# Psychometric vs. C-OAR-SE measures of brand love: A reply to Rossiter

**Aaron Ahuvia · Richard P. Bagozzi · Rajeev Batra**

**Abstract** Rossiter (Marketing Lett 23: 905–916, 2012) provides a critique of the brand love measure from Batra et al. (J Marketing 76: 1–16, 2012) and offers a new measure of brand love to be used in its stead. In this reply, we argue that our measure is more consistent with the best available understanding on love and brand love. We also note several serious problems in the underlying definition of love used by Rossiter and problems in the way his definition is operationalized in his measure.

**Keywords** Brand love · Love · C-OAR-SE method · Construct validity · Content validity · Prototypes

## 1 Introduction

Rossiter (2012) provides a critique of the conceptualization and measurement of brand love by Batra et al. (2012) (BAB hereafter) and Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). Rossiter (2012) rejects past definitions of love and brand love, as well as "the now-standard

A. Ahuvia (✉)
College of Business, University of Michigan-Dearborn, Fairlane Center South, 19000 Hubbard Drive, Dearborn, MI 48126, USA
e-mail: Ahuvia@umich.edu

R. P. Bagozzi · R. Batra
Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, 701 Tappan Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

R. P. Bagozzi
e-mail: bagozzi@umich.edu

R. Batra
e-mail: rajeevba@umich.edu

R. P. Bagozzi
Clinical, Social and Administrative Sciences, College of Pharmacy, University of Michigan, 701 Tappan Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

'psychometrics' approach" (Rossiter 2012, p. 906) to measurement. He argues for his alternative system of measurement called C-OAR-SE[1], as well as an alternative definition of love, with a corresponding brand love measure. Science advances through critique, and this debate addresses issues central to consumer–brand relationship research. So we would like to thank Dr. Rossiter for contributing to the brand love literature with his work. And it is in this spirit of open inquiry that we offer our reply and a discussion of brand love that we hope is useful to a wider audience. Because BAB is an advance on Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), this reply will focus on the former.

Since Rossiter (2012) is partly a demonstration project for *construct* definition, C-OAR-SE, one might expect his definition of love to fit well with measurement priorities that underlie C-OAR-SE, which are, first and foremost, the need to begin with an accurate definition of the construct in question. However, we will demonstrate below that Rossiter's definition of brand love is not an accurate reflection of that construct; whereas the measure of brand love from BAB is better in this regard, since it is based on extensive consumer data and a more accurate characterization of the prior literature. Below, we show this by comparing Rossiter's, and our, coverage of different dimensions or components of love; the distinction between the emotion of love and the relationship called love; and the appropriateness of a prototype, rather than a classic definitional, approach to understanding what constitutes love. Our focus in this paper is on these substantive issues related to what constitutes brand love—space limitations do not allow for a more general discussion of the C-OAR-SE approach to measurement.

## 2 C-OAR-SE theory and content validity

Rossiter argues that the "only requirement of a measure is expert-assessed high content validity" (Rossiter 2012). Content validity and construct validity are quite similar, but differ in that content validity is assessed by having experts evaluate a measure, whereas construct validity can be assessed through statistical tests on data provided by respondents, as well as by experts (Bagozzi et al. 1991). Rossiter writes that "(a)ll previous measures of brand love designed by academics and practitioners have suffered content validity problems" (Rossiter 2012, p. 907). We agree with Rossiter that a measure must accurately reflect the content it claims to measure, and if it does not, the measure is invalid regardless of how beautiful its statistical properties may be. Since we (i.e., Rossiter and the current authors) agree on this goal, it can serve as a shared basis on which to judge BAB and Rossiter (2012). Our most central claim is *that the measures presented in BAB are a more accurate reflection of love in general, and brand love in particular, than is the measure put forward by Rossiter (*2012*).*

## 3 What is (brand) love?

Many the differences between Rossiter (2012) and BAB stem from their differing conceptualizations of love in general, which then carry over to their respective

---

[1] C-OAR-SE is "an acronym for its six procedural steps of Construct definition, Object representation, Attribute classification, Rater-entity identification, Scale (item type and answer format) selection, and Enumeration (scoring)" (Rossiter 2011, p. 1562).

definitions of brand love. Based on a series of multi-method studies, BAB find that brand love is a type of consumer–brand relationship typified by the following:

*Positive attitude valence*: The consumer evaluates the love object positively.
*Positive emotional connection*: The consumer experiences positive emotions when thinking about, or using, the love object; feels emotionally bonded to it; and believes there is a natural fit between themselves and the love object.
*Self-brand integration*: The love object is integrated into the consumer's self, expressing deeply held values and important group identities, and providing intrinsic rewards. The consumer frequently thinks and talks about the love object.
*Passion-driven behaviors*: The consumer is passionately involved with the love object, has interacted with it frequently in the past, including investing money and time in it, and desires to continue this involvement.
*Long-term relationship*: The consumer wishes the love object to be a part of his or her life for a long time to come.
*Anticipated separation distress*: If the love object were to disappear, it would be emotionally painful for the consumer.
*Attitude strength*: The consumer has a high degree of certainty in, and confidence about, his opinions regarding the love object.

In contrast, Rossiter (2012) defines love as the simultaneous experience of both affection (or perhaps passion? see discussion below) and separation anxiety, provided that the intensity of this experience is quite high. We will now evaluate these two quite different definitions of love, in more detail.

3.1 Is love an emotion, a relationship, or both?

One contribution of BAB was to explicitly recognize that the word "love" sometimes refers to an emotion (e.g., love, joy, loathing, anger, disgust) but at other times refers to a relationship (e.g., love, friendship, enmity). This distinction should not be overlooked because the love emotion is quite different from the love relationship.

The love emotion is a single, specific feeling, akin to affection (Richins 1997), which, like all emotions, is short term and episodic. In contrast, the love relationship, like the friendship relationship, can last for decades and involves numerous affective, cognitive, and behavioral experiences (Fournier 1998). (BAB, p. 2)

BAB found that in qualitative in-depth interviews, consumers almost always used the word love to refer to the love relationship rather than the love emotion. Rossiter (2012) seems to have overlooked the portions of our paper addressing this issue, as he states that "Batra et al.'s qualitative developmental research… paints love as a very intense emotion" (p. 915). On the contrary, these data paint love as a relationship characterized by a variety of emotions (e.g., passion, affection, happiness, sadness, longing, desire, contentment, anger, fear, frustration and pride, among others), some of which were very intense, indicating passionate love, but others of which were affectionate and relaxed, indicating companionate love.

## 3.2 Passionate and companionate forms of love

Most theories of love recognize the distinction between passionate, "hot," romantic love on the one hand and a more affectionate, "warm," companionate love on the other (Hatfield 1988). BAB include a romantic/passionate component, which is only sometimes present in brand love, hence allowing for both passionate and companionate forms of love. Rossiter (2012, p. 910) defines brand love as "being like romantic love," but provides no justification for this choice to omit companionate love. Choosing to define brand love exclusively as the consumer equivalent of romantic love has several drawbacks. First, research has found that romantic love is less central to love in general, than is companionate love (Fehr and Sprecher 2009; Fehr 1988, 2009). Second, interviews with consumers show that their experiences of brand love are not always akin to romantic love (Ahuvia 1993; BAB), so a broader definition of brand love is needed to cover the range of actual consumer experience. And third, from a managerial standpoint, romantic love has the advantage of including a very passionate form of attraction, but the disadvantage of not describing many ongoing consumer–brand relationships. It was based on these considerations that Ahuvia (1993) and BAB provided broader definitions that include, but are not limited to, romantic/passionate love. Because the BAB measure assesses the intensity of many different aspects of brand love, it allows researchers to distinguish between passionate, companionate, and other forms of brand love as well.

Rossiter's definition of brand love, as equivalent to romantic/passionate love alone, also underlies his objection to our description of some respondents as having low levels of love for some brands. Rossiter (2011b) argues that love is a "TYPE 2" emotion that is "not continuous in intensity" (p. 85) but rather is "experienced all-or-nothing and must be measured binary" (p. 83). In other words, Rossiter sees romantic love as an emotion with only one intensity setting—high. Thus, he objects to our characterization of some consumers as having a low level of brand love. Rossiter's critique is somewhat intuitive if you limit brand love to passionate love, since it is then oxymoronic to talk about not-very-passionate passionate love. But, based on our consumer data, we view brand love as also including companionate love, which covers the full spectrum of intensity levels. Semantically, talking about low levels of brand love allows us to be clear, because "brand love" accurately identifies the construct and "low" identifies the person's score. Replacing "low levels of love" with "liking" would be less clear, because liking does not necessarily identify the same underlying construct as love. The concept of "low levels of brand love" is also very important managerially. It turns out that the brand love model predicts consumer behavior very well ($R^2$=0.67), even when the respondents ranged from neutral (no love) to having only a little love for the brand in question.

Although Rossiter (2012) defines brand love as being a form only of romantic/passionate love, his discussion of the attributes of brand love is inconsistent with that definition. On page 909, he defines love as a combination of passion and separation anxiety: "passion is itself a defining component of 'love' (the other defining component… being separation anxiety)." Including passion in this definition is consistent with his claim that brand love is analogous to romantic love. Yet on page 908, he defines love as a combination of deep affection and separation anxiety.

> Brand love is achieved only when "Deep Affection" (not "Positive Affect," which is too weak an attribute) and "Separation Anxiety" (not "Anticipated" anxiety;

anxiety must be currently felt, not "anticipated") are jointly felt in relation to the potential love object. And it's a very real feeling, not a "latent" one.

These two conflicting definitions create a substantive dilemma for Rossiter. The key difference between companionate love and romantic love is that romantic love includes a high level of passion—indeed, it is sometimes simply called "passionate love" (Hatfield 1988). So to be consistent with his focus on romantic love, he should include passion in his definition of brand love. However, Rossiter's actual measure asks about "deep affection" and makes no mention of passion. Hence, his measure does not reflect the construct—romantic love—that he is interested in.

3.3 What are the components of love?

Rossiter (2012, p. 908) claims that love is the simultaneous experience of deep affection (or passion?) and separation anxiety. Rossiter makes separation anxiety central to his definition of love yet provides no rationale for contradicting Regan et al. (1998) who found that separation anxiety was only a peripheral feature of love. Rossiter's insistence that love entails only "currently felt, not 'anticipated' anxiety," overlooks the important role of anticipated anxiety in decision making (see also Bagozzi et al. 1998). Moreover, to our knowledge, Rossiter's definition of love is not shared by any other researchers. The closest idea previously stated in the literature is probably love as experienced by people with extremely anxious attachment styles (Hatfield et al. 2000; Johnson et al. 2012; Vlachos et al. 2012). Rossiter erroneously cites Hatfield and Rapson (2000) as the lone source of this definition of love. We contacted Hatfield who informed us that Rossiter's definition was neither stated nor implied by Hatfield and Rapson (2000), nor anywhere else in her work.[2]

In sum, C-OAR-SE places an overriding emphasis on content validity, in which the definition of a construct, and the corresponding measures, is assessed through expert judgment. One unresolved problem for the C-OAR-SE methodology is how to decide between conflicting expert definitions. However, that is not a problem for Rossiter (2012), because the measure of brand love proposed there is not consistent with any expert view of love in general, or brand love, in particular, to our knowledge.

3.4 Is love best understood through a classical definition or through a prototype-based definition?

Rossiter (2012) provides a "classical" style definition of love, i.e., a fairly simple set of properties, which are necessary and sufficient for category membership (Medin 1989, p. 1470). For example, the classical definition of a bachelor is a (1) never married (2) adult (3) male. These three criteria are necessary, in that even if one is missing, the person is not a bachelor, and sufficient, in that anyone who meets all three criteria is a bachelor. We have argued above that there are serious problems with

---

[2] With Hatfield's permission, copies of our communications with her were provided to the editor of this journal.

the definition of love by Rossiter (2012). But to be fair to Rossiter, we should note that numerous past attempts to construct a classical definition of love proved unsuccessful, leading Brehm (1985) to note that "(s)ocial scientists have had as much trouble defining love as philosophers and poets" (page 90). Rossiter's difficulties, we argue, are partly due to the fact that he is trying to produce a classical-style definition of love, whereas the psychological literature on love long ago moved on to prototype-based definitions of love.

Prototypes are similar to cognitive structures such as ideal types, archetypes, and stereotypes, where a prototype is a person's idea of the clearest cases or best examples of a particular type of thing (Aron and Westbay 1996; Fehr 1993, 1999; Fitness and Fletcher 1993; Shaver et al. 1987). Lawson (2002) notes that some prototypes include lay theories about how the parts of the prototype fit together and relate to each other, e.g., if person A loves person B, then, when person B succeeds at a difficult task, person A will feel proud. Ahuvia (2011) argues that the love prototype is just such a theory-based concept, and therefore it is important for future research to investigate how the various parts of the love prototype interact or relate with each other.

Like classical definitions, prototypes are used to classify things into categories, and hence prototypes function as definitions. A prototype-based definition is often called a "duck test," wherein a person compares an unknown object to their mental prototype of a duck, and if the object "walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, and flies like a duck," then the person considers it to be a duck. Prototype-based definitions are compensatory models, whereas classical definitions are noncompensatory. For example, the duck prototype might be "a waterbird, about 15 in. long when adult, with webbed feet and a broad bill, which makes a quacking noise." If a bird lacks one attribute, e.g., webbed feet, it can still be considered a duck if it compensates for this by being strong in some other attribute, e.g., making a particularly duck-like quacking sound. In contrast, classical definitions are noncompensatory models, e.g., a duck is any member of the family Anatidae. If a bird is not a member of the family Anatidae, it does not matter how much it looks like a duck or sounds like a duck, it is not a duck. Because prototypes are compensatory models, they will have fuzzy boundaries. When using a prototype-based definition, a bird might resemble a duck in most ways, yet differ in a few ways, such that it cannot definitively be classified as either a duck or a non-duck, and instead is a sort of a duck. In contrast, classical definitions produce clear boundaries between category members and nonmembers.

The 1980s saw a tremendous upsurge in research on love that produced a large number of definitions for the term. As the debates over how to define love dragged on, many scientists concluded that the fundamental problem was that creating an accurate classical definition of love was not possible. As Fehr and Russell (1991, p. 427) wrote, from "a prototype perspective, the inability to achieve consensus (on a classical definition for love) is understandable: there may be no small set of criterial features common to all and only instances of love." This insight led to a flurry of research describing prototypes for love (for reviews, see Aron and Westbay 1996; Fehr 2009), as well as the prototypes for other psychological concepts. Research describing the prototype of interpersonal love made sufficient progress that researchers were able to move on to other topics, without endlessly debating the definition of love. If anything, debate over the proper description of the interpersonal

love prototype may have ended too quickly, as our research (described below) suggests that this previous work had significant limitations.

Ahuvia (1993) took a prototype-based approach, but differed from a past work on the love prototype in two ways. First, Ahuvia (1993) was the first empirical study to focus specifically on brand love and other forms of noninterpersonal love. Second, previous work on the love prototype had relied on the ability of respondents to readily verbalize its features and, thus, only uncovered aspects of love which were stored in respondents' memories as easily accessible declarative knowledge. Rossiter (2011b, p. 86) mentions on developing his love measure using "intensive open-ended pretesting with consumers, in which we asked them to explain in their own words" what love is. This approach is similar to these early love prototype studies, in that it assumes that respondents can easily verbalize all the salient aspect of their under-standing on love. Ahuvia (1993) developed a methodology (refined in BAB), which revealed aspects of the love prototype stored in memory as tacit, rather than declar-ative, knowledge. This allowed Ahuvia (1993, 2005) and BAB to demonstrate the centrality within the love prototype of (a) the lover merging the love object into his or her identity (c.f. Ahuvia et al. 2009; Ahuvia 2013; Aron and Aron 1996) and (b) the lover finding the love object to be intrinsically rewarding.

Whereas Rossiter's definition of love requires only passion (or perhaps affection?) and separation anxiety, the BAB definition includes other constructs beyond these two. Rossiter (2012, p. 908) states that these "completely unnecessary other items" (as he sees them) were "employed surely to adhere to the always 'use multiple items' philosophy of the psychometrics approach to measure design" which "will produce 'rubbish' data." Actually, no. These other items were included because they reflected important aspects of love, which were uncovered through an extensive series of qualitative consumer studies and then were found to support distinct subdimensions of love, once measured. Research on the love prototype has always found the characteristics of love to be quite extensive, with studies finding love to be comprised of 68 (Fehr 1988), 39 (Button and Collier 1991), 69 or 93 (Aron and Westbay 1996), and 119 (Regan et al. 1998) different features. BAB's description of love is much more parsimonious than these lists of prototype features but is still a rather extensive construct. Its size, however, is not due to our adherence to some methodological dogma, but rather is because we are looking at the qualitative data we gathered from consumers on the love relationship, and "relationships are complicated" (Ahuvia 2011). As Einstein is reputed to have said,[3] "everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler."

## 4 Conclusion

Rossiter (2012) proposed a brand love measure to replace the measures presented in Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) and later in BAB. Rossiter's measure was based on his view that brand love is akin to only romantic/passionate love. As the basis for his measure, he provides a definition of romantic love that he claims comes from Hatfield

---

[3] This quotation is often attributed to Einstein, who may indeed be its source, but this cannot be determined conclusively (http://quoteinvestigator.com/2011/05/13/einstein-simple/).

and Rapson (2000). There are four significant problems with Rossiter's proposed measure.

1. Rossiter (2012) provides two contradictory definitions of romantic love, as the combination of separation anxiety and either deep affection (on page 908) or passion (on page 909).
2. His measure lacks content validity. He describes brand love as the consumer version of romantic love. But his measure asks about affection rather than passion, which is consistent with companionate, rather than romantic, love.
3. He cites Hatfield and Rapson (2000) as the source of his definition(s) of love. But Hatfield disavows Rossiter's characterization.
4. To the best of our knowledge, there is no precedent in the love literature for either of his definitions of romantic love, and he provides no evidence to support either of them.

In contrast, the measure of brand love reported in BAB was developed through an in-depth study on the extant literatures, an extensive series of qualitative studies, and a thorough quantitative analysis. Dawes and Smith (1985) argue that prediction is the goal of all measurement. The BAB brand love measures work well in this regard, explaining 66 and 67 % (two different samples) of the variation in consumers' brand loyalty, positive WOM, and resistance to negative information about the brand. This was more explanatory power than conventional measures based on attitudes and quality perceptions alone. It also produced more predictive power than what was provided by a two-item "overall brand love" measure that was similar to the measure of Rossiter (2012), in that it simply asked respondents to assess their overall love for the brand, self-defined globally by respondents.

Many of Rossiter's objections to Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) and BAB are based on the differences between his C-OAR-SE approach and the more standard psychometric approach. Unfortunately, addressing those critiques was beyond the scope of this paper.

After all the disagreement in this reply, we would like to end on a more upbeat note. Rossiter recognizes the importance of brand love as a topic and writes that "loving the brand has impressive behavioral outcomes, no matter what the product category may be." That is something positive that we can all build on in the future.

## References

Ahuvia, A. C. (1993). *I love it! Towards a unifying theory of love across diverse love objects*. PhD Dissertation. Northwestern University, Ann Arbor

Ahuvia, A. C. (2011). Relationships are complicated: on construct validity when consumer-brand relationships are systems. In: M. Fetsherin, M. Breazeale, S. Fournier, & T. C. Melewar (Eds.), *Consumer–brand relationships: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Ahuvia, A. C. (2013). *Beyond "beyond the extended self": Russ Belk on identity. In J. Schouten (Ed.), (Vol. Consumer S)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ahuvia, A. C., Batra, R., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2009). *Love, desire and identity: a conditional integration theory of the love of things. In D. J. MacInnis, C. W. Park, & J. R. Priester (Eds.), The handbook of brand relationships. (pp. 342–357)*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Aron, A., & Westbay, L. (1996). Dimensions of the prototype of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 535–551. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.70.3.535.

Aron, E. N., & Aron, A. (1996). Love and expansion of the self: the state of the model. *Personal Relationships, 3*(1), 45–58. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1996.tb00103.x.

Bagozzi, R. P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L. W. (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 421–458.

Bagozzi, R. P., Baumgartner, H., & Pieters, R. (1998). Goal-directed emotions. *Cognition & Emotion, 12*, 1–26.

Batra, R., Ahuvia, A. C., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of Marketing, 76*, 1–16. doi:10.1509/jm.09.0339.

Brehm, S. S. (1985). *Intimate relationships*. New York: Random House.

Button, C. M., & Collier D. R. (1991). *A comparison of people's concepts of love and romantic love.* Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Conference, Calgary, Alberta.

Carroll, B. A., & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. *Marketing Letters, 17*(2), 79–89. doi:10.1007/s11002-006-4219-2.

Dawes, R. M., & Smith, T. L. (1985). Attitude and opinion measurement. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 509–566). New York: Random House.

Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(4), 557–579. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.55.4.557.

Fehr, B. (1993). How do I love thee…? Let me consult my prototype. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Individuals in relationships* (pp. 87–120). Newbury Park: Sage.

Fehr, B. (1999). Laypeople's conceptions of commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(1), 90–103.

Fehr, B. (2009). Love, a prototype approach. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1991). The concept of love viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(3), 425–438. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.60.3.425.

Fehr, B., & Sprecher, S. (2009). Prototype analysis of the concept of compassionate love. *Personal Relationships, 16*(3), 343–364. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2009.01227.x.

Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger, and jealousy in close relationships: a prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(5), 942–958.

Hatfield, E. (1988). Passionate and compassionate love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 191–217). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (2000). Love and attachment processes. In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 595–604). New York: Guilford.

Johnson, A. R., Whelan, J., & Thomson, M. (2012). Why brands should fear fearful consumers: how attachment style predicts retaliation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22*(2), 289–298. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2011.04.006.

Lawson, R. (2002). Consumer knowledge structures: background issues and introduction. *Psychology and Marketing, 19*(6), 447–455. doi:10.1002/mar.10019.

Medin, D. L. (1989). Concepts and conceptual structure. *American Psychologist, 44*(12), 1469–1481. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2690699.

Regan, P. C., Kocan, E. R., & Whitlock, T. (1998). Ain't love grand! A prototype analysis of the concept of romantic love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*(3), 411–420. doi:10.1177/0265407598153006.

Rossiter, J. R. (2011). *Measurement for the Social Sciences: the C-OAR-SE method and why it must replace psychometrics*. New York: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7158-6.

Rossiter, J. R. (2012). A new C-OAR-SE-based content-valid and predictively valid measure that distinguishes brand love from brand liking. *Marketing Letters, 23*(3), 905–916. doi:10.1007/s11002-012-9173-6.

Shaver, P. R., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(6), 1061–1086. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.52.6.1061.

Vlachos, P. A., & Vrechopoulos, A. P. (2012). Consumer–retailer love and attachment: antecedents and personality moderators. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 19*(2), 218–228. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2012.01.003.