹. The items were answered through a five-point Likert scale (5 = strong agree, 1 = strong disagree). The statements in the scale were asked in both English and Filipino.

Table 1 presents the factor loadings of each item as a result of a factor analysis to confirm the substantive content or meaning of factors in each dimension. Thus, identifying groups of items that covary with one another and appear to define meaningful underlying latent variables such as the

¹ Centeno (2010) used parasocial interaction scale (PSIS) by Allen (1988) with four dimensions: perceived similarity, physical attraction, empathy, and emphatic actions.

dimensions. Three items comprise the added dimension *norms and values*: (1) "He/She has an idealized image of a Filipina/Filipino" (2) "We both have the same aspirations and frustrations in life" and (3) "I admire his/her strong faith in God whenever there are problems that he/she faces".

Table 1. Celebrity PSIR Scale

Item	Dimension	Factor Loading	Mean Score	SD
I am attracted to his/her personality	Attraction	0.9	3.2981	0.73185
I admire his/her talents		0.88	3.1563	0.70581
He/She possesses a good character		0.83	3.4789	0.72528
I admire him/her because we have similar interests in life.		0.62	2.7559	0.79175
I am happy with the way he/she handles problems.	Task and Problem Solving	0.82	2.0059	0.78287
I adore how he/she resolves conflicts.		0.55	2.8497	1.21318
I can see strength and courage whenever she faces challenges.	Attraction	0.88	2.3682	0.84118
I feel sad when other people try to ruin his/her image.		0.92	2.228	0.85069
I want to be like him or her in some aspects.	Identification	0.64	3.0701	0.82309
We both have positive outlook in life.		0.71	3.5532	0.73033
We both have close ties with our family.		0.72	3.2432	0.72249
I see myself in him/her in some ways.		0.56	2.9248	0.76638
He/she makes me want to join him/her in his/her shows.	Emotional Interaction	0.87	2.3834	0.83636
His/her TV shows makes me happy when I am sad		0.79	2.5861	0.82735
I feel what he/she feels whenever I watch him/her on TV.	Attachment	0.83	2.5135	0.81915
I often agree with what he/she says		0.71	2.7365	0.73949
I look for him/her on Facebook, Google, YouTube, and other sites just to see him/her.		0.79	2.8615	0.82044
I want to meet him/her in person.		0.79	3.2542	0.84484
I really see to it that I see his/her performances on TV and films.	Attachment	0.72	3.3446	0.80696
I want to see him/her everyday.		0.65	2.7095	0.75017
I see him/her just like a friend.	Group Identification	0.84	2.4265	0.80008
His/her characteristics are similar to that of my closest friends.		0.81	2.5473	0.87689
He/she reflects a character similar to that of a family member or a relative.		0.78	2.5144	0.88801
He/she can be good friend to me and to many others.		0.56	2.9654	0.8764
He/She strives hard to achieve his/her goals	Norms and Social Value Appreciation*	0.79	3.5507	0.84445
He/She has an idealized image of a Filipina/Filipino.		0.62	3.3125	0.75176
We both have the same aspirations and frustrations in life.		0.65	2.6664	0.89062
I admire his/her strong faith in God whenever there are problems that he/she faces.	Norms and Social Value Appreciation*	0.58	3.685	0.75786

Note: * additional dimension added in the present study

3.5 Data Analysis

To provide a descriptive view the PSIR results according to demographic features of the respondents, the mean differences and the PSIR scores for each demographic variable are computed

and compared. To test for the significant differences among social groups in terms of their PSIR, t-test and analysis of variance tests were employed using the respondents' scores in parasocial scale of each celebrity and the respondents' demographic information. Furthermore, point-biserial correlation and logistic regression analyses were employed to calculate the contribution of PSIR influence of the celebrity endorser to the actual voting preferences towards the political endorsees.

4 Results

4.1 Description of Demographic Differences in PSIR

The focal celebrities' parasocial scores differ significantly in several demographic variables: gender, socioeconomic class (income groups), educational attainment, and occupational classification of the respondents. These variables are indicators of social classes that have distinctions on how celebrities are parasocially appreciated (see Centeno, 2010). Descriptive statistical tests show these comparisons (see Table 2).

Table 2. Respondents demographic information and parasocial mean scores

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE	DEFINITION	SAMPLE SIZE n (%) (N=296)	PARASOCIAL SCORES				Variable Mean Comparisons
			Mean: Highest=140, Lowest= 28; (Standard Deviation)				
			Celebrity 1 (Sarah Geronimo)	Celebrity 2 (Kris Aquino)	Celebrity 3 (Manny Pacquiao)	Celebrity 4 (Sharon Cuneta)	
Gender	Biologically assigned sex						$t_{(296)} = 2.273, p=.024$
Male		145 (49%)	85.58*	68.14	99.53*	84.22	84.37
Female		151 (51%)	81.36*	69.36	81.91*	82.75	78.84
Socioeconomic Class*	estimated household income per month						$F_{(2,293)} = 2.305, p=.001^c$
Class A	above PHP 2,045,000.00	19 (6.4%)	71.94*	72.05*	72.58*	82.16	74.68
Class B	PHP 251,001.00 to PHP 2,045,000.00	108 (36.5%)	84.95*	71.18*	84.31*	78.12	79.64
Class C	below PHP 251,000.00	169 (57.1%)	82.99*	67.07*	93.41*	86.77	82.56
Education Attainment	highest level of educational attainment						$F_{(2,292)} = 5.027, p=.007^d$
College graduate to postgraduate	finished college degree, finished or earned some postgraduate units, including professional degrees	205 (70%)	82.02	69.96	80.69*	79.23*	77.97
Vocational to some college	finished vocational degree program, earned some units in college	49 (16.7%)	89.1	69.51	100.45*	93.46*	87.09
No education to some vocational	no formal education, earned high school diploma, and earned some units in vocational school	39 (13.3%)	80.18	64.15	114.28*	89.74*	88.13
Place of Origin	type of locality where the respondent was born and raised						$t_{(296)} = .267, p=.789, ns$

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE	DEFINITION	SAMPLE SIZE n (%) (N=296)	PARASOCIAL SCORES				
			Mean: Highest=140, Lowest= 28; (Standard Deviation)				
Urban	those who were born and raised in the national capital region Metro Manila	172 (58.1%)	84.38	73.69*	83.06*	82.1	3.19
Rural	those who were born and raised in the provinces before moving to Metro Manila to work or study	121 (40.9%)	82.08	63.02*	97.38*	85.94	3.21
Occupation ^a	occupational classifications that distinguish workers who perform manual labor from workers who perform professional jobs						$t_{(295)} = 3.084$, $p = .002$
White Collared Jobs ^b	those who perform manual labor	193 (65.2%)	81.8	70.11	81.97**	78.79**	78.17
Blue Collared Jobs and No Jobs ^b	those who perform professional jobs	102 (34.5%)	85.35	66.92	101.99**	92.09**	86.59

NOTES:

* significantly different at $p < .05$ ** significantly different at $p < .01$ (2-tailed)

a no response not included (0.3%)

b based on Pelfrene et al., 2001

c LSD post-hoc reveals that Class A and C differ significantly at $p < .05$, (2-tailed).d LSD post-hoc reveals that all educational levels differ from one another, significantly at $p < .05$, (2-tailed)

Results show that parasocial mean scores are significantly higher among males ($M = 84.37$) than females ($M = 78.84$), $t(296) = 2.273$, $p = .024$. Specifically, the most noticeable deviation of high scores among males is their parasociability towards Manny Pacquiao ($M = 99.53$), while females have significantly higher scores for Sarah Geronimo ($M = 85.58$). These findings suggest that gender groups' parasocial scores are indicative of their 'parasocial support' and self-reflection of themselves towards the celebrity exemplars.

There is an inverse pattern of parasocial scores with income groups, that is, the lower the income the higher the celebrity parasociability. Specifically, the scores of the three income groups in the study differ from one another. Lower income groups have highest parasocial scores ($M = 82.56$), followed by the middle-income ($M = 79.64$), and the lowest score comes from the highest-income respondents ($M = 74.68$), $F(2, 293) = 2.305$, $p = .001$, LSD post-hoc reveals that Class A and C differ significantly at $p < .05$, (2-tailed). However, it should be noted that the sample size for Class A is relatively smaller in proportion with only 6.4% of the total sample. Though statistical tests show significant differences, interpretations should be limited to the sample only.

The educational levels are recoded into three clusters: (1) from 'no formal education to some years in vocational/technical/associate' degree-granting school, (2) finished vocational/technical/associate degree to some years in college, and (3) finished college degree to postgraduate and professional degree. Results show that those who are in the first cluster have the highest parasocial score ($M = 88.13$) while those in the last cluster expressed the lowest parasociability towards celebrities ($M = 77.97$), $F(2, 292) = 5.027$, $p = .007$; LSD post-hoc reveals that all educational levels differ from one another, significantly at $p < .05$, (2-tailed).

The type of job one has is seen as a symbolic and an economic capital towards the advancement and social positioning of order. Two types of jobs are classified in the study: white-collared jobs and

blue-collared jobs. Findings show that those engaged in white-collared jobs have lower celebrity parasociability score ($M = 78.17$) than those in blue-collared jobs ($M = 86.59$), $t(295) = 3.084$, $p = .002$.

These findings confirm results in previous work (Centeno, 2010) on differentiating PSIR according to demographic variables. Theoretically, these suggest social groups' validation of taste and social positioning. Practically, these offer potential attributive voter segmentations.

4.2 PSIR's Predictive Value to Voting Preference

To demonstrate the relationship that occurs between celebrity endorser's PSIR and voting preference towards an endorsed candidate, the mean scores of PSIR scale and the answers to reported voting preference (0: 'not voted for' vs 1: 'voted for' the candidate) were tested using a point-biserial correlation approach.

Results show that there is a significant correlation between PSIR and voting preference, all cases $r_{pb}(N = 1184) = .21$, $p < .01$.² However, when taken into account the individual pairs four celebrities and four political candidate only two pairs were significant: Kris Aquino, $r_{pb}(N = 296) = .22$, $p < .01$; and Sarah Geronimo, $r_{pb}(N = 296) = .25$, $p < .01$. The other two did not show any significant correlations: Manny Pacquiao: $r_{pb}(N = 296) = .07$, $p < .42$, *ns*, and Sharon Cuneta: $r_{pb}(N = 296) = .10$, $p < .90$, *ns*.

This means that although the mechanism of PSIR suggests relationship with voting preferences, not all celebrities' PSIR may be associated with the said dependent variable. Hypothesis 1, therefore, is partially supported.

To systematically describe the influence of celebrity PSIR to voting preference towards a political endorsee, a logit model is proposed to capture the predictive value of PSIR. Logistic model theoretical derivations are discussed in Menard (2002). Equation 1 shows the logit model:

$$\Pr(\text{Vote} | X_1) = \frac{\exp(\alpha + \beta_1 X_1)}{1 + \exp(\alpha + \beta_1 X_1)} \quad (1)$$

- where Pr (Vote): probability of voting for the endorsed candidate given a celebrity's PSIR score
 α : constant
 β_1 : coefficient of determination for PSIR
 X_1 : celebrity endorser's PSIR

The influence that can be attributed to a celebrity's parasociability was measured through the items on reported voting behavior towards the political endorsees by the celebrities. The logit model was estimated in four pairs with $N = 296$ each as well as the combined total cases $N = 1184$. A test of the full model against a constant only model was statistically significant, indicating that the celebrity parasocial predictor as a set reliably distinguished between voters and nonvoters of the candidate, $\chi^2(1) = 26.939$, $p < .001$.

Results of model estimation suggest two major points: one, on the average, celebrity PSIR is a potential significant variable in predicting voting preference towards a political endorsee; two, not all celebrities (in this study, not all four) PSIR have significant impact on preferences among voters.

Table 3 shows the model estimation using the logit model. Nagelkerke's R^2 of .21 indicated a fair relationship between prediction and grouping. Overall prediction success was 67%. The Wald criterion demonstrated that celebrity parasocial scores made a significant contribution to voting behavior prediction ($p = .024$). $\text{EXP}(\beta_{\text{PSIR}})$ value indicates that it is 1.017 times more likely that the voter will vote for the political endorsee when his/her celebrity parasocial score is increased by one point. (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). The regression coefficients of each celebrity's parasocial scores are also providing significant predictive results (see Table 3).

Looking at the coefficients of celebrity Kris Aquino PSIR to voting preference probability to candidate Noynoy Aquino voting preference, a significant β_{PSIR} of .164 ($p = .022$) suggests a predictive value of PSIR in this pair's case. Also, the constant was significant ($\alpha = -.901$; $p < .05$) suggesting that

² In Centeno (2010), $r_{pb} = .421$, $p < .01$ with 13 pairs of celebrity-candidate correlation analysis.

the intercept should be included in the model. The effect on the odds of a 1-unit increase in PSIR is $\exp(.164) = 1.178$, meaning that it is 1.178 times more likely that political endorsee Noynoy Aquino be voted upon when PSIR score is increased by one unit; with 62.2% observed prediction success ($R^2 = .18$, or 18% of the variability of voting preferences).

Meanwhile, the coefficients of celebrity Sarah Geronimo's PSIR to probable voting preference to candidate Loren Legarda, a significant β_{PSIR} of .532 ($p = .042$) also suggests a predictive value of PSIR in the pair's case. The constant was not significant suggesting that the intercept may not be necessary in the model ($\alpha = -.901$; $p > .05$). The effect on the odds of a 1-unit increase in PSIR is $\exp(.532) = 1.702$, meaning that it is 1.702 times more likely that political endorsee Loren Legarda be voted upon when the PSIR score is increased by one unit; with 91.6% observed prediction success (effect size $R^2 = .29$, or 29% of the variability of voting preferences).

However, the PSIR coefficient β_{PSIR} of Sharon Cuneta is not significant ($p = .964$), and if so, the $\exp(\beta) = 1.007$ is very small. Finally, Manny Pacquiao's negative $\beta_{\text{PSIR}} = -.160$ is also not significant.

To make the interpretations for parasocial score – voting preference relationship more meaningful, a scale-based than a score-based analysis may be useful and easily interpretable. In other words, though mathematically sound, computing the celebrity parasocial scores ranging from 1 to 240 may provide microscopic results. It will be more meaningful and logical if calculation of odds ratio is done through a scale-based logic: multiples of five (i.e., strongly agreeing to one item in the parasocial scale) may be more meaningful. Thus, increasing the parasocial score by 5, the B coefficient is 5 (0.017) = 0.085. The odds ratio is $\exp 0.085 = 1.0887$. It is 1.089 times more likely that the voter will vote for the political endorsee when the parasocial score is increased by 5.

Model estimates are tested and validated by statistical tools suited for a logistic regression. In particular, H-L test, Wald criterion, and the Omnibus test of model coefficient were used to evaluate the models and their goodness-of-fit statistics. Goodness-of-fit statistics assess the fit of a logistic model against actual outcomes (i.e., whether PSIR scores predicted voting preferences). The inferential goodness-of-fit test uses the Hosmer–Lemeshow (H–L) test that yielded a $\chi^2(8)$ of 13.805 and was insignificant ($p > .05$), suggesting that the model was fit to the data well. In other words, the null hypothesis of a good model fit to data was tenable. The models appropriating the PSIR of celebrities Kris Aquino, $\chi^2(8) = 13.805$; $p > .05$ ns, and Sarah Geronimo, $\chi^2(8) = 13.805$; $p > .05$ ns, also attained goodness-of-fit.

The statistical significance of individual regression coefficients (i.e., β s) is tested using the Wald chi-square statistic. As seen in Table 3, PSIR is a significant predictor of voting preferences ($p < .05$) when all cases were taken into account ($Wald = 1.103$, $p < .05$); also in the endorsement of Kris Aquino ($Wald = 1.472$, $p < .05$) and Sarah Geronimo ($Wald = 3.488$, $p < .05$). The same principle is given by the Omnibus test of model coefficient through χ^2 . From table 3, the $\chi^2(1)$ for the overall cases is 1.10, significant at $p = .024$. This is a test of the null hypothesis that adding PSIR to the null model has not significantly increased its ability to predict the preferences made by the respondent-voters. In other words, the PSIR coefficient is a significant predictor. Such significant level also occurs in the PSIR coefficients of celebrities Kris Aquino and Sarah Geronimo.

Table 3. Model Estimation

Parameter Estimation	Effect of Celebrity Endorser's PSIR to Voting Preference to Political Candidate (in parentheses)				
	Manny Pacquiao (Manny Villar)	Kris Aquino (Noynoy Aquino)	Sarah Geronimo (Loren Legarda)	Sharon Cuneta (Noynoy Aquino)	All Celebrity Exemplars
Constant, α	-1.47	-.901*	-4.037	-.517	-.911*
Celebrity Parasocial Score Coefficient, β_{PSIR}	-.160	.164*	.532*	.007	0.017*
Standard Error	.200	.135	.285	.151	.076

Parameter Estimation	Effect of Celebrity Endorser's PSIR to Voting Preference to Political Candidate (in parentheses)				
Exp (β) (<i>p</i> value)	.852 (.425)	1.178* (.022)	1.702* (.042)	1.007 (.964)	1.017* (.024)
Overall Success Prediction	87.2%	62.2%	91.6%	62.2%	67%
Nagelkerke's R^2	0.07	0.18	0.29	0.01	0.21
Omnibus Test of Model Coefficient, χ^2 (<i>p</i> value), <i>df</i> = 1	.641 (.423)	1.48* (.022)	3.843* (.05)	.002 (.964)	1.10 (.024)
H-L Test χ^2 (<i>p</i> value), <i>df</i> = 8	3.210 (.020)	9.5 (.302)	20.48 (.319)	27.702 (.001)	13.805 (.087)
Wald criterion	.637 (.425)	1.472* (.022)	3.488* (.042)	.002 (.964)	1.103* (.024)
<i>N</i>	296	296	296	296	1,184

Note: * denotes significant parameter, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 2 was supported. However the sub-hypotheses were not all supported, as only two (H2a and H2c) yielded significant model coefficients for PSIR. Results can yield interpretations in decomposing the factors that contribute to voting preferences of individuals. The overall effect size of 21% of the variability of voting preferences is accounted for by the celebrity's PSIR. It suggests that among the factors voters consider when voting for a candidate, a significant portion (21%) is the effect of personality of the celebrities themselves. It is consistent with how analysts view the role of celebrity as a glitter in the package of communication campaigns (Coutas, 2006). Though no previous work has explicitly modeled celebrity PSIR's effect to voting behaviors of individuals, this paper's findings support previous literature on celebrity's behavioral effects particularly those anchored on parasocial effects (e.g., Hung, 2014; Hung, Chan, & Tse, 2011; Fraser & Brown, 2002; Kozinets, 2001; Doss, 1999; Boon & Lomore, 2001).

Another interesting question, both practically and theoretically, is that why not all focal celebrities in the study did not exhibit significant coefficient (i.e., β_{PSIR}) as a predictor of voting preference towards an endorsed candidate. Intuitively, one explanation is that the celebrity's personality is not geared to elicit enough parasocial interaction and relationships from the audience or in this context, voters, to convert such relational attitude to behavior. Previous theorizing suggests that for PSIR to develop (i.e., antecedents), the celebrity, or other media persona for this matter, should appear continuously in the consciousness of the audience (Auter & Palmgreen, 1992, 2000). Looking back at the time of data collection in 2010, or the timeframe when election campaign period was undertaking, the visibility of Kris Aquino and Sarah Geronimo was scattered around media platforms, unlike the periodic appearances of Sharon Cuneta and Manny Pacquiao.

Another point of discussion is the negligible effect size of PSIR of celebrities Manny Pacquiao (7%) and Sharon Cuneta (1%). This means that their endorsements did not count at all in the voting decisions among individuals. Other factors (predictors) may have played in the evaluations of the endorsed candidates Manny Villar and Noynoy Aquino, which reasons and factors remain to be investigated in future research.

In summary, this research is positioned in a relational perspective in celebrity endorsements where social identities serve as an anchorage of the appeals posed by the celebrities. Deriving from the theory of parasocial interaction and relationships, the relational perspective sees celebrities as an influence from the extension of consumers' social circle, which could be more pronounced in a collectivistic society such as The Philippines where the research context draws empirical evidence. Moreover, it is argued that such social influence from celebrities to the individuals is translated through the former's parasocial influence.

5 Conclusions and Implications

If in the past, people traditionally regard political success in terms of acquiring a position to having the combination of 'guns, gold, and glory', these days, another kind of 'g' is seen to be added – "glitter" (Coutas, 2006). This could refer to the prominence that a political candidate receives from to the attribution of celebrities that are, or, could be attached to them. Combined with many campaigns on the media, celebrities add the glitter to the character that politicians construct through the media platforms (Drake & Higgins, 2006). The exorbitance of celebrity's contemporary cultural visibility is certainly unprecedented, and the role that the celebrity plays across many aspects of the cultural field has certainly expanded and multiplied in recent years, thus the phenomenon of 'celebrification' (Centeno, 2010). A number of advertisements that feature celebrities as their spokespersons would attest to that claim. Their roles vary and their effects are enormous as well. They are even more noticed in the context of political communication during campaign periods. The role of celebrity endorsers does heighten the receptivity of the voters to the advertisements of political candidates.

Relational paradigm in celebrity endorsements is offered in this paper following PSIR theoretical development from the original paper of Horton and Wohl (1956). This line of research area embedding parasocial interaction in celebrity studies changes the typical psychological assumptions and measurements such as attention, physical attractiveness, and most advertising research utilize in their marketing decisions (Baker & Churchill, 1977; Bower & Landreth, 2001; Debevec & Kernan, 1984). Celebrities, as a social construction and at the same time a media product pose a great significance in the societal affairs be it large or not.

Advertising and marketing approaches could benefit on the findings of this research where these areas of integrated marketing communications can gain information for planning and strategies for public engagement and communication campaigns (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). The inclusion of celebrities as opinion leaders and influence opium could be better executed by knowing patterns of behaviors that involves the relationship between celebrities and the audiences.

Celebrity ambassadorship becomes an apparent effective and yet a critical tool in reaching the public (Aaker, Batra, & Myers, 1992; Erdogan, 1999; Fleck & Quester, 2007; Friedman, Termini, & Washington, 1976; Walker, Langmeyer, & Langmeyer, 1992). Both private and public enterprises have gone to the aid of the popularity of celebrities in communicating the organization's purposes for the public. It is important that celebrity paradigm be enlarged into a sociological function such as expressions of tastes and distinctions among consumer cultures. This study could present paradigms on what the celebrities can do to stakeholder organizations and individuals in the way they decide on persuasions that happen on the media—how celebrities become influential in their everyday encounters with the society, be it in micro or macro in extent.

This research also finds relevance in celebrities' role in marketing communication and related strategic tools such as brand management, measuring advertising effectiveness, and public relations and communication campaigns that involve selection of celebrity endorsers or ambassadors. The PSIR scale model could aid practitioners and managers to assess celebrity candidates to be hired as endorsers. Finally, the logit model of celebrity PSIR could also be applied in other behaviors have= discrete choices such as brand choice and behavioral intents.

6 Future Research

The definitions and exemplars of celebrity in this study are limited to the mainstream 'stars' in the social world (e.g., entertainment and sports). An extension in future research is to look at how individuals and their social groups parasocially react and develop affiliations to other types of celebrities such as those in reality shows, broadcast, social media celebrities, and the 'celebrity' in the politicians themselves. Future research can also include other variables in the voting preference logit model, thereby making it multinomial. Also, the model in this paper needs to be retested for robustness check; a longitudinal approach using the same scale may be appropriate and yet calls for a longer period of investigation (accounting for a number of election periods). The paper used a

nonprobabilistic criterion sampling technique. Future research can opt to choose a probabilistic data collection tool to check the model's robustness across populations.

One interesting phenomenon in the Philippine elections scenario is the seemingly prevalent media priming strategies of political candidates' through media mileages (i.e., media coverage such as weddings, TV commercials, or TV guestings in celebrity shows such as talk shows or feature programs) on some periods before the election campaign period. Their appearances and prominence in the media do not explicitly pronounce their intentions on running for political posts, thereby making themselves be 'like celebrities' (as in celebrification phenomenon discussed in Centeno, 2010). However, some individuals, or voters for this matter, create 'lay theories' (i.e., common-person beliefs) on the political intentions of such media mileages. Future research can study how such activities affect consequent voting behaviors towards candidates and the role that celebrification strategy partakes in the process.

Theoretical extensions may also look at the drivers of distinctions of PSIR among celebrities as explained by and correlated to social psychological constructs such as social isolation or other social needs, intrinsic motivations, and other antecedents and consequences of parasocial distinctiveness among mediated personae such as celebrities. Finally, though the model proposed, estimated, and evaluated in the paper could indirectly capture discrete choices such as brand choice, future research on celebrity parasocial-relational model in celebrity endorsements should gear towards brand evaluations in consumer marketing.

References

- Aaker, D. A., Batra, R., & Myers, J. G. (1992). *Advertising management* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allen, C. (1988). Parasocial interaction and local TV news: Perceptions of news teams and news personalities in Denver. Presented to the Radio-TV Journalism Division of AEJMC, Portland, Oregon.
- Atkin, C., & Block, M. (1983). Effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 23(1), 57-61.
- Auter, P. J., & Palmgreen, P. (1992). Development of a new parasocial interaction measure: The audience-persona interaction scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 17(1), 79-89.
- Auter, P. J., & Palmgreen, P. (2000). Development and validation of a parasocial interaction measure: The audience-persona interaction scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 17(1), 79-89.
- Baker, M. J., & Churchill, G. A. (1977). The impact of physically attractive models on advertising evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14, 538-555.
- Biswas, D., Biswas, A., & Das, N. (2006). The differential effects of celebrity and expert endorsements on consumer risk perceptions. The role of consumer knowledge, perceived congruency, and product technology orientation. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(2), 17-31.
- Boon, S., & Lomore, C. (2001). Admirer-celebrity relationships among young adults: Explaining perceptions of celebrity influence on identity. *Human Communication Research*, 27(3), 432-465.
- Bower, A. B., & Landreth, S. (2001). Is beauty best? Highly versus normally attractive models in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 30(1), 1-12.
- Brinberg, D., & Plimpton, L. (1986). Self-monitoring and product conspicuousness on reference group influence. In R. J. Lutz (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research* (pp. 297-300). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Burnkrant, R., & Cousineau, A. (1975). Informational and normative social influence in buyer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(3), 206-215.
- Butler, P., & Collins, N. (1996). Strategic analysis in political markets. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(10/11), 25-36.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1984). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In T. C. Kinnear (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research* (pp. 673-675). Provo UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Callcott, M., & Phillips, B. J. (1996). Observations: Elves make good cookies: Creating likable spokesperson advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36(5), 73-79.
- Centeno, D. (2010). Celebification in Philippine politics: Exploring the relationship between celebrity endorsers' parasociability and the public's voting behavior. *Social Science Diliman*, 6(1), 66-85.
- Choi, S. M., Lee, W. N., & Kim, H. J. (2005). Lessons from the rich and famous: A cross-cultural comparison of celebrity endorsement in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(2), 85-98.
- Coutas, P. (2006). Fame, fortune, fantasi: Indonesian idol and the new celebrity. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16(4), 371-392.
- Das, M. (2011). Gender role portrayals in Indian television ads. *Sex Roles*, 64, 208-222.
- Debevec, K., & Kernan, J. (1984). More evidence on the effects of a presenter's physical attractiveness: Some cognitive, affective, and behavioral consequences. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 127-132.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgments. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51, 629-636.
- Dholakia, R., & Sternthal, B. (1977). Highly credible sources: Persuasive facilitators or persuasive liabilities? *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3, 223-232.
- Doss, E. (1999). *Elvis culture: Faith and image*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Drake, P., & Higgins, M. (2006). I'm a celebrity, get me into politics. In S. Holmes & S. Redmond (Eds.), *Framing celebrity: New directions in celebrity culture* (pp. 87-100). London: Routledge.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 161-186.
- Erdogan, B. Z. (1999). Celebrity endorsement: A literature review. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4), 291-314.

- Erdogan, B. Z. (2001). Selecting celebrity endorsers: The practitioner's perspective. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(3), 39-48.
- Erdogan, B. Z., & Kitchen, P. J. (1998). Managerial mindsets and the symbolic relationship between sponsorship and advertising. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 16*(6), 369-374.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fleck, N., & Quester, P. (2007). Birds of a feather flock together... definition, role, and measure of congruence: An application to sponsorship. *Psychology & Marketing, 24*(11), 975-1000.
- Fraser, B. P., & Brown, W. J. (2002). Media, celebrities, and social influence: Identification with Elvis Presley. *Mass Communication and Society, 5*(2), 183-206.
- Friedman, H. H., Termini, S., & Washington, R. (1976). The effectiveness of advertisements utilizing four types of endorsers. *Journal of Advertising, 5*, 22-24.
- Giles, D. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology, 4*, 279-305.
- Harris, P., & Lock, A. (2010). "Mind the gap": The rise of political marketing and a perspective on its future agenda. *European Journal of Marketing, 44*(3/4), 297-307.
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19*, 215-29.
- Hosmer, D., & Lemeshow, S. (2000). *Applied logistic regression* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hovland, C., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 15*, 635-650.
- Hovland, C., Janis, I., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hung, K. (2014). Why celebrity sells: A dual entertainment path model of brand endorsement. *Journal of Advertising, 43*(2), 155-166.
- Hung, K., Chan, K., & Tse, C. (2011). Assessing celebrity endorsement effects in China: A consumer-celebrity relational approach. *Journal of Advertising Research, 51*(4), 609-623.
- Jackson, D. J. & Darrow, T. I. (2005). The influence of celebrity endorsements on young adults' political opinions. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 10*(3), 80-98.
- Kahle, L. R., & Homer, P. M. (1985). Physical attractiveness of the celebrity endorser: A social adaptation perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research, 11*(4), 954-961.
- Kamins, M. A. (1990). An investigation into the "match-up" hypothesis in celebrity advertising: When beauty may be only skin deep. *Journal of Advertising, 19*, 4-13.
- Kamins, M. A., & Gupta, K. (1994). Congruence between spokesperson and product type: A matchup hypothesis perspective. *Psychology & Marketing, 11*, 569-586.
- Kelman, H. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 25*(1), 57-78.
- Kozinets, R. (2001). Utopian enterprise: Articulating the meaning of Star Trek's culture of consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*(1), 67-88.
- Levy, M. R. (1979). Watching news as para-social interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting, 23*(1), 69-80.
- Lin, C. A. (2001). Cultural difference in message strategies: A comparison between American and Japanese commercials. *Journal of Advertising Research, 33*(5), 40-48.
- Marland, A. (2003). Marketing political soap: A political marketing view of selling candidates like soap, of electioneering as a ritual, and of electoral military analogies. *Journal of Public Affairs, 3*(2), 103-115.
- McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16*(3), 310-321.
- McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., & Brown, J. R. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. *Media Studies: A Reader, 271*, 284.
- Menard, S. (2002). *Applied logistic regression analysis* (Vol. 106). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Misra, S., & Beatty, S. E. (1990). Celebrity spokesperson and brand congruence: An assessment of recall and affect. *Journal of Business Research, 21*, 159-171.
- Ohanian, R. (1990). The impact of celebrity spokesperson's perceived image on consumers' intention to purchase. *Journal of Advertising Research, 31*(1), 46-54.

- Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rosengreen, K. E. (1985). Uses and gratifications research: The past ten years. In K. E. Rosengreen, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), *Media gratifications research: Current perspectives* (pp. 11-37). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Perse, E. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1989). Attribution in social and parasocial relationships. *Communication Research*, 16(1), 59-77.
- Petty, R., Cacioppo, J., & Schumann, D. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(2), 135-146.
- Price, L., Feick, L., & Higie, R. (1989). Preference heterogeneity and coorientation as determinants of referent influence in the choice of service providers. *Journal of Business Research*, 19(3), 227-242
- Royo-Vela, M., Aldas-Manzano, J., Kuster, I., & Vila, N. (2007). Adaptation of marketing activities to cultural and social context: Gender role portrayals and sexism in Spanish commercials. *Sex Roles*, 58(5-6), 379-390.
- Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 14(2), 246-268.
- Rubin, A. M. & Rubin, R. B. (1985). Interface of personal and mediated communication: A research agenda. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2(1), 36-53.
- Russell, C. A. & Stern, B. S. (2006). Consumers, characters, and products: A balance model of sitcom product placement effects. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(1), 7-21.
- Schickel, R. (2000). *Intimate strangers: The culture of celebrity in America*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Schramm, H. (2015). Parasocial interactions and relationships. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The Concise Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 438-439). United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Srull, T., & Wyer, R. (1989). Person memory and judgment. *Psychological Review*, 96(1), 58-83.
- Sternthal, B., Dholakia, R., & Leavitt, C. (1978). The persuasive effect of source credibility: Tests of cognitive response. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4, 252-260.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65-93.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings. Key readings in social psychology* (pp. 276-293). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Thomson, M. (2006). Human brands: Investigating antecedents to consumers' strong attachments to celebrities. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3), 104-119.
- The 20 Top Endorsers of 2010. (2011, August). *Yes!*. Philippines: Summit Media Philippines.
- Uray, N., & Burnaz, S. (2003). An analysis of the portrayal of gender roles in Turkish television advertisements. *Sex Roles*, 48(1-2), 77-87.
- Vorderer, P. (1996). Picard, Brinkmann, Derrick & Co. as friends of the viewer: An exploratory study of parasocial relationship with TV characters. In P. Vorderer (Ed.), *Fernsehen* (pp. 153-172). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Walker, M., Langmeyer, L., & Langmeyer, D. (1992). Commentary: Celebrity endorsers: Do you get what you pay for?. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6(4), 35-42.
- Wood, N.T., & Herbst, K. C. (2007). Political star power and political parties. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 6(2-3), 141-158.
- Wyer, R. (2007). Principles of mental representation. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 285-307). New York: Guilford Press.