



ASSOCIATION FOR CONSUMER RESEARCH

Labovitz School of Business & Economics, University of Minnesota Duluth, 11 E. Superior Street, Suite 210, Duluth, MN 55802

Falling in Love With a Product: the Structure of a Romantic Consumer-Product Relationship

Yun-Oh Whang, University of Central Florida

Jeff Allen, University of Central Florida

Niquelle Sahoury, University of Central Florida

Haitao Zhang, University of Central Florida

ABSTRACT - Consumers often say they are in love with a product or brand, but what does being in love with a product really mean? Do consumers actually find themselves in a romantic product relationship that resembles a love relationship with another person? To address this question, a sample of male bikers (n=179) was surveyed with an instrument used in psychology to study different styles of interpersonal love. Findings suggest that bikers' love toward their motorcycles resembles an interpersonal love that is passionate, possessive and selfless in nature. Only the passion component of interpersonal love had an impact on loyalty to their bikes.

[to cite]:

Yun-Oh Whang, Jeff Allen, Niquelle Sahoury, and Haitao Zhang (2004), "Falling in Love With a Product: the Structure of a Romantic Consumer-Product Relationship", in *NA - Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 31, eds. Barbara E. Kahn and Mary Frances Luce, Valdosta, GA : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 320-327.

[url]:

<http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/8907/volumes/v31/NA-31>

[copyright notice]:

This work is copyrighted by The Association for Consumer Research. For permission to copy or use this work in whole or in part, please contact the Copyright Clearance Center at <http://www.copyright.com/>.

Falling in Love with a Product: The Structure of a Romantic Consumer-Product Relationship

Yun-Oh Whang, University of Central Florida
Jeff Allen, University of Central Florida
Niquelle Sahoury, University of Central Florida
Haitao Zhang, University of Central Florida

ABSTRACT

Consumers often say they are “in love with a product or brand,” but what does being in love with a product really mean? Do consumers actually find themselves in a romantic product relationship that resembles a love relationship with another person? To address this question, a sample of male bikers (n=179) was surveyed with an instrument used in psychology to study different styles of interpersonal love. Findings suggest that bikers’ love toward their motorcycles resembles an interpersonal love that is passionate, possessive and selfless in nature. Only the passion component of interpersonal love had an impact on loyalty to their bikes.

Consumers frequently ascribe existence to relationships they form with products and/or brands. As examples, some consumers name their automobiles while others insist on Harley motorcycles or demand “the real thing” over New Coke. Obviously, the vehicles are not just viewed as transportation and even classic Coke means more to loyal followers than simply a can of refreshment. What is more, consumers often say they are “in love with a product or brand,” but what does being in love with a product really mean? Is love for a product a strong expression of attachment or loyalty, or do consumers actually find themselves in a romantic relationship resembling love toward another person? If product love is romantic in makeup, then theories in psychology regarding different types of interpersonal love may be useful in capturing the fundamental nature of this phenomenon.

Some researchers in psychology argue that “falling in love is something that happens to us, not something we make happen” (Walsh 1991, p.186), suggesting that marketers cannot induce consumers to fall romantically in love with products. At the same time, proposed theories explaining why people fall in love provide insight on how close interpersonal relationships are formed (see Sternberg 1987 for a review). One study in particular (Lee 1977) developed a typology identifying six styles of love, one or more of which may explain the type of the love consumers develop with products. Marketers desire to form close consumer-product relationships because it leads to customer retention through brand loyalty. One organization recognized for having extremely loyal customers is Harley-Davidson (see e.g., Berry 1995; Schouten and McAlexander 1995; Spethmann 1998). For that reason, the Harley brand of motorcycle appears to be well suited for exploring the existence and structure of romantic consumer-product relationships.

Borrowing from the literature on interpersonal love, the primary objective of the study is to develop a theoretical framework for understanding the structure of love toward a product. Is consumers’ “love” for a product similar to or different from romantic love toward another person? Secondary objectives are to identify different love styles and any demographic features that might be related (see e.g., Lee 1977; Taraban and Hendrick 1995). The study’s findings should not only provide marketers with an understanding of the fundamental nature of product love, but also offer some insight into the formation of romantic product/brand relationships. The next section reviews previous literature and discusses a theoretical framework linking interpersonal with product love.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Although there is no universally accepted definition of love, anyone knows when s/he is in love with another. Love is an outcome of bi-directional interaction between two partners, yet its highly dynamic interactivity makes it challenging for researchers to study. But, when the target of love is replaced with an object (e.g., a product or brand), love becomes unidirectional and thus less dynamic. In this way it is perhaps easier to study product rather than interpersonal love. Unfortunately, to date there has been little research on this issue. This also raises a fundamental research question; can product love be described as romantic even though it is not directed toward another human being? Consider Branden’s (1980) definition of love quoted below.

“The origin of our desire to love lies in our profound need to value, to find things in the world which we can care about, can feel excited and inspired by. It is our values that tie us to the world and that motivate us to go on living. Every action is taken for the purpose of gaining or protecting something we believe will benefit our life or enhance our experience” (p.67).

From this definition, it can be concluded that the target of a romantic relationship (i.e., love) is not limited to another human being.

The term love has been applied in the marketing literature in several ways. Extending resource exchange theory (Foa and Foa 1974), Brinberg and Wood (1983) suggested six resource categories for market exchange that included love; the others are status, information, money, goods, and services. More recently, Fournier (1998) proposed an integrated framework for brand-consumer relationships categorizing relationship quality as love/passion, commitment, and intimacy, categories that correspond to the proposed dimensions of Sternberg’s (1986) triangular theory of interpersonal love.

Concepts similar to love have also been studied in the marketing literature. Individual self-expression (e.g., Kopytoff 1986; McCracken 1986) and identity development (e.g., Kleine, Kleine III, and Allen 1991) have been suggested as key drivers of emotional attachment to an object. Ethnographic research on the extremely loyal customers of Harley-Davidson motorcycles (Schouten and McAlexander 1995) and the television series *Star Trek* (Kozinets 2001) has introduced the idea of “brand communities” (e.g., McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). Brand communities refer to groups of consumers “based on a structured set of social relationships among admirers of a brand” (Muniz Jr. and O’Guinn 2001, p.412). These and other studies have investigated consumption phenomena akin to “being in love” with a product or brand. Although these studies intimate the possibility of a romantic consumer-product relationship, none have attempted to directly link theories of interpersonal love with love toward a product.

Numerous studies on interpersonal love in psychology have proposed various theories on the nature of love and developed suitable scales to empirically test these frameworks. Table 1 presents a summary of five prominent theories and their dimensions or styles of love.

Conducting a comprehensive factor analysis of all five theories, Hendrick and Hendrick (1989) reported that Lee’s (1977)

TABLE 1
A Summary of Interpersonal Love Relationship Theories

Theory	Dimension	Source
Love Attitude Scale	Eros, Ludus, Storage, Pragma, Mania, Agape	Lee (1977)
Relationship Rating Form	Viability, Intimacy Passion, Caring Satisfaction, Conflict	Davis and Todd (1982, 1985)
Triangular Theory of Love	Intimacy, Passion Commitment	Sternberg (1986)
Passionate Love Scale		Hatfield and Sprecher (1986)
Attachment Styles	Avoidant Anxious-Ambivalent Secure	Shaver and Hazan (1987), Hazan and Shaver (1987)

TABLE 2
Descriptions of Each of Lee's Love Attitude Styles

Style	Definition	Description
Eros	Romantic, Passionate	The search for a beloved whose psychical presentation of self love embodies an image already held in the mind of the lover.
Ludus	Game-Playing Love	Playful or game love. Permissive and pluralistic. The degree of 'involvement' is carefully controlled, jealousy is eschewed, and relationships are often multiple and relatively short-lived.
Storage	Friendship love	Based on slowly developing affection and companionship, a gradual disclosure of self, an avoidance of self-conscious passion, and an expectation of long-term commitment.
Mania	Possessive, Dependent Love	An obsessive, jealous, emotionally intense love style characterized by preoccupation with the beloved and a need for repeated reassurance of being loved.
Agape	All-giving, Selfless Love	Altruistic love, given because the lover sees it as his duty to love without expectation of reciprocity. Gentle, caring, and guided by reason more than emotion.
Pragma	Logical, 'shopping list' love	Conscious consideration of 'vital statistics' about a suitable beloved. Education, vocation, religion, age, and numerous other demographic characteristics of the potential beloved are taken into account in the search for a compatible match.

(Taken from Lee 1977; Hendrick and Hendrick 1986)

typology showed the most independency among the six purported styles of love. The triangular theory of love (Sternberg 1986) and the Relationship Rating Form (Davis and Todd 1982, 1985) showed significant interdependency among dimensions. By contrast, the Passionate Love Scale (Hatfield and Sprecher 1986) and Attachment Styles (Shaver and Hazan 1987; Hazan and Shaver 1987) were unidimensional, resulting in a single factor. Because of the high

level of independency, Lee's structural typology of readily distinguishable love styles was chosen to assess consumers' love toward a product. Table 2 contains definitions and descriptions of each of these love attitude styles (see also Hendrick and Hendrick 1986).

In addition to the independency of love styles demonstrated by Hendrick and Hendrick (1989), Lee's (1977) typology has another major advantage over competing theories. Building on Lee's origi-

nal work, a series of studies has linked different love styles to various demographic and personality traits (e.g., Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Taraban and Hendrick 1995).

METHODS

Sample

A sample of male bikers attending Biketoberfest, a large bike rally held in Daytona Beach, Florida, was used for the study. Biketoberfest attendees were selected because of the strong bond they exhibit with their bikes, especially the Harley-Davidson brand. It is an ideal group of consumers with much potential for a romantic product relationship. In addition, bikers at Bikeoberfest are known to have a wide range of demographics so that the effects of these variables on the consumer-product relationship can be assessed.

The demographic profile presented in Table 3 reveals that the majority of respondents (68.2%) were between 35-54 years of age and married (55.3%). Respondents' education level was fairly evenly distributed: a high school education (27.4%), 2 years of college (24.0%), and either 4 years of college or graduate school (27.4%). The two predominant categories for occupation were professional (29.6%) and skilled/semi-skilled (22.3%). Percentages of income <\$20K (2.8%), between \$20K-39,999 (23.5%), \$40K-59,999 (25.2%), \$60K-79,999 (16.8%), \$80K-99,999 (9.5%), and >\$100K (17.3%) were also reported. The vast majority of the sample owned a motorcycle that was a Harley-Davidson (73%) and had previously attended Biketoberfest an average of four times (mean=3.9).

Survey Instrument

Data for the study was collected by means of a self-report questionnaire. Based on Lee's (1977) love typology, the short form (Hendrick, Hendrick, and Dicke 1998) of the Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986) was applied to identify which of the six styles of love consumers develop with their favorite brand of motorcycle. The short form was used because Hendrick, Hendrick and Dicke (1998) reported that the abbreviated Love Attitude Scale accounted for more systematic variance than the original 7-item scales. The shortened 18-item version of the scale is composed of six 3-item subscales representing Eros, Ludus, Storage, Pragama, Mania, and Agape love styles (refer to Table 4). Items were each measured on a 9-point scale ranging from 1="Strongly Disagree" to 9="Strongly Agree."

The two dependent variables in the study were overall love and brand loyalty. Overall love was gauged with three items: "I am in love with my bike," "I feel very possessive toward my bike," and "If I could never be on my bike, I would feel miserable", taken from Rubin's (1970) multi-item Romantic Love Scale. Four items were used to assess active and passive brand loyalty (see Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds 2000). Two items measuring active brand loyalty were: "I would highly recommend my bike to my friends" and "I often make positive comments about my bike to my friends." Two items: "Even if my bike were costly to maintain, I would still ride it" and "In the near future, I intend to ride my bike more" were used to measure passive loyalty. Items in these scales were also measured on a 9-point agreement scale identical to that used above.

Demographic information on respondents' age, marital status, education level, occupation, household income, and previous Biketoberfest attendance was also collected. Two other classification questions queried respondents on their favorite brand of motorcycle and the length of time they had owned it.

Data Collection

An intercept technique was used to distribute the questionnaires along a one-block area on Main Street in Daytona Beach, the central gathering place for attendees. Male respondents were provided with clipboards and pens to facilitate filling out the questionnaire and, as an incentive, received a "sew-on" Biketoberfest patch. On average, the questionnaire took about 12 minutes to complete and approximately two out of three individuals that were approached agreed to participate for a response rate of over 60%. Overall, the procedure resulted in 179 questionnaires that were usable for analysis.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Scale Development

A principal component analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the 18 items representing the six different styles of love. Applying the eigenvalue-one criteria, the item-set was factored to ensure that items loaded on respective dimensions ($\geq .50$) and did not cross-load ($< .35$), and to estimate the percentage of variance explained. To assess the appropriateness of the correlation matrix prior to factoring, Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were computed. Bartlett's test led to a clear rejection of the hypothesis of independence ($p < .001$) and the KMO measure of .74 (in the middling range) indicated that the application of factor analysis was appropriate.

Factoring the battery of items produced a 6-factor solution that did not entirely reproduce the six styles of love found in previous studies on interpersonal relationships (see Table 4). Six items representing both the Mania and Agape styles of love loaded on the first factor, suggesting that these two love styles are perceived as similar. One Mania item, "If I imagine someone else is riding my bike, I feel very uncomfortable," was dropped from the analysis because of a poor loading (.42). The next three factors extracted contained the 3-item subscales representing Eros, Pragma, and Storage. Loadings for the three items representing Ludus were divided among the last two factors, two items loaded on the next to last (Ludus 1) and a single item on the last factor (Ludus 2). Together, the six factors accounted for 73% of the variance in the complete set of items. It should be noted that components analyses using varimax, equimax, and oblique rotations produced the same factor profile, indicating stability in the 6-factor solution obtained.

Separate factor analyses of the 3 love and 4 loyalty items indicated that the scales are unidimensional, in both analyses all items loaded on a single factor (see Tables 5 and 6). The unidimensionality of the four loyalty items implies that respondents do not distinguish between active and passive loyalty regarding their favorite motorcycle.

Reliability and Validity

Scale reliability for each of the multi-item scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α). Applying Nunnally's (1978) criterion of .70 for exploratory research, α 's ranging from .80-.89 indicate that the scales representing Eros, Mania/Agape (i.e., the combined Mania and Agape scale), and Pragma are internally consistent. Items in these scales were summed to form composite indicators of their respective constructs. Table 4 presents loadings from an exploratory factor analysis and percentages of variance explained along with item-total correlations and α 's for the corresponding love subscales. Alpha's for the 3-item Storage scale involving long-term relations ($\alpha = .64$) and the 2-item Ludus 1 scale ($\alpha = .52$) did not

TABLE 3
Demographic Profile of the Sample (n=179) and Dummy Variable Coding

Variable	%	Variable Name(s) and Value(s)	%
Age		[Boomer, Mature]	
18-24	1.1	[0,0]	8.0
25-34	6.9		
35-44	34.9	[1,0]	69.7
45-54	34.9		
≥ 55	22.3	[0,1]	22.3
Marital Status		[Together]	
Single	22.1	[0]	39.3
Divorced	16.2		
Married	57.2	[1]	60.7
Co-habitation	3.5		
Education		[College, Grad]	
≤ High School	1.7	[0,0]	33.1
Some High School	2.3		
High School	28.7		
2-yr College	26.4	[1,0]	54.7
Vocation-Tech School	10.9		
4-yr College	16.7		
Graduate School	12.1	[0,1]	12.2
Other*	1.1		
Occupation		[White_co, Retired]	
Homemaker	0.6	[0,0]	35.4
Skilled/Semi-Skilled	26.7		
Laborer	5.2		
Farm	0.6		
Professional	34.1	[1,0]	54.7
Manager/Administrator	15.1		
Clerical	0.6		
Sales	4.1		
Retired	6.4	[0,1]	9.9
Other*	9.3		
Annual Income		[Income_c]**	
<\$20,000	2.9	[1]	27.6
\$20,000–\$39,999	24.7		
\$40,000–\$59,999	26.5	[2]	44.1
\$60,000–\$79,999	17.6		
\$80,000–\$99,999	10.0	[3]	28.2
≥ \$100,000	18.2		

* Excluded in the regression analyses.

** Ordinal index variable is used due to equal scale intervals.

meet the criterion, so these subscales were omitted from further analysis. Alpha's for the two dependent variables Love ($\alpha=.75$) and Loyalty ($\alpha=.76$) were acceptable. Tables 5 and 6 summarize the results of the factor and reliability analyses for the love and loyalty scales.

Having been successfully applied in a number of other studies (e.g., Hendrick and Hendrick 1989; Hendrick, Hendrick, and Dicke 1998; Taraban and Hendrick 1995), the Love Attitude Scale is well established as a reliable and valid measure of interpersonal romantic relationships. The instrument was field-tested on a convenience

TABLE 4

A Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis and Scale Reliability: Styles of Love (Independent Variables)

Item/Scale	Mean	Factor Loading	Explained Var. (%)	Item-Total Corr.	Alpha (α)
Mania/Agape:	4.07		21.10		.88
Sometimes I get so excited about my bike that I can't sleep.	4.05	.75		.66	
When I think about my bike, I have trouble concentrating on anything else.	3.88	.86		.81	
I would rather go without than let my bike have problems.	5.11	.77		.60	
Placing my bike's well-being before my own makes me happy.	4.06	.84		.74	
I would endure all things for the sake of my bike.	3.68	.83		.79	
Eros:	7.25		14.63		.89
My bike and I have the right physical chemistry between us.	7.40	.90		.79	
I feel that my bike and I were meant for each other.	7.15	.88		.81	
My bike fits my ideal standard of physical appearance.	7.15	.88		.73	
Pragma:	3.81		12.31		.80
A main consideration in choosing a bike is how it reflects on those close to me.	4.27	.79		.57	
One consideration in choosing a bike is how it will reflect on my career or job.	3.19	.80		.66	
I try to plan my life carefully before choosing a bike.	4.01	.83		.68	
Storage:	6.36		10.16		.64
I realized how much I loved my bike only after having it for some time.	5.86	.74		.38	
The best experience with my bike comes after spending a long time with it.	6.45	.81		.54	
My relationship with my bike is a really deep friendship.	6.77	.56		.43	
Ludus 1:	5.82		8.28		.52
I would not feel guilty to my bike if I ride other bikes.	6.10	.77		-	
I enjoy dividing my attention between a number of different bikes.	5.44	.83		-	
Ludus 2:	5.51		6.77		-
I can get over my old bike without much problem.	5.51	.91		-	

sample of 21 attendees several days before Biketoberfest was scheduled to begin. The wording of several questions was modified slightly for clarification purposes, otherwise no sign of ambiguity or misinterpretation was indicated.

Regression Analysis

Multiple regressions, with and without demographic variables, were performed using Lee's (1977) love subscales as independent variables and the overall Love and Loyalty measures as dependent variables. To facilitate interpretation of the results, many of the polychotomous classification variables were dummy coded. For example, respondents' age was recoded into three categories representing those <35, 35-54 (i.e., Boomers) and >55 (i.e., Matures) years of age, with >35 as the reference category. Table 3 also includes the coding of demographic variables used in the analyses.

Multivariate F-tests for each of the overall models reported below were significant at the .01 level or beyond. For the model without demographic variables, Mania/Agape ($\beta=.59$, $p<.001$) and Eros ($\beta=.32$, $p<.001$) were positively related to overall Love.

Length of bike ownership was significant ($\beta=.08$, $p<.05$) in addition to the love styles of Eros and Mania/Agape when demographic variables were entered. Harley-Davidson owners showed a higher level of loyalty than others ($\beta=.75$, $p<.05$) and the Eros ($\beta=.41$, $p<.001$) love style was positively related to overall Loyalty. A similar effect was obtained with respect to Eros when demographic variables were removed. None of the other variables tested were significantly related to either overall Love or Loyalty at the .05 level.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The primary objective of the study was to develop a basic framework for understanding the structure of love for a product. The study's results are largely consistent with findings on interpersonal love where Eros, Mania, and Agape were found to have the most positive impact on successful romantic interpersonal relationships (Sternberg and Grajek 1984). Overall, the findings imply that relations between bikers and their bikes is indeed a form of romantic relationship. Discussion of the findings is divided into two interre-

TABLE 5
A Summary of Factor Analysis and Scale Reliability for: Love (Dependent Variable)

Item/Scale	Mean	Factor Loading	Explained Var. (%)	Item-Total Corr.	Alpha (α)
Love:	5.82		67.15		.75
I am in love with my bike.	4.71	.83		.59	
I feel very possessive toward my bike.	6.03	.86		.65	
If I could never be on my bike, I would feel miserable.	6.72	.77		.52	

TABLE 6
A Summary of Factor Analysis and Scale Reliability for: Loyalty (Dependent Variable)

Item/Scale	Mean	Factor Loading	Explained Var. (%)	Item-Total Corr.	Alpha (α)
Loyalty:	7.51		59.00		.76
I would highly recommend my bike to my friends.	7.85	.86		.64	
I am likely to make positive comments about my bike to my friends.	7.65	.86		.64	
If my bike were to cost more to maintain, I would still continue to ride my bike.	6.77	.55		.36	
In the near future, I intend to ride more.	7.57	.75		.54	

lated parts, theoretical and practical implications for the development of romantic consumer-product relationships.

Theoretical Implications

The results of the study are interesting for two reasons. First of all, bikers do not distinguish between possessive (Mania) and selfless love (Agape), styles of love that generally do not co-exist in interpersonal love. One possible explanation is that the relationship between a product and its owner is unidirectional. Possessive love involves the assurance of love and jealousy can arise if a partner does not meet this need. Contrary to a possessive type of love, selfless love does not expect any reciprocity. These two love styles can co-exist in product love because products do not argue, get angry, or cheat on their partners. The unidirectional nature of relations with a product puts the owner in total control and reduces the anxiety about not being loved in return.

Secondly, finding that measurement items representing Ludus (game-playing love) failed to load on a solitary factor suggests that product love has a different commitment component from interpersonal love. The Ludus subscale measures openness to multiple partners (i.e., owning more than one bike) and the acceptance of a breakup (e.g., selling the bike). In interpersonal love, one who is more open to multiple partners is more likely to accept a breakup. In product love, owning multiple bikes and tolerance of a breakup are not the same component. Mean scores show that, on average, bikers have no problem owning multiple bikes, but may have some difficulty breaking up with an old bike.

Eros was a significant predictor in the regression models for both product love and loyalty. The combination Mania and Agape love style was the most important predictor of overall love, but neither style influenced loyalty. In other words, being "in love with a bike" does not necessarily imply strong attachment. Bikers love for their bikes involves feelings that are possessive (Mania), caring

(Agape), and passionate (Eros), but loyalty depends only on passionate feelings (Eros). Recall that the commitment component of product love is different from interpersonal love, owning multiple bikes and acceptance of a breakup are separate components. As a whole, then, it can be concluded that bikers are capable of loving multiple bikes simultaneously, but love for a favorite bike does not prevent falling in love with another attractive bike, even though it bears a different brand.

To some extent it is surprising that the Pragma style of love was neither related to product love nor loyalty. The Pragma love style represents self-expression and compatibility between self and the beloved, similar to symbolic or conspicuous consumption. Although bikes typically communicate the owner's values and ideals, the compatibility component appears to be irrelevant to feelings of love or attachment.

Practical Implications

The findings also suggest marketing implications for firms wishing to form romantic consumer-product relationships. Our results suggest that products with a passionate (Eros), possessive (Mania), and selfless (Agape) image are more likely to succeed, depending upon whether love or product attachment is the desired outcome. For instance, Eros, which is often referred to as the pursuit of a lover's "physical type" (Lee 1977, p.174), would readily translate into the design and hedonic elements of a product. It would represent the extent to which the product is perceived to fit consumers' ideal image of beauty.

Interpreting the coexistence of Mania and Agape is more complicated. As discussed earlier, Mania is an emotionally intense love style, while Agape is guided more by reason than emotion (Lee 1977). To suggest marketing implications independently avoids explaining what a combined style of Mania and Agape love is. One possible explanation is a common denominator between Mania and

TABLE 7
A Summary of Regression Analyses: Love and Loyalty as Dependent Variables

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables							
	Love				Loyalty			
	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Beta	t	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Beta	t
1. Models without Demographic Variables								
Constant	1.36	.72		*1.88	4.32	.67		***6.45
Eros	.32	.08	.25	***4.12	.39	.07	.42	***5.38
Pragma	-.02	.06	-.02	-.27	.08	.06	.12	1.45
Mania/Agape	.59	.06	.61	***9.91	.02	.06	.02	.27
Ludus2	-.05	.05	-.06	-.92	-.01	.05	-.01	-.17
Adj. R ² =0.50, F(3,150)=38.70***				Adj. R ² =0.17, F(4,143)=8.40***				
2. Models with Demographic Variables								
Constant	1.04	1.14		.92	4.46	.93		***4.80
Eros	.24	.09	.19	**2.63	.41	.08	.48	***5.46
Pragma	-.03	.07	-.02	-.34	.04	.06	.06	.68
Mania/Agape	.61	.07	.63	***8.37	.02	.06	.03	.27
Ludus2	-.07	.06	-.08	-1.19	.00	.05	.01	.07
Harley or Not	-.19	.35	-.04	-.53	.75	.29	.23	**2.56
Long	.08	.03	.17	**2.48	-.03	.03	-.10	-1.11
Boomer	.25	.59	.05	.42	-.47	.48	-.14	-.97
Mature	.73	.68	.14	1.07	.08	.56	.02	.13
Together	-.01	.31	-.00	-.01	.12	.26	.04	.42
College	-.03	.37	-.01	-.08	.01	.30	.00	.03
Graduate	-.33	.55	-.05	-.60	.04	.45	.01	.10
White Collar	.01	.40	.00	.02	-.02	.33	-.01	-.07
Retired	-.49	.62	-.07	-.79	-.49	.53	-.10	-.92
Income	.17	.22	.06	.78	-.08	.18	-.04	-.43
Eventime	.04	.03	.09	1.17	-.03	.03	-.11	-1.23
Adj. R ² =0.471, F(15,109)=8.36***				Adj. R ² =0.197, F(15,106)=2.98***				
* p<0.10								
** p<0.05								
*** p<0.001								

Agape, the interaction between user and product. While other styles of love focus on appearance (Eros), the number of relationships (Ludus), the length of relationship (Storage), and attribute composition (Pragma), characteristics of the interaction (e.g., functional vs. hedonic interaction, need for regular maintenance, etc.) seem to be associated with how a romantic consumer-product relationship develops. Future research is required to clarify this issue.

In sum, this study offers a structural framework for understanding romantic consumer-product relationships. The application of Lee's (1977) love style typology provides a suitable departure point for a more complete understanding of the structure of product love. Empirical evidence here shows that several styles of interpersonal love apply to product love. Of course, replications of the study, namely testing the model on other products and/or categories are necessary to determine if differences or category effects exist. Other studies might focus on the personality traits associated with different love styles in Lee's typology. In this way, findings on products could be compared and contrasted with those

of interpersonal love studies in psychology. An interesting extension would be an investigation of the three dimensions of love: intimacy, passion, and commitment (see Sternberg 1986) to further understand the building and structure of romantic consumer-product relationships.

REFERENCES

- Berry, Leonard L. (1995), "Relationship Marketing of Service: Growing Interest, Emerging Perspectives," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (Fall), 236-245.
- Branden, Nathaniel (1980), *The Psychology of Romantic Love*, Los Angeles, CA: J.P. Tarchers, Inc.
- Brinberg, David and Ronald Wood (1983), "A Resource Exchange Theory Analysis of Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (December), 330-338.
- Davis, Keith E. and Michael J. Todd (1982), "Friendship and Love Relationships," *Advances in Descriptive Psychology*, 2, 79-122.

- _____ and Michael J. Todd (1985), "Accessing Friendship: Prototypes, Paradigm Cases and Relationship Description," *Understanding personal relationships: An Interdisciplinary approach*, 17-38.
- Foa, U. and E.B. Foa (1974), *Societal Structures of the Mind*, Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fournier, Susan (1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 343-373.
- Ganesh, Jaishankar, Mark J. Arnold, and Kristy E. Reynolds (2000), "Understanding the Customer Base of Service Providers: An Examination of the Differences between Switchers and Stayers," *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (July), 65-87.
- Hatfield, Elaine and Susan Sprecher (1986), "Measuring Passionate Love in Intimate Relationships," *Journal of Adolescence*, 9 (December), 383-410.
- Hazan, Cindy and Philip Shaver (1987), "Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 52 (March), 511-524.
- Hendrick, Clyde and Susan S. Hendrick (1986), "A Theory and Method of Love," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 50 (February), 392-402.
- _____ and Susan S. Hendrick (1989), "Research on Love: Does It Measure Up?" *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 56 (May), 784-794.
- _____, Susan S. Hendrick, and Amy Dicke (1998), "The Love Attitude Scales: Short Form," *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 15(April), 147-159.
- Kopytoff, Igor (1986), "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commodization as Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 64-95.
- Kleine, Susan S., Robert Kleine III, and Chris T. Allen (1991), "How is a Possession "Me" or "Not Me"? Characterizing Types and an Antecedent of Material Possession Attachment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (December), 327-343.
- Kozinets, Robert V. (2001), "Utopian Enterprise: Articulating the Meanings of Star Trek's Culture of Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (June), 67-88.
- Lee, John A. (1977), "A Typology of Styles of Loving," *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3 (Spring), 173-182.
- McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, and Harold F. Koenig (2002), "Building Brand Community," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January), 38-54.
- McCracken, Ann L. (1986), "Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (June), 71-84.
- Muniz, Albert M., Jr and Thomas C. O'Guinn (2001), "Brand Community," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (March), 412-432.
- Rubin, Zick (1970), "Measurement of Romantic Love," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 16 (October), 265-273.
- Schouten, John W. and James H. McAlexander (1995), "Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (June), 43-61.
- Shaver, Phillip and Cindy Hazan (1987), "Being Lonely, Falling in Love: Perspectives from Attachment Theory," *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 2 (2), 105-124.
- Spethmann, Betsy (1998), "Happy Birthday to Us," *PROMO*, 11 (5), 36-42.
- Sternberg, Robert J. (1986), "A Triangular Theory of Love," *Psychological Review*, 93 (2), 119-135.
- _____ (1987), "Liking Versus Loving: A Comparative Evaluation of Theories," *Psychological Bulletin*, 102 (3), 331-345.
- _____ and Susan Grajek (1984), "The Nature of Love," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (2), 312-329.
- Taraban, Carolyn B. and Clyde Hendrick (1995), "Personality Perceptions Associated with Six Styles of Love," *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 12 (August), 453-461.
- Walsh, Anthony (1991), *The Science of Love*, Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.