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Abstract

Because loyalty to services remains elusive and unpredictable, there is a need to study consumer relationships with firms apart from the established satisfaction-loyalty chain approach. To that end, the present paper investigates feelings of attachment and love through two empirical consumer studies of two different grocery retailer brands. The findings of the current study imply that retail store image, perceived transactional value, and corporate social responsibility (CSR) associations positively influence consumer-retailer love levels. Furthermore, we find that for consumers scoring low on the value of warm relationships with others and for consumers characterized by an avoidant attachment style, the effect of consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions is less salient. Interestingly, in the case of highly avoidant individuals, the effect of consumer-retailer love is negative. Managerial implications for building consumer-firm love in the context of grocery retail, as well as future research perspectives, are provided at the end of the paper.
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1. Introduction

The grocery retail business has been characterized by a massive increase in multiple-chain patronage. Consumers are not likely to passively revisit the same store. Rather, consumers tend to seek alternative retail environments. According to Gijsbrechts, Campo, & Nisol (2008), store-loyal consumers have become the exception rather than the rule. Similarly, Turban et al. (2008) stated that the phenomenon of multichannel retailing, combined with the penetration of information and communication technologies in all retailing formats (e.g., e-commerce applications in the physical grocery store that enhance information search capabilities), decreases loyalty while simultaneously offering ample opportunities to increase loyalty.

To deal with the current industry situation, grocery retailer managers and researchers have invested in the relationship marketing paradigm and, specifically, in the satisfaction-loyalty chain. However, questions remain unanswered regarding the power of this well-accepted chain of marketing variables to which many customer relationship programs have been anchored (Yim, Tse, & Chan, 2008). Loyalty to services remains elusive and unpredictable (Agustin & Singh, 2005).

In addition to the satisfaction-loyalty paradigm, another approach to studying consumer relationships with firms focuses on feelings of attachment and love (e.g.,
Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Thomson, 2006). Both practitioner and academic research attests to the importance of the construct of brand love in building strong consumer-brand relationships. For example, Varley (2009) points out that the notion of brand love is even more important in a recession. Similarly, in a recent retail marketing conference organized by the Direct Marketing Association, one of the main key themes was that more customers are buying on emotional attachment (Johnson, 2010).

In the academic literature, a recent study by Park, MacInnis, Priester, Eisengerich, & Iacobucci (2010), provides considerable support for the centrality of the brand attachment construct in driving brand equity. In their terms (p. 14): “…the more strongly consumers are attached to a brand, the more willing they are to forsake personal resources to maintain an ongoing relationship with that brand.” In the same study the authors suggest that the construct of brand attachment when compared to the construct of brand attitude strength can add significant value to practicing managers. Arguably, in the realm of the grocery retail business, the phenomenon of multiple-chain patronage can be also attributed to managers’ solely focusing on improving customers’ overall attitudes, through customer satisfaction programs. Though this focus is important, it does not seem to help managers build loyalty (Yim et al. 2008).

For example, in the context of the retail banking industry, Park et al. (2010) find that brand attachment predicts actual customer purchase behavior (sales as reported by the company) better than brand attitude strength.

Though there seems to be mounting evidence on the importance of brand emotional attachment in building consumer favorable outcomes, little research exists
on how managers can build emotional ties with their consumers (Park, MacInnis, & Priester, 2007). Grisaffe & Nguyen (in press) noted that although emotional attachment is a significant determinant of loyal behavior, research has yet to identify antecedents of emotional brand attachment. Consistent with the research call of Grisaffe & Nguyen (in press), the central purpose of this study is to understand whether, why and when retail managers should invest in building affection-laden psychological connections between their stores and consumers. To that end, we address the “whether” question by investigating the effect of consumer-retailer love on purchase intentions, the “why” question by investigating predictors of consumer-retailer love and, finally, the “when” question by investigating the moderating effects that influence the aforementioned linkages. Pertaining to the latter, our study is important because most consumer studies in the services marketing domain tend to study direct (instead of moderating) effects of external factors (Dabholkar & Bagozzi, 2002). However, advancing hypotheses involving direct effects may be somewhat redundant and obvious, and it is thus much more meaningful to investigate the moderating effects of external factors such as consumer traits.

We empirically tested several hypotheses using two survey studies of two different grocery retailer brands. In the first study, we explored the direct-effects proposed model in a sample of 215 consumers intercepted while they were patronizing a large Greek grocery retailer that employs a high-low pricing strategy (i.e., emphasizes price specials on individual goods rather than an everyday low pricing strategy) (Lal & Rao, 1997). This retailer is the supermarket brand of a large
multinational retailer and has a long tradition in the Greek grocery retailing sector. In the second study, we replicated the findings of the first study, further investigating moderating effects in the direct-effects model in a sample of 465 consumers intercepted while they were patronizing a major multinational hard discounter in Greece.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Sections 3 and 4 include the research hypotheses and results of studies 1 and 2, respectively. We present the discussion, implications and future research directions in section 5.

2. Literature Review, Research Questions and Methodology

In their effort to build a comprehensive theory of close relationships, psychologists agree that attachment theory is an excellent framework for organizing research on close relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Attachment theory addresses research questions involving the origins, functions and developmental pathways of the bonds of human affection. Generally, attachment theory conceptualizes the propensity of human beings to make strong bonds of affection to particular others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). According to attachment theory, these particular others include infant-caregiver and adult-pair bonds. Importantly, attachment theory indicates that attachment formation begins with proximity-seeking, which is primarily motivated by a desire for security and the provision of care. Attachment formation then evolves into situations where the partner serves first as a reliable haven of safety and subsequently
as a secure base from which partners can engage in nonattachment behavior (e.g., exploration) (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

Thomson (2006) noted that because attachment theory investigates the human tendency to form, maintain and dissolve ties of affection, it is an appropriate theoretical foundation for the investigation of consumer ties of affection toward firms. Similarly, recent marketing research has supported the application of attachment theory to marketing (Thomson & Johnson, 2006). In this theoretical context several studies in the marketing literature examine individuals’ close relationships with possessions, goods, service brands and human brands (Albert, Merunka, & Valette-Florence 2008; Smit, Bronner, & Tolboom, 2007). Suggestively, Paulssen and Fournier (2007) as well as Ahuvia, Batra, & Bagozzi (2009) noted that attachments can extend beyond the context of interpersonal relationships, and that commercial relationships behave in similar ways to personal relationships.

The terminology used in the marketing literature to describe the phenomenon of consumers forming close, affection-laden relationships with brands, differs. Specifically, researchers seem to interchangeably use the terms “brand love” and “brand attachment”. For example, Thomson (2006), Thompson, MacInnis and Park (2005) and more recently Park et al. (2010) use the term “brand attachment”. On the other hand, Ahuvia (2005), Carroll & Ahuvia (2006), Albert et al. (2008), and Grisaffe & Nguyen (2009), use the term “brand love”. The question that arises here is
whether there is a difference between the two constructs of emotional attachment to brands and brand love. 

The interpersonal psychology research has long examined whether an attachment theoretical perspective can be used in the study of love. Hazan & Shaver (1997) were probably among the first who provided theoretical and empirical support on that romantic love is an attachment process. Specifically, they suggested extending Bowlby’s attachment theory-designed to characterize human infants’ love for and attachment to their caregivers-into the study of pair-bonds love. In the same vein, Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw (1998), proposed that romantic bonds between adults are emotional attachments conceptually matching infants’ emotional attachments with their primary attachment figures. Similarly, Feeney & Noller (1990) provided more empirical evidence in support of the utility of an attachment theory perspective on adult romantic love, finding that attachment styles are strongly related to different kinds of love. More recently Hazan & Zeifman (1999) reviewed the relevant literature finding that the attachment system is operative in adult romantic relationships and that attachments are transferred from parents to partners. Mikulincer (2006) adopting Bowlby’s behavioral systems perspective conceptualizes romantic love primarily as an attachment behavioral system. Further evidence that love can be conceptualized as
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\(^1\) We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out. The discussion that follows regarding the difference between the constructs of brand attachment and brand love heavily builds on the insightful suggestions of the same anonymous reviewer.
attachment had been provided by Fehr & Russell (1990). They found that maternal and paternal love scores higher on prototypicality ratings compared to romantic love (i.e., maternal and paternal love are better examples of love than romantic love). More recently, Fehr (2009) suggested that infant-parent love, is the most fundamental type of love and romantic love is something of a special case. In all, the interpersonal psychology literature discussed seems to recognize that attachment and love are frequently just two different words used to describe the same phenomenon. In the marketing literature, one can argue that a difference remains at least in the emphasis between the two constructs (i.e., love is associated with stronger attachments and passion). However, Thomson et al. (2005) developed a measure of consumers’ emotional attachments to brands building among others on the love literature. Another possible difference has to do with whether the two constructs explicitly use brand-self connection as an important part of their definitions. For example, a highly cited marketing article on emotional attachment to brands, namely the article of Thomson et al. (2005) seems to omit any explicit role for self-concept definition within the attachment construct. On the other hand self-concept definition has been given a central role in the brand love and interpersonal love literatures (e.g., Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006). At this point it should be noted that in parallel to the brand love literature, the literature on brand attachment has recently started pointing out the centrality of brand-self connection (e.g., Park et al. 2010). In all, this discussion further enhances the conclusions of the interpersonal psychology literature, indicating
that the two constructs tremendously overlap and that they are likely different words used for describing the sample psychological phenomenon.

Though we recognize that brand love and brand attachment are probably terms that can be used interchangeably to describe the phenomenon of consumers forming strong affection-laden bonds with brands, in this study we primarily use the term brand love given that our operationalization of the phenomenon heavily draws on Carroll & Ahuvia (2006) and Yim et al. (2008) namely two studies focusing on brand love.

The literature on brand love and attachment is relevantly new, but seems to attract a steadily growing interest in both academia and practice (Bergvist and Larsen 2010). Business practitioners seem to have embraced the concept of brand love. For example, Varley (2008, p. 29), suggests that especially in a recession “…the concept of brand love is more important than ever and should not be dismissed as too fluffy”. In the academic literature, one of the first studies in the brand love literature was that of Shimp and Madden (1988). These authors developed a typology of consumer-object relationships based analogously on the triangular theory of love (Sternberg, 1986). More recently, Fournier (1998) noted the importance of love in consumers’ relationships with brands. In the same vein, Kleine and Baker (2004) wrote of the bonds people form with material possessions (e.g., baby blankets, stuffed animals, and motorcycles), positing material possession attachment as an important mechanism used by consumers to valuate goods. Similarly, Ahuvia (2005) using an interpretive paradigm examined the role of loved objects and activities on our sense of who we
are. Thomson’s (2006) work was one of the first empirical efforts to investigate why consumers develop strong attachments to “human brands”, further suggesting attachment strength as a parsimonious proxy for consumer-brand relationship strength.

Summarizing the aforementioned writings, attachments are a type of strong relationship that people first experience with their parents; later in life, these attachments develop to involve other “targets” as well (Thomson, 2006). All in all, consumers seem to develop strong emotional attachments to gifts, collectibles, places, tangible goods brands, human brands, service brands, stores and favorite objects (Fournier, 1998; Park, Macinnis, & Priester, 2006).

Given that the elusive and unpredictable nature of consumer loyalty has been routinely associated with the service quality and satisfaction-building processes and on the tendency of people to form affectionate ties with animate and inanimate objects, one can logically conclude that building consumer-firm love and attachment is an alternative process for strengthening consumer loyalty. Along these lines, Yim et al. (2008) found empirical evidence in support of a multi-process paradigm that, besides service quality and satisfaction, involves the formation of customer-firm affection as a way to strengthen consumer loyalty.

Therefore, the research question that emerges relates to how firms can cultivate and build ties of strong affection with consumers. Carroll and Ahuvia’s (2006), as well as Ahuvia’s (2005), writings were some of the first to empirically recognize antecedents of consumer-firm love and attachment. Specifically in the
context of packaged goods brands, they identified the hedonic and self-expressive properties of brands as important predictors of consumer-firm affection. However, they called for the investigation of more antecedents of the consumer-provider emotional attachment phenomenon. Recently, Kim, Kim, Jolly, & Fairhurst (2008) examined the antecedents and outcomes of customer love in the context of apparel and grocery retailing. Their empirical findings show that customer love is predicted by perceived relationship investment, hedonic store experience, and symbolic store experience. Grisaffe and Nguyen (2009), identify a set of four underlying psychological mechanisms that consumers report as reasons for developing strong emotional attachments to brands (i.e., traditional marketing characteristics, utilitarian and hedonic benefits, socialization, & sentimentality). Finally, Bergvist and Larsen (2010) identify brand identification and sense of community as direct antecedents of brand love.

Consistent with Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), this article adopts a positivist research approach, contributing to the methodological pluralism necessary for the complete understanding of a phenomenon. Specifically, we extend their work by identifying more antecedents of consumer-firm love and attachment in a services setting involving two grocery retailers. It should be noted that, according to Yim et al. (2008), consumer ties of affection with service firms rarely receive research attention.

Finally, the study advances theory in another important way. Incorporating insights from adult attachment theory and consumer behavior, the study investigates the moderating role of a set of personality traits (i.e., attachment avoidance, nostalgia
proneness and romanticism) and consumer values (i.e., warm relationships with others) in the link between consumer love and re-patronage intentions.

3. Study #1

3.1. Hypotheses

We advance hypotheses building from attachment theory (Bowlby, 1979) and the literature on brand love. Attachment theory investigates the human tendency to form, maintain and dissolve ties of affection. Therefore, attachment theory is an appropriate theoretical foundation for investigating consumer ties of affection toward grocery retailers. Brand love is defined as the degree of passionate emotional attachment that a satisfied consumer has for a particular brand name (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006). The work reported here adds to the past work on consumer ties of affection to firms (Yim et al. 2008; Park et al. 2010) and consumer love for products (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006) by positing consumer-retailer love as having a direct influence on consumer re-patronage intentions.

**H1. Consumer-retailer love positively influences purchase intentions.**

Hypothesis 1 investigates whether investing in consumer-retailer love has merit. A probably more interesting research question though, that has received little research attention is how managers can build ties of affection with consumers (Park et al. 2007).
Park et al. (2007) provided a conceptual framework indicating that people are most likely to develop attachments to offerings that fulfill functional needs (i.e., enabling the self), their experiential needs (i.e., gratifying the self) and their symbolic needs (i.e., enriching the self). Building from these three pillars, we recognized antecedents that constitute suitable strategies for enhancing the retailer-self connection and, consequently, consumer-retailer love.

Building from the emotional attachment framework of Park et al. (2007), we posited corporate social responsibility (CSR) associations, retail store image and transactional value as direct antecedents of consumer-retailer love. We selected these variables (a) due to their academic and managerial prominences (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004; Sen, Bhattacharya, & Korschun, 2006; Thaler, 1985) and (b) due to their emotionally charged content. These three variables, amongst others, likely involve hedonic and self-expressive elements, namely, characteristics capable of explaining why consumers are likely to develop ties of affection with service providers (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006).

Specifically, given the theoretical content and the resulting benefits that these three variables bring to consumers, we posit that (a) retail store image enables and enriches the consumer’s self; (b) transactional value gratifies the consumer’s self; and (c) CSR gratifies and enriches the consumer’s self.

Retail store image is posited as a three-dimensional, second-order formative construct involving a) a general store attributes dimension, b) an appearance-related dimension, and c) a salesperson/service dimension (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1999;
Manolis, Keep, Joyce, & Lambert, 1994). These factors help consumers decide which retailer is more likely to effectively serve utilitarian needs through a reliable functional performance, which is the basic assumption behind attachment (Park et al. 2007). It is likely that retail store image also influences the emotional attachment of consumers through the “enriching the self” mechanism. Consumers may patronize retail stores that are more likely to help them express, maintain and enhance their self-concepts. For example, consumers may bolster weak social or private self-concept by patronizing retailers positioned as upscale or of high status.

Perceived transactional value relates to the perceptions of psychological satisfaction or pleasure obtained from the financial terms of a price-deal (Grewal, Monroe, & Krishnan, 1998). Building on this definition, we identified the construct of perceived transactional value as a marketing element that has the potential to gratify a consumer’s self (Park et al. 2007).

CSR associations reflect the firm’s status and activities with respect to its perceived societal obligations (Brown & Dacin, 1997). Sen (2007) suggested that a company’s CSR actions can help it build deep, meaningful connections with consumers because CSR actions reveal a company’s “soul” or “character”. More formally, these institutional associations are likely to positively influence consumer love and attachment levels through the “enriching the self” mechanism (Park et al. 2007). Because corporate social responsibility is about doing social good, consumers may use associations with corporate responsibility to define themselves and retain a positive inner and social self-image. In other words, patronizing a socially responsible
retailer may make consumers feel better about themselves, helping the customer understand who they are as people, ultimately satisfying self-definitional and self-expressive needs. Finally, it is likely that CSR also influences the love and attachment levels of consumers through gratification mechanisms. For example, in patronizing a socially responsible firm, consumers may feel that the firm is doing social good on their behalf—something that possibly evokes a mood-altering response. Psychology studies support this speculation (Harbaugh, Mayr, & Burghart, 2007). Therefore, drawing on the previous discussion, we posit the following:

**H2.** Retail store image positively influences consumer-retailer love.

**H3.** Transactional value positively influences consumer-retailer love

**H4.** Corporate social responsibility associations positively influence consumer-retailer love

### 3.2. Materials, Procedures and Results

We use Partial Least Squares (PLS) to estimate the parameters of the proposed model. The primary goal of this research is to investigate the determinants of consumer-retailer love (i.e., explaining variance) in an exploratory rather than confirmatory mode, rendering prediction-based structural equation modeling (i.e., PLS) more appropriate.

We measured consumer-retailer love by adapting items used by the marketing literature, namely Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) and Yim et al. (2008) and items adapted from the possessions attachment literature (Ball & Tasaki, 1992; Sivadas & Venkatesh, 1995). We adapted items capturing the construct of retail store image
from Manolis et al. (1994). It should be noted that we model the retail store image as a formative second-order construct including three first-order molar factors namely, the general retail store factor, the salesperson-service factor and the appearance factor. Since an increase in any one of the first-order dimensions (e.g., general retail store) will increase the overall magnitude of the second-order construct (e.g., retail store image), without necessarily affecting the rest of the first-order factors, these first-order factors should be probably theorized as formative (Diamantopoulos, Riefler, & Roth, 2008). We adapted transactional value measures from Grewal et al. (2001) and CSR association items from Sen, Bhattacharya, & Korschun (2006). Items capturing re-patronage intentions measures were adapted from Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman (1996). Measures were assessed using nine-point semantic differential and Likert scales.

With regard to data collection, researchers collected data in low, medium, and high-peak shopping days. The researchers “intercepted” a total of 215 respondents in four supermarket stores of a Greek grocery retailer, employing a face-to-face personal interviewing method.

Figure 1 depicts estimation results. Important demographics have been included as control variables. Of the respondents, 65% are women and 46% are married. The sample was balanced in terms of age groups represented: 50% are in the 25-44 age group and approximately one out of three is in the +44 age group. Moreover, more 25% of the respondents are lyceum graduates, whereas more than 30% of the respondents are holders of a bachelor degree. Overall in terms of gender,
age, education and marital status, the sample is representative of Greek supermarket shoppers, as indicated by the store managers of the supermarket chain.

<Insert Figure 1 Here>

Model estimates explain 25% of the variance in consumer-retailer love and the 39% in re-patronage intentions. Variance explained is the main model fit criterion in PLS analysis. Furthermore, since models yielding significant bootstrap statistics may still be invalid in a predictive sense (Chin & Newsted, 1999), we also employed measures of predictive validity for focal endogenous constructs. One such measure is the $Q^2$ measure (i.e., the Stone-Geisser test), which is a kind of cross-validated $R^2$, representing how well observed values are reconstructed by the parameter estimates of the model (Tenenhaus, Vinzi, Chatelin, & Lauro, 2005). $Q^2$ values for consumer-retailer love and re-patronage intentions are .16, and .31, respectively, indicating that the model’s predictive relevance is good (Sirohi, McLaughlin, & Witting, 1998; Tenenhaus, Vinzi, Chatelin, & Lauro, 2005).

With regard to the measurement quality results, our measurement model conforms to acceptable reliability, convergence and discriminant validity standards (see Table 1).

<Insert Table 1 Here>

Statistical significance results based on 500 bootstrap samples (Brown and Chin 2004) support H1, H2 and H3, but not H4 (see Figure 1). Specifically, CSR associations do not seem to influence consumer-retailer love to the grocery retailer
Furthermore, it seems that demographic variables do not seem to statistically influence consumer-retailer love. However, though statistically not significant, some demographic path coefficients are somewhat large, warranting further examination (i.e., sex, education, and income). The remaining t-values are greater than 2.00, indicating statistical significance (see Figure 1). All regression coefficients signs are in the predicted direction.

4. Study #2

We replicated and extended the results of study 1 in the context of a discount grocery retailer. Specifically, hypotheses advanced in study 1 address the whether and why questions with regard to building consumer-retailer love in the context of grocery retailing. Another important question pertains to when managers should invest in building ties of affection with consumers. We address this question in study 2 by positing consumer traits as an important moderating factor in the relationship between consumer-retailer love and purchase intentions. Therefore, in addition to testing the hypotheses of study 1, we empirically tested hypotheses relating to four potentially moderating variables: warm relationship with others (Herche, 1994), consumer romanticism (Holbrook & Olney, 1995), consumer nostalgia (Holbrook 1993), and attachment avoidance (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

4.1. Hypotheses
Study 2 begins by retesting hypotheses 1-4 from study one. Specifically, we test whether: a) consumer-retailer love positively influences purchase intentions (H1) b) retail store image positively influences consumer-retailer love (H2), c) whether transactional value positively influences consumer-retailer love (H3), d) whether corporate social responsibility associations positively influence consumer-retailer love (H4). As already mentioned we extend study 1 by examining more antecedents and moderating variables.

Attachment theory postulates that individuals differ in attachment proneness (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan 2000). Similarly, recent research in consumer psychology has suggested that people are characterized by different styles of interpersonal relationship (e.g., Green 2007), and recent marketing literature has provided empirical evidence that customers are likely to differ based on their desire for closeness (Mende, Bolton, & Bitner, 2009). Altogether, these sources have indicated that consumers are likely to differ in their tendency to form strong attached relationships, something that renders possible the existence of contingency effects in the relationship between consumer-retailer love and consumer-related outcomes, such as purchase intentions. The following four variables have been shown to correlate with the desire of individuals for closeness, and therefore, are likely to moderate the love-purchase intentions link: priority placed on warm relationships with others (Herche, 1994), consumer romanticism (Holbrook & Olney, 1995), consumer nostalgia (Holbrook 1993), and attachment avoidance (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). We have selected these four individual-differences variables due to (a) their emotionally-
charged content and (b) their prominence in the marketing literature (Bearden & Netemeyer, 1999) and the literature on love and attachment (e.g., Whang, Allen, Sahoury, & Zhang, 2004).

First, we identified the construct of warm relationships with others as: a) an antecedent of consumer-retailer love, and b) as a positive moderator of the link between consumer-retailer love and purchase intentions. The warm relationships with others construct is a personal value, namely, an enduring belief that a specific end state of existence or specific mode of conduct is preferred to an opposite or converse end state of existence or mode of conduct (Herche, 1994). Arguably, people scoring high on this value will tend to maintain a greater degree of emotional proximity in their interpersonal relationships. These people will tend to have relationships characterized by higher levels of emotional involvement and trust. Therefore, we posit the following hypotheses:

**H5a.** The “warm relationships with others” consumer value positively influences consumer-retailer love.

**H5b.** The “warm relationships with others” consumer value moderates the positive effect of consumer-firm emotional attachment on purchase intentions. Specifically, for low scores of the construct, the relationship between consumer-retailer love and repatronage intentions will be attenuated, whereas for high scores, the relationship will be strengthened.

In the same vein, we hypothesize that the consumer trait romanticism is a) a determinant of consumer-retailer love and b) that it positively moderates the
attachment-purchase intentions linkage. Romantics are more likely to be sensitive and emotional than people low on romantic tendencies (Holbrook & Olney, 1995). Similarly, more romantic consumers, compared to less romantic consumers, are more likely to be emotionally charged in their relationships, which probably renders emotional attachment as more salient in determining their future consumer behavior. Therefore, we predict the following:

**H6a.** The trait of romanticism positively influences consumer-retailer love.

**H6b.** For highly romantic consumers, the relationship linking consumer-retailer love to purchase intentions will be of greater significance. For less-romantic consumers, the saliency of consumer-retailer love in predicting purchase intentions will be less significant.

We further hypothesize that consumer nostalgia (i.e., a longing for the past, a yearning for yesterday, or a fondness for possessions and activities associated with days of the past) (Wildschut, Sedikides, Arndt, & Routledge, 2006) will have an antecedent role on consumer-retailer love and a positive moderating effect on the link between consumer-firm love and purchase intentions. This effect is likely to take place because nostalgia-prone consumers are more likely to be characterized by higher levels of emotional intensity compared to less nostalgia-prone consumers. Arguably, this is because nostalgia proneness, as an individual trait, is characterized by the generation of autobiographical memories that relate to past experiences, namely, affectively charged outcomes (Baumgartner, Sujan, & Bettman 1992). Indeed, a close examination of the literature on nostalgia and marketing indicates that
nostalgic memories (i.e., the product of nostalgia-prone people) are likely charged with positive affect. For example, Holak and Havlena (1998) and, more recently, Orth & Bourrain (2008) found that nostalgic memories generate a variety of strong emotional-motivational responses. Similarly, Gal and Orth (2007) suggested that consumers may become more emotionally attached to brands that remind them of the past. In the same vein, Grisaffe & Nguyen (in press, p. 6) suggested, “…emotional attachments result when brands tie to affectively-laden memories, evoking or symbolizing nostalgic experiences…” . Such a mechanism may be strengthened in the context of consumers who can be characterized as being more nostalgia prone. Therefore, we predict the following:

**H7a.** *The trait of nostalgia positively influences consumer-retailer love*

**H7b.** *For highly nostalgic consumers, the relationship linking consumer-firm love to purchase intentions will be of greater significance. For less nostalgic consumers, the saliency of consumer-firm love in predicting purchase intentions will be less significant.*

Finally, we examine whether attachment avoidance is a direct antecedent of consumer-retailer love and whether it moderates the effect of consumer-retailer love on purchase intentions. We hypothesize that since avoidant individuals-namely, consumers characterized by a high degree of self-reliance, desire for autonomy and avoidance of intimacy in social relationships (Campbell, Simpson, Boldry, & Kashy, 2005)—avoid intimacy with their interpersonal relationship partners, they will do the same with their brand relationship partners. With regard to the moderating role of
attachment avoidance we predict that this trait will negatively moderate the effect of consumer-retailer love on purchase intentions. Attachment avoidance corresponds to discomfort with closeness and dependency or a tendency to avoid intimacy with others (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). In the same vein, avoidant individuals tend to form shallow, less-stable, short-term relationships, and they demonstrate a lower level of interest for close, intimate relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). This probably indicates that affectionate ties will be less salient in their consumer decision making. Therefore, we predict the following:

H8a. The trait of attachment avoidance negatively influences consumer-retailer love

H8b. For highly avoidant consumers, the relationship linking consumer-retailer love to purchase intentions will be attenuated. For less-avoidant consumers, the saliency of consumer-retailer love in predicting purchase intentions will be strengthened.

4.2. Materials, Procedures and Results

We intercepted 465 consumers while they patronized a major multinational discounter, employing a face-to-face interviewing method. Data were collected during low-, medium-, and high-peak shopping days at seven different stores located in the Attica region in Greece. Of the respondents, 63% were women and 47% were married. The sample was balanced in terms of age groups represented: 49% were from the 25-44 age group, and 38% were over 44 years old. Moreover, 28% of the respondents were lyceum graduates (i.e., senior high-school graduates), whereas 30% of the respondents held a bachelors degree. Overall, in terms of gender, age, education
and marital status, the sample is representative of Greek supermarket shoppers. It should be noted that the sample of study 2 is demographically similar to the sample of study 1.

We employed the same measures used in study 1. Furthermore, with regard to the four moderating factors, we measured consumer nostalgia by adapting items from Holbrook (1993) and consumer romanticism by using items adapted from Holbrook & Olney (1995). Warm relationship with others measures were adapted from Herche (1994). Finally, items capturing attachment avoidance were adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan (2000). Measures were assessed using nine-point semantic differential and Likert scales (see Appendix A).

Similarly to study 1, we chose partial least squares (PLS) as the analytical method to estimate the parameters of the proposed model. We chose PLS to accommodate the presence of a large model and the hypothesized existence of moderating effects because PLS is more appropriate than covariance-based structural equation modeling when models are complex and the goal of the researcher is to explain variance (Smith & Barclay, 1997).

Measurement model results conform to widely accepted measures of reliability and convergent and discriminant validity (see Table 2).

<Insert Table 2 Here>

Figure 2 depicts regression coefficients and estimated t-values for the direct and moderated effects model. Model estimates explained a large amount of variance.
in consumer-retailer love ($R^2=.37$) and re-patronage intentions ($R^2=.42$). $Q^2$ values for consumer-retailer love and re-patronage intentions are .24 and .30, respectively, indicating that the model’s predictive relevance is good (Sirohi, McLaughlin, & Wittink, 1998; Tenenhaus, Vinzi, Chatelin, & Lauro, 2005). Statistical significance results, based on 500 bootstrap samples (Brown & Chin, 2004), supported H1-H4 (see Figure 2 and Hypotheses Development section in Study 1). First, we found that retail store image also positively influences consumer-retailer love in study 2 ($b=.31$, $t$-value= 6.16). The same stands for perceived transactional value ($b=.21$, $t$-value= 4.72). Furthermore, in the second study, we found CSR associations to positively influence consumer-retailer love ($b=.13$, $t$-value= 2.78), in support of H4. We did not find support for H4 in study 1. Furthermore, in contrast to the findings of study 1, some demographic variables seem to statistically influence consumer-retailer love. Specifically, we found negative effects for education and income on consumer-retailer love ($b=-.14$, $t$-value= 3.38 and $b=-.06$, $t$-value= 1.49$).

In contrast to our expectations, *warm relationships with others* do not seem to directly influence consumer-retailer love ($b=-.02$, $t$-value= 0.35), therefore H5a is rejected.

As predicted we found a direct positive effect for *consumer romanticism* ($b=.22$, $t$-value= 5.46) and *consumer nostalgia* ($b=.07$, $t$-value= 1.85). Therefore H6a-H7a are not rejected. Interestingly, contrary to our expectations we find no support for H8a.

\[ p < .10 \text{ (one-tailed test)} \]
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Specifically, we find that consumer avoidant attachment style has a positive effect on consumer-retailer love ($b=.09$, $t$-value$= 1.87$). This empirical finding is consistent with some recent findings in the marketing literature (Thomson & Johnson, 2006). These findings suggest that avoidant consumers probably desire positive emotions in commercial relationships to make up for the lower levels of emotional involvement, trust and satisfaction that characterize their personal relationships. Furthermore, this finding is consistent with attachment theory, which suggests that although avoidant individuals avoid intimacy in relationships, they do not shun social contact altogether.

Finally, we found a strong positive effect for consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions ($b=.63$, $t$-value$= 21.69$), consistent with the results of study 1.

To test H5b-H8b, we entered the moderated terms in the direct effects model. We found support for H5b and H8b but not H6b and H7b. As predicted, avoidant attachment style negatively moderates the effect of consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions ($b=-.08$, $t$-value$= 2.22$), and warm relationships with others multiplies the effect of consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions ($b=.13$, $t$-value$= 3.38$). Put differently, avoidant attachment style weakens the positive effect of consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions, whereas warm relationships with others strengthens this link. Interestingly, although avoidant attachment style has a direct positive effect on consumer-retailer love (see the relevant discussion above), it also seems to have an adverse moderating effect on the link between consumer-retailer love and re-patronage intentions. According to simple slope analyses, we found that highly avoidant individuals consider consumer-retailer love as a negative
determinant of their re-patronage intentions, whereas low avoidant individuals consider consumer-retailer love as a positive determinant.

In contrast to our predictions, romanticism and nostalgia do not moderate the effect of consumer-retailer love on re-patronage intentions.

The two significant interaction terms suffered from convergent validity problems (i.e., AVE<.5). However, both interaction terms present large composite reliabilities (i.e., CR=.88 and CR=. 89, see Table 2), and they are sufficiently discriminant from the rest of the constructs included in the model. If a latent variable is reliable, it may be a sufficient demonstration of convergent validity for some researchers (see Ping 2007 for a good discussion on this issue). According to Ping (2009), in first-time studies, low AVE scores might still be acceptable if there are no major discriminant validity problems and any significant effects involving the low AVE latent variable are held to a higher significance requirement (both hold true in this study). However, Ping’s suggestions refer to AVEs “slightly” below .50, which is not the case in our study. Given the abovementioned, the reader should consider the results involving the low AVE latent variable (i.e., the interaction term) as tentative/provisional and in need of replication. At this point, we should point out that we assessed for spurious moderating effects, following the suggestions of Lubinski &

3 to the best of our knowledge, our marketing study is one of the first that examines whether individual differences can moderate the effect of the relatively unexplored construct of emotional attachment on outcome variables.
Humphreys (1990). Specifically, we simultaneously estimated the quadratic effects of the constituent terms of the statistically significant moderating effects. Empirical results suggest that the interaction effect (i.e., the consumer-retailer love by avoidance interaction effect) is still significant in the presence of the squared Emotional Attachment term and the squared Avoidance term (b=-.089, t-value=2.32). Similarly, the warm relationship with others by consumer-retailer love interaction term is still significant (b=.082, t-value=1.99), even after the inclusion of the two constituent squared terms (i.e., consumer-retailer love and warm relationship with others squared)\(^4\). Interestingly, consumer-retailer love has a positive quadratic effect on purchase intentions (i.e., increasing returns to scale) (b=.14, t-value=2.09), and warm relationships with other has a negative quadratic effect on purchase intentions (i.e., decreasing returns to scale) (b=-.11, t-value=2.10).

To investigate whether the inclusion of the multiplicative terms in the main effects model is empirically meaningful, we used the difference of \(R^2\) values (Ping, 1998). The results indicated that the addition of the moderating terms is empirically meaningful (\(f^2 = 36.72, p<.01\)). This piece of statistical evidence provides further empirical support for the significant moderation effects we found.

\(^4\) We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out
5. Discussion and Conclusions

Our findings suggest marketing implications for firms wishing to form emotionally-laden relationships with consumers. Specifically, our findings confirm that consumer-retailer love positively influences re-patronage intentions (Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996). Managerially, that influence means that investing in building emotionally-laden relationships with consumers will probably pay off in terms of loyalty. To that end, managers should focus on building ties of affection with their customers. Specifically, they can build such ties by investing in the manipulation procedure of the consumer-retailer love direct antecedents that have predicting power on this dimension. Furthermore, we found that investing to build higher levels of perceived transactional value, retail store image and corporate social responsibility associations is a good strategy for establishing and strengthening ties of affection with consumers. Understanding whether consumer perceptions of transactional value, retail store image and CSR relate to consumer-retailer love can help managers monitor and enhance consumer outcomes by employing marketing initiatives that appropriately manage emotionally-laden antecedents. The predicted positive effect of CSR associations on consumer-retailer love was only found in one of the two samples used. A possible explanation for this divergent finding may be the nature of the two different types of grocery retailers used in the study (e.g., a hard discounter vs. a high-low/promo retailer). However, this is a conjecture that needs to be theoretically and empirically justified by future research efforts. To that end, we encourage future researchers to replicate our findings across different types of grocery retailers as well
as retailers in general (e.g., more risk-prone retailer settings, such as pharmaceuticals and apparel).

Another important finding of the study relates to moderated effects results. These effects indicate that managers should target their investments (embedded in Integrated Marketing Communication programs) mainly to those less avoidant and valuing warm relationships with others customers. Thus, although firm investments in ties of affection promise important firm-level outcomes, they should be guided by careful segmentation analyses. Specifically, our study indicates that, amongst others, personality and values traits should be used as segmentation variables. Suggestively, loyalty cards could serve as a good tool for collecting consumer data, combined with the periodical execution of incentive programs to continuously collect data on consumer personality traits, value systems and consumption behaviors. Similarly, as far as the behavioral data are concerned, POS could feed such a database with actual transactional data (i.e., not just intentions). Thus, these results provide challenging opportunities for future research that investigates the effects emotional attachment in shopping behaviors by replicating the present study.

For the remaining customers (i.e., those high in avoidance and low in valuing warm relationships with others), the influence of consumer-retailer love on repatronage intentions is probably tempered. It seems that emotionally-laden mechanisms are not equally effective in influencing the consumption behaviors of individual consumers. To that end, investing in factors included in the traditional satisfaction-loyalty relationship marketing paradigm seems more appropriate for
certain consumer segments. However, given that strictly store-loyal consumers have become the exception rather than the rule, future research should focus on uncovering other novel factors that will compel these consumer segments to continue patronizing the store and provide positive recommendations. Again, the emotionally-laden factors proposed in this study do not do an adequate job of influencing the consumption outcomes of certain consumer segments.

Comparing the findings of the present study with current business practice, it is observed that grocery retail chains already place particular emphasis on CSR initiatives (e.g., recycle bins placed at the entrance/exit of grocery stores directly connected with a specific CSR program), enhancing consumers’ perceived transactional value through a series of alternative promotional programs (e.g., sales and specials, coupons and loyalty card points) and improving retail store image (through servicescapes improvement programs, value-expressive advertising, etc.), which is the case for both types of retailers involved in the present study. However, all of these programs are executed on a one-to-many basis, meaning that there are ample opportunities to narrow the target audience and invest in customers that have the aforementioned personality and values-based characteristics (i.e., are less avoidant and value warm relationships with others).

It should be underlined that the data collection phase of the present study was executed in a period when the world economic crisis had begun to affect the Greek business landscape and, correspondingly, the purchasing power of Greek consumers. Thus, while the research hypotheses of the present study are adequately supported by
theory, we were expecting at the beginning of this research initiative that retailer love may not significantly affect purchase intentions simply because consumers would use only pure economic criteria (e.g., price) to select and patronize a grocery store during a period of economic crisis. Moreover, this observation is more valid in the grocery sector than in other sectors, where hedonic consumption possesses a greater percentage (e.g., apparel, etc.). This discussion further strengthens the findings of the present study in the sense that retailer love still has a predicting power on purchase intentions despite the specific economic circumstances (i.e., economic crisis) and sector characteristics (i.e., grocery vs. apparel sector).

The findings imply that consumer nostalgia does not moderate the effects of consumer-retailer love on consumer purchase intentions. This finding may be explained by the fact that the two retail chains used in the present study have operated in Greece for a small period of time compared to other grocery retailers in the Greek market. To that end, future research should explore the moderating power of that dimension, employing retail chains that operate in a particular market for decades. In addition, sampling should focus on older individuals for whom nostalgia is applicable.

It should be noted that our findings further suggest that consumer nostalgia serves as a direct antecedent of consumer-retailer love. For practicing managers, this is an important finding, indicating that managers can use nostalgic appeals in their marketing messages as a means of enhancing ties of affection with consumers.

In the same vein, although we did not find a significant moderating effect for romanticism, we found a direct positive effect of this trait on consumer-retailer love.
These results suggest that (a) consumer-retailer love is important for less- and more-romantic consumers and (b) using romantic appeals in positioning efforts is a probably a good idea for practicing managers, aiming at building ties of affection with their target segments. At this point, it should be noted that regardless of the non-significant moderating role of romanticism, we believe that the proposed mechanism is intuitively and theoretically sound, and future research should elaborate more on this moderating effect. An explanation for this non-significant finding probably involves a third moderating variable, likely the service category used as context in this study (i.e., grocery retailing). Future research should try to replicate our results in more service categories, preferably with services involving physical acts to consumer the bodies of consumers (i.e., passenger transport; lodging, beauty salons, etc.). These types of services are more likely to elicit emotional responses than services involving physical acts to owned objects, services involving information processing or services that deliver non-physical acts to the minds of consumers (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004).

In this study, we tried to measure relatively complex psychological constructs using only a few items, which is probably problematic (with the exception of the consumer-retailer love, the central variable of the study). However, given that the existent relevant marketing scales do not exist in short-forms, the practice of incorporating lengthy instruments in data collection tools is also problematic, which is true because consumers are less willing to respond to lengthy questionnaires and practicing managers often react negatively to such practices. In our study, we were
diligent in selecting items that were more likely to conceptually manifest the study’s constructs. Future research should take these observations into account and focus on developing reliable, valid and short-form measurement scales that focus on commercial (rather than interpersonal) relationships.

Finally, future research should investigate the effects of situational factors (e.g., the antecedent states of consumers, purpose of shopping/consumer motivational orientation, task definition, and shopping with others or alone) in all of the aforementioned relationships because, according to the established knowledge, emotions are likely to be strongly affected by the specific circumstances framing each customer visit to a given store.

Appendix

**Consumer-Retailer Love** (Ball & Tasaki, 1992; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Yim et al. 2008; Sivadas & Venkatesh, 1995)

1. XYZ is “my” store; my favorite super-market that I can count on
2. I always enjoy shopping at XYZ
3. I never get bored of shopping at XYZ
4. I love shopping at this super-market
5. If I were describing myself, shopping at XYZ would likely be something I would mention
6. Shopping at XYZ reminds me of beautiful memories and experiences

**Transactional Value** (Adapted from Grewal et al. 1998)

1. I take great pleasure of buying good quality products at prices much lower than normal
2. Besides saving money, I feel extremely happy when I pay a little money on products whose value is much greater
**Retail Store Image (Manolis et al. 1994) (reversely coded)**

*General Store Attributes Dimension*

1. This super-market chain has a: good selection of merchandise/bad selection of merchandise
2. This super-market chain has a: good layout/bad layout
3. This super-market chain is: high class/low class

*Appearance-Related Dimension*

1. This super-market chain has: good appearance/bad appearance

*Salesperson-Service Dimension*

1. This super-market chain provides: good service/bad service
2. This super-market’s salespersons make a: good impression /bad impression

**CSR associations (Sen et al. 2006)**

1. This super-market chain treats its employees: Bad/Well
2. This super-market chain: Does not care for the environment/ Cares for the environment

**Re-patronage Intentions (Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman 1996)**

1. Consider this super-market chain your first choice when going shopping
2. Consider shopping more frequently from this super-market chain the coming years

**Nostalgia scale (Holbrook 1993)**

1. Things used to be better in the old good days
2. Products are getting shoddier and shoddier

**Romanticism-Classicism (Holbrook and Olney 1994)**

1. The heart not the brain should be your guide
2. It’s OK to daydream a lot

**Warm Relationship with others (Herche, 1994)**

1. I often commend others on their efforts, even when they fail
2. Without my close friends, my life would be much less meaningful

**Avoidance (Fraley, Waller and Brennan 2000)**

1. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners
2. I prefer not to show a romantic partner how I feel deep down
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retail Store Image</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Store Image Attributes</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salesperson-Service Image*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appearance-Related Image</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Transactional Value</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Corporate Social Responsibility Associations</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Consumer-Retailer Emotional Attachment</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Re-patronage Intentions</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Matrix, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

**Notes:** The diagonal represents the square root of AVE. Lower diagonal values indicate factor correlations. CR: Composite Reliability. *measured using a single-item
Figure 1. Parameter Estimates: Study 1

NOTES: *p<.05, **p<.01 (one-tailed test)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retail Store Image</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Store Image Attributes</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salesperson-Service Image</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appearance-Related Image*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Transactional Value</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Corporate Social Responsibility Associations</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Consumer-Retailer Love</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Re-patronage Intentions</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Avoidant Attachment Style</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consumer Romanticism</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Consumer Nostalgia</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Warm Relationships With Others</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. (Consumer-Retailer Love) X (Avoidant Attachment Style)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (Consumer-Retailer Love) X (Romanticism)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (Consumer-Retailer Love) X (Nostalgia)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (Consumer-Retailer Love) X (Warm Relationships)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Matrix, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Notes: The diagonal represents the square root of AVE. Lower diagonal values indicate factor correlations. CR: Composite Reliability. *measured using a single-item
Figure 2. Parameter Estimates: Study 2

NOTES: *p<.05, **p<.01 (one-tailed tests)
Beta coefficients of the direct effect constructs are linear-only terms model estimates and squared.
Multiple correlations estimates are non-linear terms model estimates
Quadratic terms were estimated for methodological reasons (i.e., check for spurious moderator effects)