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ABSTRACT
This paper discusses the dimensions of consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects. Eighteen semi-structured interviews were conducted with consumers from different age categories and social milieus. A thorough analysis of the narratives revealed the existence of four dimensions of consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects: pleasure, discomfort, guilt, and control. Participants were also questioned about their level of materialism, their unsatisfied desires, their ability to cope with unsatisfied desires, their satisfaction with their current life, and their subjective well-being. The relationships between these concepts are explored and implications of the proposed concept for different streams of consumer research are discussed.

BACKGROUND
Saint Augustin, an ancient philosopher, stated that “happiness is continuing to desire what one possesses”. This a priori simple assertion integrates three fundamental facets of humanity: happiness, desire, and possessions. The present research emanates from the observation that some consumers cannot prevent themselves from constantly desiring consumption objects, whereas others are less inclined to desiring such objects. Some consumers want to live a luxurious life of abundance, constantly looking for objects that will bring them satisfaction and happiness, whereas others do not pay much attention to possessions, believing that happiness resides in simple things.

This research is concerned with an unexplored concept in consumer behavior, i.e., the propensity to desire consumption objects. More precisely, the objective of this research is to identify the dimensions of consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects and to discuss the implications of this concept for other related concepts such as materialism, subjective well-being, aberrant consumer behaviors, and voluntary simplicity.

LITERATURE REVIEW
In this research, the concept of desire is approached from an emotional/psychological perspective, although the social and cultural aspects of desires (Belk, Ger, and Askegaard 2003; Girard 1977; Wilk 1997) are not ignored. According to Frijda (1986, p. 85), a desire is a positive emotion that reflects a “tendency to bring nearer whatever the desire is for”. Presumably, this emotion is induced by the thoughts of, or the encounter with a fit object not possessed, when such possession seems to be called for. Whereas consumption desires refer to the set of objects, products, brands or experiences that a consumer wants to possess or to experience, the propensity to desire corresponds to a natural predisposition to desire such things. Therefore, it is considered in this research as an individual trait, like other traits such as the need for cognition (Cacioppo, Petty, Freinstein, and Jarvis 1996), the need for uniqueness (Tian, Bearden, and Hunter 2001), or the susceptibility to social influence (Netemeyer, Bearden, and Teel 1992).

Consumption Desires and Related Concepts
Desires, in general, are an important aspect of human life because they represent what people want to obtain. They are also important in the genesis of human actions and are believed to lead to intentions to act (Perugini and Bagozzi 2004). Because the stream of research on consumption desires is relatively new to the field of consumer behavior, several concepts have been used interchangeably. The purpose of this section is to discuss these concepts in order to make appropriate distinctions and conceptual links with the notion of desire. More specifically, desires are contrasted with passions, temptations, consumption dreams, and goals.

Desires versus passions. Studies focusing on consumption desires are limited in number. Belk, Ger, and Askegaard (2003) were among the first to conduct a research on the concept of desire. They see a desire as “a powerful cyclic emotion that is both discomforting and pleasurable” (Belk, Ger, and Askegaard 2003, p. 326). Within this perspective, a desire is felt by consumers as an embodied passion involving a quest for otherness, sociality, danger, and inaccessibility.

Frijda et al. (1991, p. 218) define passions as “high-priority goals with emotionally important outcomes”. For them, most passions lead individuals to spend a great deal of time and effort. Passions arouse positive and negative emotions, enhance motivation, increase well-being, and provide meaning in everyday life. But they can also turn to obsessions, and interfere with achieving a balanced, successful life (Vallerant et al. 2003). Because emotions are of variable intensity (Sonnemans and Frijda 1995), there may be not only intense desires (passions), but also harmonious desires, and latent ones, not so intense, though they may be important for consumers. Consumption desires therefore must be seen as varying in intensity, going from latent desires to passions, and eventually to obsessions.

Desires versus temptations. Studies on temptations (Baumeister 2002; Dholakia et al. 2006; Fishbach, Kruglanski, and Friedman 2003) also integrate the concept of desire. Temptations are defined as short-term motives (Fishbach, Kruglanski, and Friedman 2003), causing a sudden desire to acquire an object (Baumeister 2002 refers to an “infatuated desire”). Studies have generally linked temptations to impulsive consumption and especially to impulsive buying. Frijda (1986) mentions that emotional behavior often displays the characteristics of impulsiveness, and Belk and al. (2003) observe that impulsive buying seeks immediate fulfillment. However, desires are not always pressing, they can be cultivated and fostered through time. Not all consumption desires induce impulsiveness; otherwise many consumers would go bankrupt.

Desires versus dreams. Another related concept to consumption desires is that of consumption dream. d’Astous and Deschênes (2005) conceptualize consumption dreams as mental representations of consumption objects that consumers desire and experiences that they want to realize. Within this perspective, consumption dreams are said to be activated and monitored by the consumer. The authors further state that dreaming about consumption objects is sometimes the only available alternative for consumers faced with constraints preventing them from consuming (e.g. financial constraints, non-availability of the product, religious, cultural or social restrictions). Obviously, desired objects can be dreamed of, but the possession aspect of consumption dreams does not appear to be as important as it is for desired objects. Dreaming of consumption objects is a pleasurable activity in itself and does not induce discomfort and frustration as it is the case with consumption desires (Belk et al. 2003).

Desires versus goals. Consumption desires should also be contrasted with consumption goals. Goals are desirable states that one is committed to attain through action (Kruglanski 1996). The nuance between goals and desires appears to lie on the aspect of
commitment; in general, commitments to goals appear to be much stronger than commitments to desires. There is also a stronger connectedness between goals and intentions than between desires and intentions, as desires are of a higher level of abstraction (Perugini and Bagozzi 2004).

In conclusion, it has been argued in this section that although the concept of consumption desire is related to other concepts such as passions, temptations, consumption dreams, and goals, it does not seem to be confined to uniquely one of them.

**METHOD**

Since there are few studies on the topic of desire, and none on the propensity to desire consumption objects, a qualitative approach seemed appropriate to investigate the topic. An exploratory qualitative research was conducted in order to identify the different dimensions underlying the propensity to desire consumption objects. Specifically, eighteen semi-structured interviews were conducted. Individual interviews give the opportunity to delve deeply in the experiences of consumers and allow assessing the subtle links between concepts of interest. The discussions were structured around five sections of an interview guide. The first section dealing with experiences of consumption desires was the most important part of the interview and pursued a phenomenological approach, as explained by Creswell (1998).

**Participants**

Participation was done on a voluntary basis. The participants were French-speaking adults, aged between 21 and 79 years (see Table 1), who came from different social milieus. Some participants had greater financial means than others and the majority had a university degree. The age diversity allowed a rich amalgam of consumption desire experiences since the participants were at different life stages. The interviews were conducted on the campus or in the house of the participants, at their convenience. Each semi-structured interview lasted between 30 and 90 minutes. The participants had a good understanding of what was expected from them and responded adequately to all questions.

**Interview Guide**

The interviewer started with a brief introduction that explained the objective of the research and the concept of consumption desire. In order to avoid ambiguities, a consumption desire was defined as “any product, service, or experience that one desires. It could be a sophisticated and expensive object or a simple and inexpensive one”. The interview guide integrated five sections as described below:

- Section 1: participants were asked to talk about past experiences where they felt and experienced desires for consumption objects. These experiences were a starting point to assess their propensity to desire, the nature of those desires, and their importance in everyday life.

**TABLE 1**

Distribution of informants according to age and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>20–30 years</th>
<th>30–50 years</th>
<th>50–60 years</th>
<th>60 and +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Section 2: participants were questioned about their degree of materialism, using the dimensions of Belk (1985) and Richins and Dawson (1992). Open-ended questions were formulated on the basis of these dimensions to allow the informants to elaborate their response (e.g. “In general, what importance do you give to material objects or things that you possess?”).

- Section 3: participants were asked about their unsatisfied desires, and about the desires they thought would be left unsatisfiable, and the reasons for such situations.

- Section 4: participants were asked about their ability to cope with unsatisfied desires.

- Section 5: participants were questioned about their subjective well-being and satisfaction with their present life.

All the interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed individually. The participants were contacted a second time and were provided with the transcriptions and analysis to get their feedback and to be sure that the interpretations adequately reflected their feelings and opinions. Though some adjustments were made and additional explanations added, in general the analyses and interpretations represented adequately the participants’ points of view.

**RESULTS**

Because the aim of the study is to assess consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects, it was important to obtain detailed descriptions of relevant phenomena. The transcriptions of the raw data were subjected to a phenomenological analysis following the general steps developed by Giorgi (1985). The descriptions were read entirely in order to get a general sense of the whole statement. Meaning units were detected and delineated from each interview. The informational insights deduced from these meaning units were analyzed and expressed more directly. Finally, a coherent statement describing each dimension of the phenomenon was elaborated.

**Characteristics of Consumption Desires**

The analysis of the data revealed additional interesting characteristics of consumption desires, refining and complementing previous studies on the subject. In agreement with the results of Belk, Ger, and Askegaard (2003), the desire for consumption objects was mainly felt by the participants as an emotion that can be pleasurable, but also uncomfortable. Consumption desires appear to be of variable intensity, depending on their importance for the consumer. The content and accessibility of consumption desires also seem to be important characteristics. In general, getting any particular desired object may be more or less difficult, but is considered, in the mind of most consumers, as realistic and realizable. In other words, consumers generally desire objects they think they are able to put their hands on, even if the desire is associated with some difficulty. This aspect is consistent with the notion of
perceived performability of desires, discussed by Perugini and Bagozzi (2004). When the probability to accomplish a given desire is low or quasi-null, participants would qualify it as “a crazy desire”, “a fantasy”, “a dream”, or “a phantasm”. On the other hand, a consumption object that is too easy to get is not a desire but becomes some sort of “evidence”. One important finding of this research is that consumers make distinctions between concepts related to consumption desires. This implies that these concepts should not be used interchangeably by consumer researchers and that efforts are still needed in order to draw up the boundaries of each concept, and to study the overlapping areas.

Dimensions of the Propensity to Desire Consumption Objects

Participants’ propensity to desire consumption objects was studied through the narratives of consumption experiences. To illustrate, the following verbatim of a male participant reveals a high propensity to desire consumption objects (all verbatims were translated from French by the author):

“I’d say that they (consumption desires) are relatively present. I mean, it’s rare that I’ll deprive myself, it’s super rare, because I’m always thinking of something I can get: I don’t have this, I’ll need that…all the time, all the time. Obviously, I would not necessarily spend, I wouldn’t buy, but I have the impression that I create needs that are exclusively based on desires: I saw that, it’d be fun…I’d need it…and I always find something. For companies, I’m an excellent consumer” (participant F, 21 years old).

Four dimensions emerged through a thorough analysis of the interview data. Three dimensions (pleasure, discomfort, and guilt) reflect the emotional facets of the concept, whereas the dimension of control reflects its cognitive facet. A summary of the qualitative study results was sent to a prominent consumer researcher working in the area of consumption desires to get his comments on the adequacy of the dimensions. Feedback was very encouraging, and some adjustments were made on the basis of his remarks. The four dimensions that are described below are supported by several statements of the participants.

Pleasure. The propensity to desire consumption objects integrates a pleasurable feeling mentioned by all participants. It is the pleasure of having desires, and also the pleasure of feeling able to realize them. This dimension agrees with the results of Belk, Ger, and Askegaard (2003) who argue that «desiring desire» is pleasurable in itself. The majority of informants asserted that they would not be happier if they realized all their unsatiated desires because it would mean losing this pleasurable feeling.

Consumption desires described by the participants fall into one or the other types of pleasures (intellectual, social, emotional, and physical) reported by Dubé and Le Bel (2003). It is interesting to note that the pleasure derived from the entire desire experience is intensified when consumers take the time to desire the object before getting it.

“I think that the nice moments do not happen during the event itself, but before. We are talking about traveling…say we are going to Hawaii; the best moments of the travel are before leaving, it’s when you are preparing yourself, it’s when you are anticipating the fun you will have, it’s when you are on the plane. I say to my boyfriend: «Normand, it’ll go so fast, these are the best moments!»…sometimes I tell him: «pinch me! It must not go fast; we have to crystallize this moment” (participant M, female, 45 years old).

Discomfort. Consumers desiring consumption objects are exposed to different levels of negative emotions, such as disappointment, frustration, sadness, and sometimes jealousy and envy toward others. These emotions are generally caused by consumers’ inability to satisfy a particular desire immediately and they reflect the internal tension they experience. The intensity of these negative emotions is heightened by the importance of the desire for the consumer, the hope that comes with its concretization, and the effort done to achieve it. These elements are consistent with those presented by Ortony, Clore and Collins (1988) in their analysis of the intensity of negative emotions.

“If I really desire something, I can feel frustrated” (participant R, male, 24 years old).

“I feel disappointed. I don’t know but, I’d say “why do others get what they want and not me!” But it’s not hatred” (participant B, male, 21 years old).

“I felt sad. Disappointment and envy toward people who were chosen (for a humanitarian mission), and frustration toward the evaluators, feelings of unfairness” (participant S, female, 20 years old).

“It makes me heartsick, it affects my mood, and generally this bad mood goes on my children and my boyfriend, depending on who is present” (participants M, female, 45 years old).

Guilt. Lazarus (1991) explains that the emotion of guilt is generated by having done, or wanting to do, something the person regards as morally reprehensible (p.240). It is interesting to note that Lazarus’ (1991) conception implies that there is no need for an actual transgression to feel guilty; simply imagining oneself in some transgression situation is sufficient.

The propensity to desire consumption objects appears to create a dilemma between abstinence and satiation, and succumbing to a desire sometimes causes feelings of guilt. Consumption desires often involve some financial considerations and compromises, which can lead consumers to hesitate before acting, and sometimes to feel guilty before and afterward. Some participants stated that they could feel guilty only because they had consumption desires. That is, some consumers feel guilty either because they have too many consumption desires, or because they desire expensive and ostentatious objects. It is therefore important to note that consumers have different degree of proneness to guilt.

“Christmas time eliminate it (the guilt)...It’s like you are forced to consume, so the idea of pleasure is more present because you don’t feel guilty to spend, because you have to make these purchases. So it’s this way, and it’s fun because it’s the only time of the year that you shop with lots of bags in your hands, you go to boutiques of different styles” (participant S1, female, 20 years old).

“…I also feel this guilt relating to traveling…ambivalence between guilt and satiating the desire….we often travel my
boyfriend and I, and we leave the children at home, so the guilt is deep. I want to travel, to satiate my desire, but leaving the children alone more than 2-3 days, it starts to...after 5-7 days the guilt is larger than the fun I have to satiate my desire. I think it’s the case for several consumption experiences” (participant M, female, 45 years old).

“Our swimming pool is fantastic...and we hesitated a lot (before having it). Always this idea of compromise, consequences, and we felt a little bit guilty, it’s so ostentatious, it’s an “extra”, and it doesn’t necessarily fit our values. We are not people that dress like those who have money, or those who have luxurious things, that’s not me” (participant M, female, 45 years old).

Control. This dimension represents the cognitive aspect of the propensity to desire. On one hand, some consumers have difficulties to control themselves or to resist to desired objects. When they have the opportunity and the financial means, they are willing to let themselves go, and to succumb. As Belk et al. (2003) observed, consumers not only lose control but also abandon themselves to the object of longing. On the other hand, some consumers voluntarily restrain themselves in order to avoid feeling weak. Other consumers go even further and consciously inhibit themselves from desiring objects they can’t put their hands on.

The propensity to desire consumption objects integrates ambivalence between letting go and restraint. Consumers are generally looking for a balance between taking control and being controlled by their desires of consumption objects. This observation is consistent with Frijda’s (1986) analysis of emotional phenomena. In fact, the author asserts that the balance between impulse (absence of control) and inhibition (or voluntary control) shifts constantly as a function of the actual need for caution and control, and the person’s daring, sense of competence, desire to hold himself or herself in hand, and similar variables. It is also worth noting that consumers appear to “play” (consciously act on/fluctuate) with this dimension of control in order to better appreciate the desired object.

“I could say that I generally follow my desires...when I want something, I just can’t wait” (participant F, male, 21 years old).

“I don’t resist, I really don’t...If I really want it, I buy it, I don’t know what resisting means” (participant M, male, 52).

“(Resisting) it will depend on the last time you succumbed to your desires. If you have done a big expenditure last week, not necessarily utilitarian...next time, you have more “brakes” to succumb. If it has been a long time since you succumbed to one of your desires, you will give away, we become weaker and more permissive” (participant JF, male, 39 years old).

“My desires are controllable, I’m able to control them...generally, I buy things I planned to buy...On the other hand, I’ll feel weak if I give away and buy anything else. I feel like I give away too much to my desires, and I try to restrain myself as much as possible” (participant R, male, 24 years old).

Additional Results

As mentioned previously, the participants were questioned about their level of materialism, their unsatisfied and insatiable desires, their coping abilities, satisfaction with their current life, and their subjective well-being. The results look very relevant and several relationships between these concepts deserve to be investigated further.

Belk (1985) argues that possessiveness, non-generosity, and envy are the three main dimensions of materialism. Possessiveness appears to be the dimension that has the strongest association with the propensity to desire consumption objects. Several participants with a high propensity to desire are willing to share their possessions and do not exhibit envy toward other consumers. Richins and Dawson (1992) consider materialism as a consumer value incorporating the centrality and importance of acquisitions. Within this perspective, acquisitions contribute to the pursuit of happiness and success, even for participants with a high propensity to desire. In brief, the relationships between the propensity to desire consumption objects appears to be related to the importance of acquisitions, but not with the two other dimensions of materialism. Acquisitions are generally relegated to a secondary level in the definition of happiness and success, even for participants with a high propensity to desire. In brief, the relationships between the propensity to desire consumption objects and the dimensions of materialism as a consumer trait or value deserve to be studied.

Unsatisfied desires are explained mainly by a lack of financial resources, or a lack of time and competence. The effort to achieve these desires is variable and depends on their centrality for the consumer. For their part, insatiable desires are considered as impossible to achieve, and they take little place among the considerations and plans of the participants. Faced with the inaccessibility of such desires, consumers do not spend any energy on them and exclude them from their “list” of desires. One female participant even said that she prohibited herself from desiring “objects” that she thought she could not acquire. As mentioned before, participants qualified impossible desires as “dreams”, “fantasies”, “illusions”, etc., without any expectation to realize them. However, it may be very pleasurable to think of them. On the basis of the interviews, insatiable desires do not appear to influence life satisfaction and the subjective well-being of the participants. This result contrasts with the conclusions of Solberg et al. (2002) who argue that unobtainable desires, as well as the degree of desirability of unobtainable goods, have a negative impact on satisfaction. Their research focused on satisfaction from the point of view of personal income and with material well-being, and this may therefore explain the differences with the present results.

The propensity to desire consumption objects integrates a frustration dimension, leading consumers to use several coping strategies to manage it. Several strategies emerged through the interviews (e.g. “It’s not meant to be, it’s not meant to be”, “I don’t think of it”, “I try to rationalize, to think of it: it’s this way, you can’t do anything!”, “If I don’t have the financial means, I’ll let it go”, “I’ll convince myself to defer it later on”), and are consistent with the coping strategies discussed in the literature (e.g. Duhachek 2005; Lazarus and Folkman 1984; Sungwhan and Baumgartner 2004). In the context of this research, the ability to cope with frustration varied from one participant to the other, depending among other things on the importance and the intensity of the desire.

The propensity to desire consumption objects does not appear to affect satisfaction with life and the subjective well-being of the participants. Participants of different age groups emphasized elements such as work, achievements, family and friends, etc. as being more relevant determinants of their satisfaction and well-being. Being in front of an interviewer could have influenced the responses to this subtle question. Therefore, the effects of the propensity to desire on satisfaction with life and subjective well-being deserve to be studied further.
CONCLUSION AND NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

The study of consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects can be considered as an attempt to answer Baumgartner’s (2002) call for a better understanding of the individual consumer. It should have some impact on various streams of research such as materialism, the subjective well-being of consumers, aberrant consumer behaviors, and anticonsumption attitudes.

The relationship between the propensity to desire and consumer’s materialism is worth studying because it looks ambiguous. Materialism is a set of centrally held beliefs about the importance of possessions in one’s life (Richins and Dawson 1992). It was also defined by Belk (1984) as “the importance a consumer attaches to worldly possessions” (p. 291). Common sense would suggest that a high propensity to desire consumption objects would lead unavoidably to a high level of materialism. The qualitative research data indicate however that it is not necessarily the case. A follow-up research will try to disentangle the relationship between these two concepts and to study their effects on consumers’ subjective well-being. The subjective well-being of consumers should be given more attention in consumer research. Previous studies have found that a high level of materialism is negatively associated with subjective well-being (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002; Belk 1984). However, the propensity to desire consumption objects does not appear to affect subjective life satisfaction and well-being. In fact, desiring is pleasurable, motivating, and satisfying in and of itself. Investigating the relationship between the three concepts should be enlightening.

It should be also interesting to assess the impact of the propensity to desire on aberrant consumer behaviors. The consequences of such behaviors in the North American economy are enough important to warrant a great interest in their study. Aberrant and dysfunctional consumer behaviors include credit misuse and abuse, compulsive buying, and purchase of counterfeit goods (Budden and Griffin 1996). It is important to examine whether a high propensity to desire ultimately lead to such aberrant behaviors and, if it is the case, how it leads consumers to engage into these behaviors.

The propensity to desire could have an impact on consumer’s indebtedness. The quest for satiating desires is not without its costs and many consumers could easily find themselves in the “debtor’s prison” (see Bernthal, Crockett, and Rose 2005). Credit cards are part of daily life, but they are far from being used only for necessities. They are usually considered, by consumers, as an empowering and facilitating means for consumption (Bernthal, Crockett, and Rose 2005). However, almost half of credit cards holders in the United States do not carry a monthly balanced account (Manning 2000). In this context, it could be interesting to identify the determinant dimensions that lead to an exaggerated level of indebtedness and to verify if indebtedness can be explained by the quest for pleasure, control, compensation, or another dimension of the propensity to desire consumption objects.

Compulsive consumption is another matter of concern. Faber and Christenson (1996) propose that biochemical, psychological, and sociological causes are underlying factors of this behavior. Among the psychological causes, Faber, O’Guinn, and Krych (1987) have identified the desire for stimulation and arousal. This is consistent with the results of the qualitative research, for respondents with a high propensity to desire acknowledged their attractiveness to novelty. Moreover, O’Guinn and Faber (1989) have found an association between compulsive buying and the tendency to fantasize. Although the concept of propensity to desire is different from fantasizing, a parallel could be drawn.

In addition, a high propensity to desire consumption objects, combined with limited financial resources, could lead consumers to satiate their desires through alternative ways such as buying counterfeit products. Tom et al. (1998) argue that consumers who purchase counterfeit goods are attracted by the opportunity to buy branded products that communicate the desired prestige of legitimate products at a substantially lower price. Although participants in the qualitative study were not questioned on this issue, some of them spontaneously talked about satiating their desires through shrewd ways, not necessarily counterfeited products, but ones that are not as expensive as “the best products”, but bringing them the same level of satisfaction.

From another perspective, the concept of propensity to desire consumption objects could bring new insights in the literature of anticonsumption attitudes, especially with regards to voluntary simplicity (VS), and could help to better understand the process by which consumers join this relatively new trend. Voluntary simplicity is based on a system of beliefs and a set of practices that are principally aimed at minimizing the consumption of material goods in order to achieve satisfaction, fulfillment, and happiness in life (Zavestosky 2002). Without doubt, adhering to the movement is a voluntary action, but studying the psychological profile and some individual characteristics (e.g. propensity to desire) of these consumers could enable researchers to predict which consumer is likely to join the movement. Does adhering to voluntary simplicity means having a very low propensity to desire consumption objects? How do these consumers control and manage their natural propensity to desire? Is it through inhibition or reorientation? Within this same perspective, an interesting issue was also raised during the interviews. Some consumers appear to be confined to “involuntary simplicity” and are struggling with their propensity to desire consumption objects.

The present research represents a starting point to a larger project. In fact, based on the dimensions deduced from the qualitative inquiry, follow-up studies will be conducted to elaborate a measurement scale to assess consumers’ propensity to desire consumption objects, and the relationships between this concept and other concepts discussed in this paper will be examined.
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