

ARTICLE REVIEW FORM
JURNAL DINAMIKA MANAJEMEN
Management Department Faculty of Economics
Universitas Negeri Semarang

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you in advance for reviewing the following article. Please be mindful that you belong to a community of scholars, educators, and practitioners who devote their energy to sharing knowledge. Always be respectful and professional when providing feedback. Referees are encouraged to be critical, constructive, and, above all, respectful.

Read the article and complete the reviewer report form within this document.

- Make **annotations or comment** to the article using a method that clearly differentiates your text from the author's such as block letters, different colored text, or the "Track Changes" function in Microsoft Word.
- **Please make sure that your identity stay hidden** while you are make a comment as we are using double-blind review process.
- Upload the completed report using the same link from which you downloaded the original report. When uploading the completed report, please include the recommendation regarding the publication decision.
- **Deadline:** Reports should be returned within **two weeks** of this invitation. Please see the referee selection email for your deadline.

Please do not hesitate to contact us by email if you have any questions about the refereeing process. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen

PLANNING REVIEW ARTICLES

Title	BRAND ATTACHMENT VS. BRAND LOVE: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THEY IDENTICAL?
-------	---

REVIEW ARTICLES

Please give examination on each of the section on table below

General Comments	Overall, the paper provides a fundamental insight regarding brand love and brand attachment. Previous research mostly examining the relation with another variable; however, this research is profoundly attempt to understand
Abstract	Abstract is clear, however it should add with research implication briefly
Introduction	Introduction is well-develop
Method	Authors should explain research data, how to collect, and how many paper studied.
Result & Discussion	Well-elaborated
Conclusion & Recommendation	Need improvement, see suggestion in the section.
References	Good

ASSESTMENT SUMMARY
(please check the boxes)

ASSESSMENT INDICATORS	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	v	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scholarly	<input type="checkbox"/>	v	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	v	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appearance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	v	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth of the Research	v	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASSESTMENT SUMMARY
Reviewer Recommendation

- v Accepted with minor revisions
- Accepted with major revisions
- Suggested to sent it to other journals such as:
- Rejected with the reason:

Brand Attachment Vs. Brand Love: To What Extent Are They Identical?

Abstract

Brand attachment and brand love is important marketing concepts in developing a strong relationship of brand. Nevertheless, up to now the boundaries of these two concepts are still blurred. This research seeks to study the two constructs of brand attachment and brand love at the conceptual, definition and operational dimensions. The study was carried out by in-depth examination of articles related to brand attachment and brand love. Each of these constructs is defined and presented in relation to theoretical concepts, operational dimension and measurement patterns that have been used in empirical research. In the end, this review reveals that although there are similarities between brand attachment and brand love, they are different. This difference is viewed from the concepts, measurement dimension and intensity between the two. Brand attachment and brand love are two constructs that have emotional content and influence the behavior to maintain the relationship with a brand. However, brand attachment is "more self-focused" relative to the thoughts and feelings of a particular object; whereas brand love is "more brand-focused" which includes cognitive consistency, power of great positive attitude, more frequent thoughts and conversations about the object of attitude.

Abstrak

Keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek merupakan konsep pemasaran yang penting dalam mengembangkan hubungan merek yang kuat. Meskipun demikian, hingga saat ini batasan kedua konsep tersebut masih terbatas. Penelitian ini berupaya melakukan studi terhadap dua konstruk keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek pada tataran konseptual, definisi dan dimensi operasional. Penelitian dilakukan dengan pemeriksaan secara mendalam pada artikel-artikel yang berkaitan dengan keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek. Masing-masing konstruksi ini didefinisikan dan disajikan dalam kaitannya dengan konsep teoritis, dimensi operasional, dan pola pengukuran yang telah digunakan dalam penelitian empiris. Pada akhirnya, ulasan ini mengungkapkan bahwa meskipun terdapat kesamaan antara keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek, namun keduanya berbeda. Perbedaan tersebut dilihat dari konsep, dimensi pengukuran dan intensitas antara keduanya. Keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek adalah dua konstruk yang memiliki kandungan emosional dan mempengaruhi perilaku untuk menjaga hubungan dengan merek. Namun, keterlekatan merek lebih berfokus pada diri yang bersifat relatif berdasarkan pikiran dan perasaan terhadap objek tertentu sedangkan cinta merek lebih berfokus pada merek yang mencakup konsistensi kognitif, kekuatan sikap positif yang besar, pemikiran dan percakapan yang lebih sering tentang objek sikap.

Introduction

The research on marketing recently has paid greater attention in studying the emotional aspect of brand-consumer relationship. Brand has been considered to be meaningful and significant in fulfilling the psychological, utilitarian, hedonic, social, symbolic, or even spiritual goals. When the brands are self-relevant, improve goal fulfillment (Park and MacInnis, 2018), and can provide

intrinsic rewards (Batra et al. 2012) the consumers will be emotionally connected to the brands. Brands that enable to evoke strong and positive emotions can motivate consumers not only to make repeat purchases but also increase psychological and affective commitment (Park and MacInnis, 2018) through advocacy behaviors and engagement in the brand community (Brodie et al. 2013).

Some studies show emotional aspects such as brand attachment (Thomson et al. 2005; Park 2010, 2013) and brand love (Caroll and Ahuvia 2006; Albert et al. 2009; Batra et al. 2012) as important concept in developing the strong brand relationship. Those constructs describe the level of connection and intensity of brand-consumer relationship that can influence commitment (Thomson et al. 2005), long-term relationship (Caroll and Ahuvia 2006), and behaviors that can increase the profitability of the brand (Park et al. 2010).

A large number of research studies on brand love and brand attachment in marketing literature have been produced. However, some research (Gomez-Suarez 2019 and Palusuk et al. 2019) suggested that boundaries between the two constructs are still blurred and relatively difficult to decipher until today. Moussa (2015) argued that they had similarity because of reflecting the emotional bond and sharing the same innate theoretical assumption. Despite this, some researchers (such as Albert et al. 2008, 2009; Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2011; and Loureiro et al. 2012) consider that the two constructs are different. Gomez-Suarez (2019) suggested that those two constructs are different constructs in term of meaning, dimensions and items in defining them.

The emergence of two emotionally charged constructs of brand namely brand attachment and brand love has recently attracted some researchers. Critiques on concept of brand-consumers relationship in marketing literature mainly brand attachment and brand love (Albert et al. 2008; Moussa 2015; Palusuk et al. 2019 and Gomez-Suarez 2019) highlight the importance of establishing the boundary between brand attachment and brand love. The conceptual boundary is needed because those different terms have been viewed by some researchers as the same constructs (as in Thomson et al. 2005; Caroll and Ahuvia 2006; Belaid and Behi 2011; and Moussa 2015).

Moreover, the terminological confusion arises because those concepts have been explained by some researchers using the same theory, such as the self-expansion theory in understanding brand attachment by Park et al. (2010) and brand love by Ahuvia (2005). Both researches has assumption that brand attachment and brand love are cognitive and affective constructs that can motivate consumers to maintain close relationships. Another theory namely Attachment Theory (Bowlby 1958) is used to understand brand attachment (Thomson et al. 2005 and Aureliano-Silva 2018;) and brand love (Bagozzi et al. 2014). Gumparathi and Patra (2019) exposed that Attachment Theory was relevant to be used in the research related to cognitive and affective responses of consumers to a brand such as brand love and brand attachment. Although there is an overlap on the impact of strong and positive relationships on brands, they are conceptually different (Park et al. 2006; Albert et al. 2008, 2009; Loureiro et al. 2012; Hwang and Kandampully 2012; Park et al. 2013; Palusuk et al. 2019). Therefore, further explanation and boundary on both constructs are required for deep understanding. Following the suggestion of Park et al. (2013) and Gomez-Suarez (2019), this research analyzes similarities and differences between constructs of love and attachment to a brand. A comparison of the two constructs will be presented. Furthermore, the comparison is made at the level of conceptual, definition, and operational dimension.

Brand Attachment

The conceptualization of attachment stems from a psychological concept that has been explored in Bowlby's research (1979, 1980) in the context of primary caregiver-infant relationships. Bowlby showed that attachment is an emotion-laden target specific bond between infant and primary caregiver (Thomson et al. 2005). The attachment of infants to the primary caregiver (mother/caregiver) is obtained from the results of evolution through interactions (Park et al., 2006). The previous research by Hazan and Zeifman (1999) suggested that attachment formation takes place through a series of phases starting from physical closeness, cognitive awareness, perception and emotion in the context of relationships. When the attachment gets stronger, someone will have the desire to maintain closeness, be motivated to learn about the environment, seek security when there is a threat and experience emotional distress when facing separation.

Specifically, Park et al. (2006) revealed that this attachment serves basic human needs to secure a protection from physical and psychological threats that can influence relationship

behaviors in the future. In marketing research, the literature shows that the attachment can go beyond the context of people's relationships. The basic conceptual characteristics and behavioural effects of attachment are assumed to have similarities with attachment to an object. Several studies (Thomson et al. 2005; Park et al. 2006; Park et al. 2010) showed that consumers could develop attachment to objects or brands.

Several previous studies refer to material ownership (Belk 1988) regarding to the emergence of the concept of brand attachment. The object has become a part of the self and has symbolic meaning which comes from personal history so that it evokes emotions. This idea of material possession has provided an interesting idea of attachment in the relationship of individuals and material objects (Schultz et al. 1989). Schultz et al. (1989) defined attachment as a construct in the consumer behavior. Attachment is multidimensional property of material object possession which represents the degree of linkage perceived by an individual between him/herself and particular object (p. 360). When the object becomes more favorite than the others, it becomes part of the self and consumers tend to attach to this object. The attachment appears from the previous experience with the object and has a relative strength based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards a certain object. Attachment represents something that the individual feels towards the object in question. When the object is considered to be part of the self, the attachment will be stronger (Schultz et al. 1989).

Furthermore, Lacoëuilhe (2000) began to define and develop and also validate the measurement of the brand attachment. Lacoëuilhe (2000) assumed that attachment is an emotional predisposition or psychological link. Attachment is a psychological variable that refers to a long-lasting and irreversible affective reaction (separation is painful) and expresses psychological closeness to the Lacoëuilhe brand (2000, p. 66). Using the attachment theory (Bowlby 1979), Thomson et al. (2005) conceptualized that consumers also developed a strong emotional attachment to the brand. Attachment is defined as the specific emotion-laden target specific bond between a person and a specific object (Thomson et al. 2005, p 77-78) which varies in strength. When consumers have stronger attachment to the brand, they will maintain closeness with the object.

Extending the concept related to those constructs, Park et al. (2006) developed brand attachment that had affective and cognitive based on attachment theory (Bowlby 1979). Park et al.

(2006) conceptualized the relationship-based attachment construct. Like the attachment of a infants and their mothers, individuals develop attachment to brands that can be counted on to fulfill needs to gratify the self (experiential consumption), to enable the self (functional consumption), and/or to enrich the self (symbolic consumption). The bonds originate from a rich and accessible network of memories that engages thoughts and feelings about the brand and the brand's relationship with oneself. Personalized experiences and autobiographical memories of a highly self-relevant brand create an emotional bond. Brand attachment is the strength of the cognitive and emotional bond connecting the brand with the self (p. 9). Brand attachment includes two important elements, namely (1) the relationship between brand and self, and (2) the cognitive and emotional bonds that affect readiness to allocate resources to the brand.

Supporting the previous study, Park et al. (2010) suggested that attachment has motivated consumers to develop themselves or incorporate the brand into themselves so that consumers who attached to the brand would invest their resources in order to maintain the relationship with the brand. They will use their resources that include (1) social resources, such as maintaining the brand and degrading the alternatives, (2) financial resources, such as willingness to pay a higher price for the brand; and (3) time resources, such as involvement in the brand community and brand promotion through social media. Therefore, the conceptualization of brand attachment includes:

- There is a bond that connects the brand with oneself (Schultz et al. 1989; Lacoeuilhe 2000; Thomson et al. 2005; Mickulincer and Shaver 2007; Park et al. 2010)
- The strength felt is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards specific objects (Schultz et al. 1989) or varies (Thomson et al. 2005).
- Develop over time through experiences (Schultz et al. 1989; Thomson et al. 2005; Park et al. 2010).
- Use resources to maintain the relationship with the brand (Thomson et al. 2005 and Park et al. 2006, 2010).

Thus, this study argues according to Park et al. (2010) that brand attachment is the strength of the bond which connects the brand with oneself. Attachment comes from previous interactions or experiences with the brand that involve thoughts and feelings about the brand and the brand-self relationship. This attachment is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards objects that can influence consumers to maintain relationships with brands.

Brand Attachment Measurement

Measurement model of brand attachment originated from Lacouilhe's (2000) research that was developed from an individual-object relationship framework (Belk 1998; Ball and Tasaki 1992) as in Table 1. Lacouilhe (2000) developed uni-dimensional measurement model that focused on affective factor because of psychological closeness to the long-lasting and irreversible brand. This measurement model consisted of five-item scale, namely affection, pleasure, connection, attraction, and comfort in owning the brand. The scale has been developed from three sources of information (i.e. literature review, interview and projective testing) and had satisfactory psychometric quality from a standard measurement perspective. However, the measurement scale faces methodological limitations regarding the scale measure and its one-dimensional character. The item ignores antecedents or consequences of attachment that should be able to use in order to understand the basics of affective relationships from various aspects and avoid dissociating various concepts discussed as in the multidimensional approach. In addition, the operational approach used in item creation only uses interpretive lines and item refinement by experts.

Furthermore, Thomson et al. (2005) and Park (2006; 2010) developed a scale of attachment with a multidimensional approach. Thomson et al. (2005) developed a scale of attachment based on emotional closeness with the brand. It consisted of three first-order factors which were labelled affection, passion and connection. Thomson et al. (2005) showed that attachment varied in strength associated with feelings or specific emotional factors on the brand. The individual will maintain closeness to the object as the attachment gets stronger. The strong attachment is associated with stronger feelings of affection (affectionate, loved, peaceful, friendly), connection (attached, bonded, connected) and passion (passionate, delighted, captivated). However, this multidimensional measure has been debated by some researchers (Park et al. 2010; Albert et al. 2009; Bergkvist and Bech Larsen 2010 and Sarkar et al. 2012) because of the similarities in the use of love item which is a dimension of interpersonal theory in measuring brand love.

Despite being multidimensional, Park et al. (2006) revealed that the measurement of Thomson et al. (2005) only reflected the affect component of brand self-connection so that the measurement only represented a part of the brand attachment factor. Park et al. (2006) proposed not only the brand-self relationship but also the automaticity of thoughts. The two dimensions are considered to be able more to describe and represent the state of mind when consumers are very

attached to the brand rather than using just one. Supporting the previous study, Park et al. (2010) re-developed measure scales which included brand-self cognitions, thoughts, and autobiographical memories that were more than emotions. Attachment includes brand-self connection (part of who you are and personally connected) and prominence (automatic thoughts/feelings and thoughts/feelings come naturally). Consumers will categorize the brand as part of themselves and will make the brand as top of mind from positive feelings and memories when consumers attach to the brand.

The measurement of brand attachment in marketing literature is divided into two approaches, namely affective approach and cognitive-affective approach. These approaches stemmed from two different conceptualizations of research that have operationalized the scale for measuring brand attachment. The affective or emotional approach seeks to measure attachment by focusing on the affective or emotional components (eg. Lacoeyuilhe 2000; Thomson et al. 2005; Shimul et al. 2019), meanwhile the cognitive-affective approach measures the brand attachment through cognitive and affective components (Park et al. 2006; 2010).

Affective Approach

Studies included in this group used the theoretical assumption that consumers emotionally attached to the objects of consumption. The strength of the relationship between consumer-brand is determined by the emotional component that can reflect the strength of consumers' attachment to the brand. Lacoeyuilhe (2000) used emotional criteria or overall affective reactions in the operationalisation of measurement scale of brand attachment such as affection, pleasure, connection, attraction, and comfort in owning the brand. The results of the study obtained five items which have been verified by using validity (discriminant and convergent) and reliability tests. Furthermore, the measurement of brand attachment has been adopted by several researchers (such as Belaid and Behi 2011; Bahri- Ammari et al. 2016; and Nashtae et al. 2017) in various contexts.

Belaid and Behi (2011) and Nashtae et al. (2017) used this measurement in the context of a product/brand. Belaid and Behi (2011) measured the attachment to utilitarian products in Tunisia by using four items which were measured using a Likert scale. The results show that one item needs to be deleted because it does not fit the context of the product. Meanwhile, Nashtae et al. (2017) still adopted five items by using a Likert scale. The results show that all items are valid and reliable in measuring attachment to durable goods and fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG). Furthermore,

Bahri-Ammari et al. (2016) used this measurement in the context of service in Tunisia. Like Belaid and Behi (2011), they also used four measurement items that were adapted to the research context. All items were measured by using a Likert scale and the results indicated that four items had good internal consistency.

Supporting the affective approach, Thomson et al. (2005) also identified a series of emotional items that reflected the strength of brand attachment. Using the premise that consumers could articulate the characteristic of emotional brand attachment, the study produced 10 items that reflected three factors labeled Affection, Passion, and Connection. The measurement of emotional attachment has been adopted by some researchers as in Table 2. Research have been conducted in various contexts such brands/companies, service and mobile app context. In the context of products/brands, most research was carried out on products/brands that have been purchased or owned by respondents, brands that have been used continuously and were non-switching for a long time. Meanwhile, in the context of service, the research was conducted on favorite services that have been used by respondents. In the mobile app context, it was conducted on mobile app used by respondents.

All items in each study were measured by using a Likert scale with a different number of items (brand attachment from Thomson et al. 2005) which were adapted according to each research context. Malar et al. (2011) adopted six items of attachment to various familiar brands in several industries. Meanwhile, Zhou et al. (2012) adopted the whole items from Thomson et al. (2005), which were 10 items in the context of brand community in China. Other researchers who used 10 items were Tran et al. (2021) in the mobile app context. Moreover, Dwivedi (2018) adopted seven items of brand attachment frequently used by Australian consumers on social media. Huaman-Ramirez and Merunka (2019) adopted nine items of attachment to several local brands in different services categories. Other researchers who used nine items were Torres et al. (2019) who measured the attachment to airline travel sector in the USA. Aboulnsr and Tran et al. (2018) adopted five items of attachment to the new products and well-known brand for technological advances in the US. Other researchers using five items were Ghorbanzadeh and Rahehagh (2020) who measured the attachment to smartphone and apparel brands in Iran. Hwang and Kandampully (2012) adopted three items of attachment to luxury fashion brands and other researchers who used three items were Loureiro et al. (2012). However, brand attachment measurement used by Loureiro et al. (2012) was

combined with other measurement items (Chang and Cheng 2006) apart from measurement from Thomson et al. (2005).

Another affective approach was developed by Shimul et al. (2019) in measuring attachment to luxury brands. The emotion, exclusivity and symbolic values of luxury became the basis for Shimul et al. (2019) to operationalizing the measurement scale of brand attachment. The research is conducted in the luxury brand context. Questionnaire items are emotional and measured using a Likert scale. The results show that the use of the luxury brand attachment scale is able to provide a better measure and understanding of consumer attachment to luxury brands compared to brand attachment in general.

Cognitive-affective Approach

The study from previous group ignored the cognitive dimension of BA construct. Park et al. (2010) suggested that the strength of a relationship between consumer and brand was not limited only on the feelings but also the brand-related thoughts and memories originating from rich memory networks or mental representations. Park et al. (2010) used cognitive and affective components as general starting point for measuring brand attachment. Park et al. (2010) developed and validated the more parsimony measure of brand attachment, tested the based assumption and showed that the measure indicated brand attachment. Park et al. (2010) measured the brand attachment by observing the consumers' responses towards 10-item scale on three different brands, namely Quaker Oats Meal, Apple iPod and a local university by using 10-point Likert type scale. The analysis result reduced 10 items into 4 items that are more parsimony and fit to the marketing practice. In the next Park et al. (2010) study, two-dimensional measurement (brand self-connection and prominence) of BA was tested by different variables, brands and respondents. The results indicated that four items that represented brand self-connection and prominence had a good internal consistency.

Several researchers also used the measurement items developed by Park et al. (2010) in their research nowadays as in Table 3. Park et al. (2010) measurement items have been used in the context of brands/companies (such as fashion, cars, riding events, apparel, bikes etc.) and service. The research was conducted to the respondents who already used the brands or became old costumers and had repeat purchases. Items have been adopted as a whole, such as 10 items from the sample study of Park et al. (2010), four items used by Park et al. (2010) in the results of their

final studies and in combination with other researchers. All items were measured by using a Likert scale.

Commented [a11]: Author should add "Method"

Table 1. Research on Brand Attachment Measurement

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Lacoeuilhe (2000)	Uni-dimension (5 items)	-	France	Pantyhose, feminine deodorant, and laundry detergent
Thomson et al. (2005)	Multi-dimension: affection, passion and connection	7-point rating scale, ranging from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Very well. 10 items.		
Park et al. (2010)	Bi-dimension: brand self-connection Prominence (4 items)	11-point scale with 0 = Not at all and 10 = Completely	Europe	Quaker Oats Oatmeal, Apple iPod and local university, Apple iPod, Nike and retail bank costumers
Shimul et al. (2019)	Uni-dimensional (seven items)	Seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not representative at all, to 7 = Clearly representative	Europe	Luxury brand products: Louis Vuitton, Gucci, Giorgio Armani, Dolce & Gabbana, Swarovski, and Rolex Non-luxury brand products: Google, Apple (iPhone, Macbook), Nike, and Colgate

Source: the authors

Table 2. The Use of Scale Measurement of Brand Attachment Thomson et al. (2005)

Authors	Context	Country	Number of Items
Malar et al. (2011)	Fast moving consumer goods, durable consumer goods, service and retailing	-	Six items
Zhou et al. (2012)	Brand community	China	Ten items
Loureiro et al. (2012)	Car	Portugal	Three items
Hwang and Kandampully 2012	luxury fashion brand		Three items
Aboulnsr and Tran (2018)	New products and well-known brand for technological	US	Five items
Dwivedi et al. (2018)	Brand in social media	Australia	Seven items
Torres et al. (2019)	Airline travel sector	USA.	Nine items
Huaman-Ramirez (2019)	Service (leisure activity, hotel, restaurant, retail, travel, bank, movie theatre)	Peru	Nine items
Ghorbanzadeh and Rahehagh 2020	Smartphone and apparel.	Iran	Five items
Tran et al. 2021	Mobile app context	-	Ten items

Source: the authors

Table 3. The Use of Scale Measurement of Brand Attachment Park et al. (2010)

Authors	Context	Country	Number of Items
Yen et al. (2018)	Service (travel agency)	Taiwan	Ten items
Cheng et al. (2016)	Service (Hotel)	Taiwan	Ten items
Kauffman et al. (2016)	luxury fashion brand	Brazil	Ten items
Chu et al. (2016)	Brand in twitter	US	Ten items
Wu et al. (2017)	Product and service	China	Five items
Japutra (2018)	Some product categories (car manufacturers, electronics, food and beverages, fashion retailers and airlines.	UK	Four items
Lim et al. (2019)	branded apparel	Malaysia	Six items
Kumar and Nayak (2019) a	Brand community	India	Four items
Kumar and Nayak (2019) b	Brand community	India	Four items
Rajaobelina et al. (2020)	m-banking app	Canada	Four items

Source: the authors

Brand Love

The initial conceptualization of love in the marketing literature review has been studied by several researchers (Shimp and Maden 1988; Ahuvia, 1993; Whang et al., 2004) through the

consumer's relationship with an object. Most researchers (Shimp and Maden 1988; Ahuvia, 1993; Whang et al., 2004) used the theory of interpersonal love applied to consumer situations. Meanwhile, other researchers used the grounded theory (Batra et al. 2012) and parasocial (Fetscherin 2014). The construct of feelings of love in the marketing literature was introduced by Shimp and Maden (1988) from the relationship between consumers and objects of consumption (products, brands, shops, etc.) by using Sternberg's (1986) theory of interpersonal love. Although the consumer-object relationship is qualitatively different from the person-to-person relationship, there are many similarities to all relationships between the consumer and the object of consumption (such as product, brand, store, commercial etc.). Three components of love in the context of consumption which are longing, likes and decisions/commitments determine the nature of consumer's relationship with an object. Ahuvia (1993, 2005) also studied the concept of love in various objects of consumption. Ahuvia proposed that the consumer also felt love for an object other than people such as pets, computers, paintings, old cars and so on. Agreeing with Shimp and Maden (1988), in his subsequent research Ahuvia (2005) argued that consumer-object love had similarities with interpersonal love. This thinking is also in accordance with the previous research of Whang et al. (2004) that linked the theory of interpersonal love to products. Whang et al. (2004) showed a romantic relationship between consumers and products. Bikers' love for motorbikes is like a form of interpersonal love.

Furthermore, Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) introduced brand love as a new marketing construct that had a very strong affective or emotional focus on the brand. Brand love is the passionate and emotional feeling of a particular trade name (p. 81). Brand love involves the integration of the brand into self and consumer satisfaction which is the result of a long-term relationship with the brand. However, brand love cannot fully fit into the form of interpersonal love due to the looser use of the word love in commercial products. Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010) and Batra et al. (2012) stated explicitly that brand love was different from interpersonal love. Brand love and interpersonal love had different characteristics (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010 and Batra et al. 2012). Brand love is unidirectional while interpersonal love is two-way. The element of sexual intimacy (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010) and altruistic from consumers on brands and emotional feelings from brands to consumers could not be found in brand love (Batra et al. 2012).

Batra et al. (2012) revealed that brand love represented a high-level construct driven by emotional relationship and an overall positive attitude towards brands. Brand love was not just an emotion of love (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) that was short-term and episodic but a relationship that could last decades involving affective, cognitive and behavioral experiences (Batra et al. 2012, p. 2). Love for brands that is not completely irrational also gets support from Sarkar (2014) and Langner et al. (2015). Consumers will conduct a cognitive evaluation on a brand (Sarkar 2014) and are more often driven by rational profit (Langner et al. 2015). However, brand love plays an important role in maintaining the consumer relationship with brands. As stated in previous research, brand love can influence consumers to speak positively to other consumers (Batra et al. 2012, Albert and Merunka 2013), commitment, willingness to pay premium prices (Albert and Merunka 2013), brand loyalty (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012 and Algharabat et al. 2017) and customer engagement (Prentice et al. 2019).

Therefore, conceptualization of brand love has been studied by several researchers using different theoretical basis such as theory of interpersonal love (Albert, et al. 2008; Whang et al. 2004; Sarkar et al. 2012; Rossiter et al. 2012), parasocial (Fetscherin 2014) and the grounded theory approach (Batra et al. 2012). Brand love has become a important topic of marketing but there are just a few agreements on brand love (Albert et al. 2008). Based on the literature conducted, brand love includes:

- The long-term relationship with the brand (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012; Batra et al. 2012)
- Involving emotional and rational relationships (Batra et al. 2012; Sarkar 2014; Langner et al. 2015).
- Having affective and cognitive consistency (Fournier 1998; Carrol and Ahuvia 2006), a certainty, more frequent thinking and discussion on the object of attitude (Batra et al. 2012).
- Predicting the behaviors of brand in the future such as speaking positively to other consumers (Batra et al. 2012, Albert and Merunka 2013), commitment, willingness to pay premium prices (Albert and Merunka 2013), brand loyalty (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012 and Algharabat et al. 2017) and customer engagement (Prentice et al. 2019).

From our literature review based on Table 4, we assume that love includes emotional and rational relationships from a long-term relationship with the brand. Brand love arises from a long

history with brands involving affective, cognitive and behavior (Fournier 1998; Batra et al. 2012). Thus, supporting Batra et al. (2012), brand love is a high-level construct driven by emotional relationships and overall positive attitudes towards brands.

Table 4. Dimensions and Operationalization of Brand Love

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Carroll and Ahuvia (2006)	Uni-dimensional	Five-point Likert type scale	-	Consumer package goods such as soft drinks, soaps, and cereals
Albert et al. (2008)	Multidimensional: Passion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration of the relationship • Self-congruity • Dreams • Memories • Pleasure • Attraction • Uniqueness • Beauty • Trust • Declaration of affect 	-	Consumers in France and U.S.	Shoes, car, lingerie, wristwatch, perfume, food, music, cigarette, and furniture.
Albert et al. (2009)	Multidimensional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Passion: Duration, Dream, Memories, Intimacy, Uniqueness. Affection: Idealization, Pleasure 	10-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 (does not apply at all) to 10 (totally applies)	-	clothes, perfume, grocery, car, cosmetics, hi-fi/ audio/ video, shoes, music, computers, lingerie, hygiene, various
Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010)	Uni-dimensional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two items: - expressed love sense of loss in case of unavailability. 		Australia	The brand of an iconic product category owned by many Australian consumers.
Sarkar (2011)	Bi-dimensional: Passion Intimacy	Five-point Likert type scale	undergraduate student in Indian universities	Product category that consumers remember
Rossiter (2012)	Using C-OAR-SE based measure	Five categories of representative answers "hate", "dislike", "neutral", "liking", and "love".	German	Laundry detergent, coffee, and computers, fashion clothing category
Fetscherin (2014)	Interpersonal love (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Lee 1977) Parasocial love (Perse and Rubin 1989)	5-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree; to 5 = strongly agree	As and Japan	Car

Continued from Table 4.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Multidimensional: 1. Self-brand integration 2. Passion-driven behaviors 3. Positive emotional connection 4. Long-term relationship 5. Anticipated separation distress 6. Attitude valence	7-point Likert type scale. Ranging from not at all to very much	USA	Popular clothing brand

Source: the authors

Brand Love Measurement

Construct of love already started from the research on the consumer relationship with the object in Shimp and Maden's (1988) research. Shimp and Maden (1988) adapted the theory of interpersonal love (Sternberg 1986) person-to-person to define the characteristic of consumer relationship with the objects of consumption. Three components of love adopted by Sternberg (1986) which are intimacy, passion and decision/commitment become longing, like and decision/commitment. However, the research was still conceptual, so that the development and empirical test related to the construct validity is still proposed for further research. Continuing to measure love in products, Whang et al (2004) developed a multidimensional measurement of love that was adapted directly from the interpersonal love style (love typology, Lee's 1977), namely passionate (Eros), possessive (Mania), and selfless (Agape).

Furthermore, several researchers started to specifically develop measurements for brands as shown in Table 4. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) developed quantitatively uni-dimensional measure on love construct of the consumer who was satisfied with a particular brand. The measurement model focuses on the affective components that consist of passion, attachment, positive evaluation, positive emotions and declaration of love. The construct test has fulfilled good discriminant validity, but the use of uni-dimension becomes a limitation when it is associated with the use of multidimensional interpersonal love literature (Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012). Additionally, the measurement overlaps with the attachment construct. This is because Thomson et al. (2005) use love in the attachment dimension, while Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) use attachment in the brand love dimension.

Overcome any overlaps with other constructs, Albert et al. (2009) developed the feeling measurement of brand love by using the qualitative and quantitative approach to explore the concept of love. Albert et al. (2008) stated eleven dimensions that described the feeling of brand love and a special kind of relationship they have with the brands they like. Those eleven dimensions include cognitive and affective components that comprise passion, duration of the relationship, self-congruity, dreams, memories, pleasure, attraction, uniqueness, beauty, trust and declaration of affect. Meanwhile for attachment, Albert et al. (2008) did not keep it as component of brand love. Moreover, Albert et al. (2009) also redeveloped the measurement scale of brand love based on the integration of various theories of interpersonal (the Passionate Love Scale, Hatfield and Sprecher 1986; the Triangular Theory Love Scale, Sternberg 1986; and the Romantic Love Scale Rubin, 1970) and the result of his study exploration. Consumers' real feelings of love for some brands are measured through 22 items and seven dimensions namely Uniqueness, Pleasure, Intimacy, Idealization, Duration, Dream and Memories. The seven factors offer a second order solution with two factors labelled Passion and Affection.

Several other researchers (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010; Sarkar et al. 2012; Rossiter et al. 2012) focused on developing a measurement scale for brand love romantic to overcome overlaps with other constructs based on the theory of interpersonal love. Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010) developed the measurement of brand love through two items namely expressed love which included in passionate love scales (Hartfield and Sprecher 1986) and feeling of loss from passionate or romantic love (Hartfield and Sprecher 1986 and Rubin 1970) to overcome any overlap with emotional attachment. However, as well as Carroll and Ahuvia's (2006) measurement, Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen's (2010) measurement was also uni-dimensional. Considering the lack of theory and methodology in the conceptualization of brand love, Sarkar et al. (2012) redeveloped the concept and measured consumer's feeling of love to a brand based on Sternberg (1986) Triangular Theory. Sarkar et al. (2012) re-conceptualized the brand love romantic based on interpersonal emotions and consumption. The romantic brand love is a multidimensional construct measured from two factors namely intimacy and passion. However, Rossiter et al. (2012) stated that the use of verb "love" on person-to-person could not be directly applied to an object like brand. The verb "love" has various meanings when it is used for different objects. Rossiter et al. (2012) developed a new construct measure of brand love with C-OAR-SE based. The measure of answer category is determined to define feelings from hatred to love so that the product (choices from respondents) is

differentiated according to the quadrant of the answer category. Another researcher Fetscherin (2014) used items from the love attitude scale by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986).

The use of interpersonal love theory in the research of brand love is already a standard, but the emotional traits equality of interpersonal love and brand love is still a debate (Batra et al. 2012 and Langner et al. 2015). Brand love has different characteristic from interpersonal love so that the researchers need to be discreet in transferring directly the theory and scale of interpersonal love to brand love (Batra et al. 2012 and Langner et al. 2015). However, Batra et al. (2012) argued that the researchers were still allowed to use the theory of interpersonal love as a source of hypothesis or supporting evidence in examining the consumer-brand relationship. Through qualitative study, Batra et al. (2012) revealed elements of brand love prototype that produced seven core elements namely self-brand integration, passion-driven behaviors, positive emotional connection, long-term relationship, positive overall attitude valence, attitude certainty and confidence (strength), and anticipated separation distress. Meanwhile, another researcher Fetscherin (2014) developed another measurement adopted from parasocial love scale (Perse and Rubin, 1989) as comparison of interpersonal love scale (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986 and Lee 1977).

Furthermore, Bagozzi et al. (2017) redeveloped the scale that was parsimony and has been validated from the development of Batra et al. (2012) measurement scale which was only conceptual. The measurement scale of brand love is multidimensional that consists of three multilevel versions which are 26, 13 and 6 items. The differences of those three versions are based on two things that are the number of variances explained by each measure and the sub-dimensions in brand love. As well as the research of Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) and Batra et al. (2012), this study put the dimension of emotional attachment in the measurement scale of brand love.

Based on literature review, it can be revealed that the theory of interpersonal love is already used as basis to develop the measurement scale of brand love that is multidimensional (Whang et al. 2004; Albert 2008, 2009; Batra et al. 2012; Sarkar et al. 2012; Bagozzi et al. 2017). Furthermore, there was attachment dimension that has been used by researchers in measuring brand love (such as Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Batra et al. 2012 and Bagizzi et al. 2017). That overlapped when the love item has also been used by previous researchers (i.e. Thomson et al. 2005) in measuring brand attachment. Nevertheless, several researchers (Albert et al. 2008, 2009 and Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010) previously have conducted another review to examine the scale item of brand love

and distinguish it from other constructs. Albert et al. (2008) conducted a review related to measuring brand love. Meanwhile, other researchers separated love and attachment items and did not use attachment as a measure of brand love (Albert et al. 2009; Bergkvist and Bech-larsen 2010; Loureiro et al. 2012).

The conceptualization of the use of measuring brand love has not been agreed to at this moment although brand love has become an important topic in current research. In general, as previously discussed, brand love has been measured using uni-dimensional and multidimensional scales. *First*, brand love was measured using a uni-dimensional measurement developed by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). *Second*, brand love was measured using a multidimensional measurement developed from several researchers such as Albert et al. (2009); Sarkar et al. (2012); Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2017).

Initially, the measurement of brand love was developed by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) which was uni-dimensional with ten-item scale. The research was conducted in the context of consumer-packaged goods that have been purchased regularly over a long period of time. The result shows that the measurement scale is already validated empirically as predictor variable of brand love. Moreover, Table 5 shows that that uni-dimensional measurement item has been used in the research of brand love in the various contexts such as context of brand/company, context of service-brand/company and platform online. Most research were conducted to respondents who already use the brand, service or platform (social media). Item was measured using Likert scale adopted with the number of items that vary for each researcher. The use of a different number of items is due to the presence of an item (which is attachment) in the measurement of brand love that is considered as independent construct, the use of an item that simply captures love with the brand (Loureiro et al. 2012), or a deleted item because it has factor loading $<0,5$ in the context of the research (eg. Hwang and Kandampully 2012; Ismail and Spinelli 2012; Islam and Rahman 2016; Wallace 2014; Wallace et al. 2017).

Some researchers have used the uni-dimensional measurement of Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) as stated above; however, other research use the multidimensional measurement to measure the brand love. Like uni-dimensional measurement, the multidimensional measurement scale of brand love is also used to measure love in various contexts such as context of brand/company, context of service and online platform. Albert et al. (2009) measurement scale was already used by

Hegner et al. (2017) in the context of fashion brand in Netherlands. The whole items (22 items) were measured using a Likert scale and the result showed that Albert (2009) measurement scale can be used in the context of love for fashion. Fetscherin et al. (2014) adopted the scale of interpersonal love (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Lee 1977) and parasocial love (Perse and Rubin 1989) to measure love for favourite brand with broad product categories such as soft drinks, mobile phones, (running) shoes, cars in Brazil. The result showed that the item has been well validated.

Furthermore, the item from the scale development of interpersonal love scale (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986) was used again by Fetscherin (2014) in the context of favourite brand which was cars in US and Japan. The research also used Likert scale and the result also shows that the item is well-validated. Items of other multidimensional measurements are measurement scales from Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2016). The multidimensional scales from Batra (2012) and Bagozzi (2016) have already used in the context of brand/company and service of the company. The measurement scales of the research were measured using Likert scale. The research was conducted to respondents who loved the brand, ever used the brand, or have experienced service of the brand/company.

Table 5. Summary of Past Empirical Studies for Brand Love

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Loureiro et al. (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree)	Portugal	Car owners	Car
Hwang and Kandampully (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale (e.g. 1= Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree).	United States	Student	Luxury fashion (Chanel, Louis Vuitton, Burberry and Polo Ralph Lauren)
Ismail and Spinelli (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> -7 items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert-type scale	UK	Student	fashion brand
Albert et al. (2013)	<i>Multidimensional</i> (Albert et al. 2009)	-	France	Consumer	consumer's favorite product brand category (i.e. the brand attached to it)
Chen et al. (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale (ranging from 1 = not at all descriptive" to 7= "extremely descriptive")	Facebook users in Taiwan	Facebook users	Facebook page

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Wallace et al. (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale	Ireland	Students (Facebook users)	Fashion brands, sportswear, soft drinks, alcohol, retailers, including fast food, other websites, music, including artists and equipment, cosmetics, and food brands
Sarkar and Sreejesh (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Ten items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree)	India	Owners of premium car brands	Car
Vernuccio et al. (2015)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Seven items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)	Europe and USA	Facebook fans' pages	Facebook fan pages (Alcohol and energy drinks, Automotive, Fashion brands, Food brands, Luxury, Music, entertainment, including artists and equipment, Other categories Personal care and cosmetics Retailers, including fast food Soft drinks Sportswear)
Islam and Rahman (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (scale ranging from 1= strongly agree to 5 = for strongly disagree)	India	Students	Fashion apparel brands
Karjaluoto et al. (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Nine items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (scale ranging from "1= strongly disagree" to "5= strongly agree")	Finnish	Consumers	Popular brand: Apple, Nike and Adidas
Roy et al. (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) Ten items	7-point Likert type scale, ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree.	-	Online marketplace shopper.	online retailer brands

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Algharabat . (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Ten items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale	Jordan	Students	brands liked and followed on Facebook page: Fashion, food and tea/coffee, hair care and cosmetics, sportswear, music, including artists and equipment, sport, automotive and others.
Huang et al. (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree	Taiwan	Mobile phone customers	mobile phone
Wallace et al. (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1=strongly disagree” to 7=strongly agree	Ireland	Facebook users who “Liked” brands	fashion, haircare and cosmetics, music, food and tea/coffee, sport, alcohol, sportswear
Hsu and Chen (2018)	<i>Unidimensional</i> Ten items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point, Likert-type scales ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree	Taiwan	Online bookstore users	online bookstore
Hegner et al. (2017)	<i>Multidimensional</i> 22 items (Albert et al. 2009)	seven-point scale	Netherlands	Respondents that indicated to have a favourite fashion brand	Fashion brand
Loureiro et al. (2017)	Bagozzi et al. (2014)	seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1= “strongly disagree” to 7= “strongly agree”	Germany	Online users (millennial generation)	Brand page on Facebook
Bairrada et al. (2018)	<i>26-item scale, is from Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2016).</i>	seven-point Likert type scale	Portugal	Students and non-students	

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Junaid et al. (2019)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) Ten items	Five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (strongly agree).	Pakistan	Muslim smartphone users	Smartphone brands
Prentice et al. (2019)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Five- Likert type scale, ranging from “very much” to “not at all”.	Europe	Passengers who have experienced air travel in Europe with low cost carriers and existing airlines	Airline
Rodriguez and Rodriguez (2019)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Five-point Likert type scale, with 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree	Portugal and Sweden	Students	traditional luxury and neo-luxury brands from different categories product: fashion, mobiles, watches, coffee and cars
Amaro et al. (2020)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - seven items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1= strongly disagree, to 5=strongly agree	Europe (Germany, Portugal, Spain, Italy)	A large group of international students (from the Erasmus program of the European Union)	Destination
Khan et al. (2020)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Sarkar et al. (2012)		Malaysia	Muslim users of halal branded restaurants	Restaurants

Source: the authors

Boundaries of BL and BA

BA and BL are the main factors in building the consumer relationship with the brand. Several researchers (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Thomson et al. 2005) have considered the two items to be identical. This is because those two variables (BA and BL) are constructs that have emotional content and are part of one of them. Thomson et al. (2005) defined that attachment was an emotion-laden target specific bond between a person and a specific object which was measured from

affection (affectionate, loved, peaceful, friendly), connection (attached, bonded, connected) and passion (passionate, delighted, captivated). Other than that, Fournier (1998) defined love as a rich affective foundation. Moreover, Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) also defined brand love as the level of passionate emotional attachment that a satisfied customer had with a particular trade name as measured through affective components consisting of passion, attachment, positive evaluation, positive emotions and declaration of love.

The recognition of affective dimensions, which is love on Thomson et al. (2005) and attachment on Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), has showed blurred boundaries between love and brand attachment. Although both constructs involve in emotions, but the two have different focuses (Park et al. 2013 and Palusuk et al. 2019). Brand attachment is the strength of the bond that connects the brand with oneself (Park et al. 2010) when the brand is relevant to the self, able to represent the consumers and able to increase the fulfillment of goals (Schultz et al. 1989; Park et al. 2018). Brand attachment is measured by the brand self-connection and prominence (Park et al. 2010). Meanwhile, brand love is driven by an emotional relationship and an overall positive attitude towards brands (Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012) when brands can provide intrinsic rewards such as providing happiness or excitement, or extrinsic rewards (such as great quality). Brand love is measured by passion (duration, dream, memories, intimacy, uniqueness) and affection (idealization, pleasure) (Albert et al 2009).

Furthermore, they also have a different origin and intensity of strength. On the attachment, the bond is strong due to the close relationship between the brand and self and the prominent thoughts and memories. The perceived attachment strength is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards a particular object (Schultz et al. 1989) or varies in strength (Thomson et al. 2005). Meanwhile on love, a strong bond is based on the emotional relationship (affection and passion) and positive attitude towards the brand. Brand love includes affective and cognitive consistency (Fournier 1998; Carrol and Ahuvia 2006), greater attitude extremity and intensity, more certainty and importance, affective–cognitive consistency, more frequent thinking and talking about the attitude object (Batra et al. 2012). In addition, the strong feelings consumers had for brands in brand love indicated that brand love had a very deep, lasting and irreplaceable strength (Albert et al. 2013), so that love would apply to a much more limited number of brands than attachment. Based on these evidences, BA and BL are two different but closely related constructs

which imply that an increase in one variable (BA) can influence the increase of the other variable (BL) (as in Loureiro et al. 2012).

Discussion and Implication of the Research

Previous conceptual discussion shows that brand attachment and brand love are two constructs that have emotional content and influence subsequent behavior to maintain the relationship with the brand. The research has recognized that attachment is a dimension of brand love whilst love has been admitted as a dimension of brand attachment. Several researchers (Albert et al. 2009; Loureiro et al. 2012; Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012; and Sarkar et al. 2012) have attempted to address overlaps by separating the attachment items in measuring brand love. However, the difference between two types of constructs is needed so as not to confuse and lead to a poor understanding of the consumer-brand relationship.

BA is basically an affective state in the form of a bond that connects the brand with oneself. Then, it is relatively based on thoughts and feelings towards certain objects that can influence subsequent behaviors to the brand. The stronger attachments, the more intense the closeness to the object. In the attachment theory (Bowlby 1959), the emotional attachment to an object can predict subsequent behaviors of individuals with that object, such as committing, investing and making sacrifices for the object (Thomson et al. 2005). In contrast to brand attachment, brand love is a very rich and much stronger affective state that results from a long-term relationship between consumers and brands (Fournier 1998 and Carroll and Ahuvia 2006). In addition to strong affective state, BL includes cognitive consistency, great strength of positive attitudes, higher certainty and interest, more frequent thinking and talking about the object of attitude. Brand love comes from strong emotional relationship and positive attitude towards brands (Batra et al. 2012).

In marketing practice, this paper contributes to a better understanding on the behavior that comes from the relationship of consumer-brand. Understanding consumer behavior should understand the affective effect and cues of consumers. When a brand can evoke strong and positive it can motivate consumers to maintain their closeness to the brand, increase commitment, advocate and tell the brand voluntarily. Marketing communication and positioning play an important role in increasing emotional responses to build long-term relationship with consumers.

Commented [a12]: Author(s) should emphasis in discussion, the difference and the similary between brand love and brand attachment. However the discussion is too short compared with another section. I suggest author to re-organize the paper. I don't suggest author add paper page.

Commented [a13]: Author mention self-expansion theory, it will be more obvious if author(s) linked with brand love and brand attachment.

References

- Ahuvia, A. C. (2005). Beyond the Extended Self: Loved Objects and Consumers' Identity Narratives. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(1), 171-184.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2008). When consumers love their brands: Exploring the concept and its dimensions. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(10), 1062–1075.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2009). The feeling of love toward a brand: Concept and measurement. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 36, 300–307.
- Albert, N., & Merunka, D. (2013). The role of brand love in consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(3), 258-266.
- Algharabat, R. S. (2017). Linking social media marketing activities with brand love: the mediating role of self-expressive brands. *Kybernetes*, 47(10), 1801-1819.
- Amaro, S., Barroco, C., & Antunes, J. (2020). Exploring the antecedents and outcomes of destination brand love. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(3), 433-448.
- Aureliano-Silva, L., Strehlau, S., & Strehlau, V. (2018). The Relationship between Brand Attachment and Consumers' Emotional Well-Being. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 17(1), 1-16.
- Aboulnasr, K., & Tran, G. A. (2019). Is love really blind? The effect of emotional brand attachment on the perceived risk of really new products. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 29(1), 81-96.
- Ball, A. D., & Tasaki, L. H. (1992). The Role and Measurement of Attachment in Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1(2), 155-172.
- Bagozzi, R., Batra, R., & Ahuvia, A. (2014). Brand love scales: Construct validity, managerial utility, and new conceptual insights. *working paper*, 1-18.
- Bairrada, C. M., Coelho, F., & Coelho, A. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of brand love: utilitarian and symbolic brand qualities. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(3/4), 656-682.
- Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(2), 1–16.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Batra, R., & Ahuvia, A. (2017). Brand love: Development and validation of a practical scale. *Marketing Letters*, 28(1), 1–14.

- Belaid, S., & Behi, A. T. (2011). The role of attachment in building consumer-brand relationships: an empirical investigation in the utilitarian consumption context. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 20(1), 37 – 47.
- Bergkvist, L., & Bech-Larsen, T. B. (2010). Two Studies of consequences and actionable antecedents of brand love. *Brand Management*, 17(7), 504-518.
- Bahri-Ammari, N., Niekerk, M. V., Khelil, H. B., & Chtioui, J. (2016). The effects of brand attachment on behavioral loyalty in the luxury restaurant sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 559-585.
- Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105-114.
- Carroll, B. A., & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some Antecedents and Outcomes of Brand Love. *Marketing Letters*, 17(2), 79-89.
- Chu, S.-C., Chen, H.-T., & Sung, Y. (2016). Following brands on Twitter: an extension of theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Advertising*, 35(3), 421-437.
- Chen, H., Papazafeiropoulou, A., Chen, T.K., Duan, Y., & Liu, H. W. (2014). Exploring the commercial value of social networks Enhancing consumers' brand experience through Facebook pages. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 27(5), 576-598.
- Cheng, J.-C., Luo, S.-J., Yen C.-H., & Yang, Y.-F. (2016). Brand attachment and customer citizenship behaviors. *The Service Industries Journal*, 36(7-8), 263-277.
- Chang, P.- L., & Chieng, M.- H. (2006). Building consumer-brand relationship: A cross-cultural experiential view. *Psychology and Marketing*, 23(11), 927-959.
- Dwivedi, A., Johnson, L. W., Wilkie, D. C., & Araujo-Gil, L. D. (2018). Consumer emotional brand attachment with social media brands and social media brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(6), 1176-1204.
- Fetscherin, M. (2014). What type of relationship do we have with loved brands?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 31(6/7), 430–440.
- Fetscherin, M., Boulanger, M., Filho, C. G., & Souki, G. Q. (2014). The effect of product category on consumer brand relationships. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 23(2), 78–89.
- Ghorbanzadeh, D., & Rahehagh, A. (2020). Emotional brand attachment and brand love: the emotional bridges in the process of transition from satisfaction to loyalty. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 15(1), 16-38.

- Gomez-Suárez, M. (2019). Examining Customer–Brand Relationships: A Critical Approach to Empirical Models on Brand Attachment, Love, and Engagement. *Administrative Sciences*, 9(10), 1-16.
- Gumparthy, V. P., and Patra, S. (2020). The Phenomenon of Brand Love: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 19(2), 93-132.
- Hatfield., Elaine., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring Passionate Love in Intimate Relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, 9(4), 383-410.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman, D. (1999). *Pair bonds as attachments: Evaluating the evidence*. In J. Cassidy and P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 336–354). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hegner, S. M., Fenko, A., & Teravest, A. (2017). Using the theory of planned behaviour to understand brand love. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 26(1), 26–41.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 392-402.
- Huaman-Ramirez, R., & Merunka, D. (2019). Brand experience effects on brand attachment: the role of brand trust, age, and income. *European Business Review*, 31(5): 610-645.
- Huang, C. (2017). The impacts of brand experiences on brand loyalty: mediators of brand love and trust. *Management Decision*, 55(5), 915-934.
- Hsu, C. L., & Chen, M. C. (2018). How gamification marketing activities motivate desirable consumer behaviors: Focusing on the role of brand love. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 88, 121–133.
- Hwang, J., & Kandampully, J. (2012). The role of emotional aspects in younger consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 21(2), 98–108.
- Islam, J. U., & Rahman, Z. (2016). Examining the effects of brand love and brand image on customer engagement: An empirical study of fashion apparel brands. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 7(1), 45-59.
- Ismail, A. R., & Spinelli, G. (2012). Effects of brand love, personality and image on word of mouth: The case of fashion brands among young consumers. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 16(4), 386–398.
- Japutra, A., Ekinci, Y., & Simkin, L. (2018). Positive and negative behaviours resulting from brand attachment: The moderating effects of attachment styles. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52 (5/6), 1185-1202.

- Junaid, M., Hou, F., Hussain, K., & Kirmani, A. A. (2019). Brand love: the emotional bridge between experience and engagement, generation-M perspective. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28(2), 200-215.
- Khan, A., Mohammad, A. S., & Muhammad, S. (2020). An integrated model of brand experience and brand love for halal brands: survey of halal fast food consumers in Malaysia. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*.
- Karjaluoto, H., Munnukka, J., & Kiuru, K. (2016). Brand love and positive word of mouth: The moderating effects of experience and price. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 25(6), 527-537.
- Kaufmann, H. R., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Manarioti, A. (2016). Exploring behavioural branding, brand love and brand co-creation. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 25(6), 1-23.
- Kumar, J., & Nayak, J.K. (2019). Consumer psychological motivations to customer brand engagement: a case of brand community. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 36(1), 168-177.
- Kumar, J., & Nayak, J.K. (2019). Brand engagement without brand ownership: a case of non-brand owner community members. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28 (2), 216-230.
- Lacoeuilhe, J. (2000b). L'attachement a la marque: proposition d'une echelle de mesure. *Recherche et Application en Marketing*, 15(4), 61-77.
- Langner, T., Schmidt, J., & Fischer, A. (2015). Is It Really Love? A Comparative Investigation of the Emotional Nature of Brand and Interpersonal Love. *Psychology and Marketing*, 32(6), 624-634.
- Lee, J. A. (1977). A Typology of Styles of Loving. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 173-182.
- Loureiro, S. M. C., Ruediger, K. H., & Demetris, V. (2012). Brand emotional connection and loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(1), 13-27.
- Loureiro, S. M. C., Gorgus, T., & Kaufmann, H. R. (2017). Antecedents and outcomes of online brand engagement: The role of brand love on enhancing electronic-word-of-mouth. *Online Information Review*, 41(7), 985-1005.
- Lim, X.-J., Cheah, J. -H., Cham, T. H., Ting, H., & Memon, M. A. (2019). Compulsive buying of branded apparel, its antecedents, and the mediating role of brand attachment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 32(7), 1539-1563.
- Malar, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W.D., & Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional brand attachment and Brand personality: the relative importance of the actual and the ideal self. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 35-52.
- Moussa, Salim (2015). I may be a twin but I'm one of a kind. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 18(1), 69-85.

- Nashtaee, M. S., Hanzaei, K.H., & Mansourian, Y. (2017). How to develop brand attachment in various product categories? *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 29(5), 1198-1220.
- Palusuk, N., Koles, B., & Hasan, R. (2019). All you need is brand love: a critical review and comprehensive conceptual framework for brand love. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 35(1-2), 97-129.
- Park, C. W., MacInnis, D. J., & Priester, J. (2006). Beyond attitudes: Attachment and consumer behavior. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 12(2), 3-35.
- Park, C. W., MacInnis, D. J., Priester, J., Eisingerich, A. B., & Lacobucci, B. (2010). Brand attachment and brand attitude strength: Conceptual and empirical differentiation of two critical brand equity drivers. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(6), 1-17.
- Park, C. W., Eisingerich, A. B., & Park, J. W. (2013). Attachment-aversion (AA) model of customer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(2), 229–248.
- Park, C. W., & MacInnis, D. J. (2018). Introduction to the Special Issue: Brand Relationships, Emotions, and the Self. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 3(2), 123-129.
- Prentice, C., Wang, X., & Loureiro, S. M. C. (2019). The influence of brand experience and service quality on customer engagement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 50, 50–59.
- Rajaobelina, L., Tep, S.P., Arcand, M., & Ricard, L. (2021). The relationship of brand attachment and mobile banking service quality with positive word-of-mouth. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*.
- Rodriguez, C., & Rodriguez, P. (2019). Brand love matters to Millennials: the relevance of mystery, sensuality and intimacy to neo-luxury brands. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28(7), 830–848.
- Rossiter, J. R. (2012). A new C-OAR-SE-based content-valid and predictively valid measure that distinguishes brand love from brand liking. *Marketing Letters*, 23(3), 905–916.
- Roy, P., Khandeparkar, K., & Motiano, M. (2016). A lovable personality: The effect of brand personality on brand love. *Journal of Brand Management*, 23(5), 97-113.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(2), 265-273.
- Sarkar, A. (2014). Brand love in emerging market: a qualitative investigation. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 17(4), 481-494.
- Sarkar, A., & Sreejesh, S. (2014). Examination of the roles played by brand love and jealousy in shaping customer engagement. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 23(1), 24-32.

- Sarkar, A., Ponnampalath, A., & Murthy, B. K. (2012). Understanding and measuring romantic brand love. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 11(4), 325-348.
- Schultz, S.E., Kleine, R. E., & Kernan, J.B. (1989). These are a few of my favorite things: toward an explication of attachment as a consumer behavior construct. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 16(1), 359-366.
- Shimp, T. A., & Madden, T. J. (1988). Consumer-Object Relations: A Conceptual Framework Based Analogously on Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15, 163- 168.
- Shimul, A. S., & Phau, I. (2018). Consumer advocacy for luxury brands. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 26(3), 264-271.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review*, 93(2), 119–35.
- Thomson, M., MacInnis, J., & Park, C. W. (2005). The ties that bind: Measuring the strength of consumers' emotional attachments to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(1), 77-91.
- Tran, T. P., Furner, C. P., & Albinsson, P. A. (2021). Understanding drivers and outcomes of brand attachment in mobile branded apps. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(1),113–124.
- Torres, J. L. S., Rawal, M., & Bagherzadeh, R. (2020). Role of brand attachment in customers' evaluation of service failure. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 30(3), 377-391.
- Whang, Y-O., Allen, J., Sahoury, N., & Zhang, H. (2004). Falling in love with a product: the structure of a romantic consumer-product relationship. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 31, 320-327.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & Chernatony, L. D. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 23(1), 33–42.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & Chernatony, L. D. (2017). Consumers' self-congruence with a "Liked" brand: Cognitive network influence and brand outcomes. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 367-390.
- Wu, J., Chen, J., & Dou, W. (2017). The Internet of Things and interaction style: the effect of smart interaction on brand attachment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 33(1-2), 61-75.
- Yen, C. -H., Chen, C.-Y., Cheng, J.-C., & Teng, H.-Y. (2018). Brand attachment, tour Leader attachment, and Behavioral intentions of tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 42(3), 365 –391.
- Zhou, Z., Zhang, Q., Su, C., & Zhou, N. (2012). How do brand communities generate brand relationships? Intermediate mechanisms. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(7), 890–895.

ARTICLE REVIEW FORM
JURNAL DINAMIKA MANAJEMEN
Management Department Faculty of Economics
Universitas Negeri Semarang

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you in advance for reviewing the following article. Please be mindful that you belong to a community of scholars, educators, and practitioners who devote their energy to sharing knowledge. Always be respectful and professional when providing feedback. Referees are encouraged to be critical, constructive, and, above all, respectful.

Read the article and complete the reviewer report form within this document.

- Make **annotations or comment** to the article using a method that clearly differentiates your text from the author's such as block letters, different colored text, or the "Track Changes" function in Microsoft Word.
- **Please make sure that your identity stay hidden** while you are make a comment as we are using double-blind review process.
- Upload the completed report using the same link from which you downloaded the original report. When uploading the completed report, please include the recommendation regarding the publication decision.
- **Deadline:** Reports should be returned within **two weeks** of this invitation. Please see the referee selection email for your deadline.

Please do not hesitate to contact us by email if you have any questions about the refereeing process. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen

PLANNING REVIEW ARTICLES

Title	.
-------	---

REVIEW ARTICLES

Please give examination on each of the section on table below

General Comments	A study comparing these two variables is quite feasible, exploration has focused on concepts and measurements. To make it concisely, the author is recommended to reduce the number of article pages (20-22 pages)
Abstract	Quite fairly
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confusion and overlap the therminological should be explained briefly - To enhance the understanding points, author should mention that this systematic review looks at several points → more focus for readers
Method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly state objectives with an explicit and reproducible methodology even that this is a systematic review. - Specifics on the methods and processes that will be used - The document details should mention it (i.e databases) - Does this article belong to the type of meta-analysis?
Result & Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before present the result, the author must show the tabulation of study characteristics, quality and effects as well as use of statistical methods for exploring differences between studies and combining their effects (meta-analysis) - This article has not clearly defined the boundary between the issue and the results of the review
Conclusion & Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where is the conclusion? → overall summary can be trusted - It has been important to note → Any recommendations

	should be graded by reference to the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence
References	Authors must use automatic application reference → identifying why the author referred to something in a certain part of the text and allowing readers to examine the sources of a text

ASSESTMENT SUMMARY
(please check the boxes)

ASSESSMENT INDICATORS	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scholarly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appearance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth of the Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASSESTMENT SUMMARY
Reviewer Recommendation

- Accepted with minor revisions
- Accepted with major revisions
- Suggested to sent it to other journals such as:
- Rejected with the reason:

Brand Attachment Vs. Brand Love: To What Extent Are They Identical?

Abstract

Brand attachment and brand love is important marketing concepts in developing a strong relationship of brand. Nevertheless, up to now the boundaries of these two concepts are still blurred. This research seeks to study the two constructs of brand attachment and brand love at the conceptual, definition and operational dimensions. The study was carried out by in-depth examination of articles related to brand attachment and brand love. Each of these constructs is defined and presented in relation to theoretical concepts, operational dimension and measurement patterns that have been used in empirical research. In the end, this review reveals that although there are similarities between brand attachment and brand love, they are different. This difference is viewed from the concepts, measurement dimension and intensity between the two. Brand attachment and brand love are two constructs that have emotional content and influence the behavior to maintain the relationship with a brand. However, brand attachment is "more self-focused" relative to the thoughts and feelings of a particular object; whereas brand love is "more brand-focused" which includes cognitive consistency, power of great positive attitude, more frequent thoughts and conversations about the object of attitude.

Abstrak

Keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek merupakan konsep pemasaran yang penting dalam mengembangkan hubungan merek yang kuat. Meskipun demikian, hingga saat ini batasan kedua konsep tersebut masih terbatas. Penelitian ini berupaya melakukan studi terhadap dua konstruk keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek pada tataran konseptual, definisi dan dimensi operasional. Penelitian dilakukan dengan pemeriksaan secara mendalam pada artikel-artikel yang berkaitan dengan keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek. Masing-masing konstruksi ini didefinisikan dan disajikan dalam kaitannya dengan konsep teoritis, dimensi operasional, dan pola pengukuran yang telah digunakan dalam penelitian empiris. Pada akhirnya, ulasan ini mengungkapkan bahwa meskipun terdapat kesamaan antara keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek, namun keduanya berbeda. Perbedaan tersebut dilihat dari konsep, dimensi pengukuran dan intensitas antara keduanya. Keterlekatan merek dan kecintaan merek adalah dua konstruk yang memiliki kandungan emosional dan mempengaruhi perilaku untuk menjaga hubungan dengan merek. Namun, keterlekatan merek lebih berfokus pada diri yang bersifat relatif berdasarkan pikiran dan perasaan terhadap objek tertentu sedangkan cinta merek lebih berfokus pada merek yang mencakup konsistensi kognitif, kekuatan sikap positif yang besar, pemikiran dan percakapan yang lebih sering tentang objek sikap.

Introduction

The research on marketing recently has paid greater attention in studying the emotional aspect of brand-consumer relationship. Brand has been considered to be meaningful and significant in fulfilling the psychological, utilitarian, hedonic, social, symbolic, or even spiritual goals. When the brands are self-relevant, improve goal fulfillment (Park and MacInnis, 2018), and can provide

intrinsic rewards (Batra et al. 2012) the consumers will be emotionally connected to the brands. Brands that enable to evoke strong and positive emotions can motivate consumers not only to make repeat purchases but also increase psychological and affective commitment (Park and MacInnis, 2018) through advocacy behaviors and engagement in the brand community (Brodie et al. 2013).

Some studies show emotional aspects such as brand attachment (Thomson et al. 2005; Park 2010, 2013) and brand love (Caroll and Ahuvia 2006; Albert et al. 2009; Batra et al. 2012) as important concept in developing the strong brand relationship. Those constructs describe the level of connection and intensity of brand-consumer relationship that can influence commitment (Thomson et al. 2005), long-term relationship (Caroll and Ahuvia 2006), and behaviors that can increase the profitability of the brand (Park et al. 2010).

A large number of research studies on brand love and brand attachment in marketing literature have been produced. However, some research (Gomez-Suarez 2019 and Palusuk et al. 2019) suggested that boundaries between the two constructs are still blurred and relatively difficult to decipher until today. Moussa (2015) argued that they had similarity because of reflecting the emotional bond and sharing the same innate theoretical assumption. Despite this, some researchers (such as Albert et al. 2008, 2009; Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2011; and Loureiro et al. 2012) consider that the two constructs are different. Gomez-Suarez (2019) suggested that those two constructs are different constructs in term of meaning, dimensions and items in defining them.

The emergence of two emotionally charged constructs of brand namely brand attachment and brand love has recently attracted some researchers. Critiques on concept of brand-consumers relationship in marketing literature mainly brand attachment and brand love (Albert et al. 2008; Moussa 2015; Palusuk et al. 2019 and Gomez-Suarez 2019) highlight the importance of establishing the boundary between brand attachment and brand love. The conceptual boundary is needed because those different terms have been viewed by some researchers as the same constructs (as in Thomson et al. 2005; Caroll and Ahuvia 2006; Belaid and Behi 2011; and Moussa 2015).

Moreover, the terminological confusion arises because those concepts have been explained by some researchers using the same theory, such as the self-expansion theory in understanding brand attachment by Park et al. (2010) and brand love by Ahuvia (2005). Both researches has assumption that brand attachment and brand love are cognitive and affective constructs that can motivate consumers to maintain close relationships. Another theory namely Attachment Theory (Bowlby 1958) is used to understand brand attachment (Thomson et al. 2005 and Aureliano-Silva 2018;) and brand love (Bagozzi et al. 2014). Gumparathi and Patra (2019) exposed that Attachment Theory was relevant to be used in the research related to cognitive and affective responses of consumers to a brand such as brand love and brand attachment. Although there is an overlap on the impact of strong and positive relationships on brands, they are conceptually different (Park et al. 2006; Albert et al. 2008, 2009; Loureiro et al. 2012; Hwang and Kandampully 2012; Park et al. 2013; Palusuk et al. 2019). Therefore, further explanation and boundary on both constructs are required for deep understanding. Following the suggestion of Park et al. (2013) and Gomez-Suarez (2019), this research analyzes similarities and differences between constructs of love and attachment to a brand. A comparison of the two constructs will be presented. Furthermore, the comparison is made at the level of conceptual, definition, and operational dimension.

Brand Attachment

The conceptualization of attachment stems from a psychological concept that has been explored in Bowlby's research (1979, 1980) in the context of primary caregiver-infant relationships. Bowlby showed that attachment is an emotion-laden target specific bond between infant and primary caregiver (Thomson et al. 2005). The attachment of infants to the primary caregiver (mother/caregiver) is obtained from the results of evolution through interactions (Park et al., 2006). The previous research by Hazan and Zeifman (1999) suggested that attachment formation takes place through a series of phases starting from physical closeness, cognitive awareness, perception and emotion in the context of relationships. When the attachment gets stronger, someone will have the desire to maintain closeness, be motivated to learn about the environment, seek security when there is a threat and experience emotional distress when facing separation.

Specifically, Park et al. (2006) revealed that this attachment serves basic human needs to secure a protection from physical and psychological threats that can influence relationship

behaviors in the future. In marketing research, the literature shows that the attachment can go beyond the context of people's relationships. The basic conceptual characteristics and behavioural effects of attachment are assumed to have similarities with attachment to an object. Several studies (Thomson et al. 2005; Park et al. 2006; Park et al. 2010) showed that consumers could develop attachment to objects or brands.

Several previous studies refer to material ownership (Belk 1988) regarding to the emergence of the concept of brand attachment. The object has become a part of the self and has symbolic meaning which comes from personal history so that it evokes emotions. This idea of material possession has provided an interesting idea of attachment in the relationship of individuals and material objects (Schultz et al. 1989). Schultz et al. (1989) defined attachment as a construct in the consumer behavior. Attachment is multidimensional property of material object possession which represents the degree of linkage perceived by an individual between him/herself and particular object (p. 360). When the object becomes more favorite than the others, it becomes part of the self and consumers tend to attach to this object. The attachment appears from the previous experience with the object and has a relative strength based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards a certain object. Attachment represents something that the individual feels towards the object in question. When the object is considered to be part of the self, the attachment will be stronger (Schultz et al. 1989).

Furthermore, Lacoetilhe (2000) began to define and develop and also validate the measurement of the brand attachment. Lacoetilhe (2000) assumed that attachment is an emotional predisposition or psychological link. Attachment is a psychological variable that refers to a long-lasting and irreversible affective reaction (separation is painful) and expresses psychological closeness to the Lacoetilhe brand (2000, p. 66). Using the attachment theory (Bowlby 1979), Thomson et al. (2005) conceptualized that consumers also developed a strong emotional attachment to the brand. Attachment is defined as the specific emotion-laden target specific bond between a person and a specific object (Thomson et al. 2005, p 77-78) which varies in strength. When consumers have stronger attachment to the brand, they will maintain closeness with the object.

Extending the concept related to those constructs, Park et al. (2006) developed brand attachment that had affective and cognitive based on attachment theory (Bowlby 1979). Park et al.

(2006) conceptualized the relationship-based attachment construct. Like the attachment of a infants and their mothers, individuals develop attachment to brands that can be counted on to fulfill needs to gratify the self (experiential consumption), to enable the self (functional consumption), and/or to enrich the self (symbolic consumption). The bonds originate from a rich and accessible network of memories that engages thoughts and feelings about the brand and the brand's relationship with oneself. Personalized experiences and autobiographical memories of a highly self-relevant brand create an emotional bond. Brand attachment is the strength of the cognitive and emotional bond connecting the brand with the self (p. 9). Brand attachment includes two important elements, namely (1) the relationship between brand and self, and (2) the cognitive and emotional bonds that affect readiness to allocate resources to the brand.

Supporting the previous study, Park et al. (2010) suggested that attachment has motivated consumers to develop themselves or incorporate the brand into themselves so that consumers who attached to the brand would invest their resources in order to maintain the relationship with the brand. They will use their resources that include (1) social resources, such as maintaining the brand and degrading the alternatives, (2) financial resources, such as willingness to pay a higher price for the brand; and (3) time resources, such as involvement in the brand community and brand promotion through social media. Therefore, the conceptualization of brand attachment includes:

- There is a bond that connects the brand with oneself (Schultz et al. 1989; Lacoeuilhe 2000; Thomson et al. 2005; Mickulincer and Shaver 2007; Park et al. 2010)
- The strength felt is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards specific objects (Schultz et al. 1989) or varies (Thomson et al. 2005).
- Develop over time through experiences (Schultz et al. 1989; Thomson et al. 2005; Park et al. 2010).
- Use resources to maintain the relationship with the brand (Thomson et al. 2005 and Park et al. 2006, 2010).

Thus, this study argues according to Park et al. (2010) that brand attachment is the strength of the bond which connects the brand with oneself. Attachment comes from previous interactions or experiences with the brand that involve thoughts and feelings about the brand and the brand-self relationship. This attachment is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards objects that can influence consumers to maintain relationships with brands.

Brand Attachment Measurement

Measurement model of brand attachment originated from Lacouilhe's (2000) research that was developed from an individual-object relationship framework (Belk 1998; Ball and Tasaki 1992) as in Table 1. Lacouilhe (2000) developed uni-dimensional measurement model that focused on affective factor because of psychological closeness to the long-lasting and irreversible brand. This measurement model consisted of five-item scale, namely affection, pleasure, connection, attraction, and comfort in owning the brand. The scale has been developed from three sources of information (i.e. literature review, interview and projective testing) and had satisfactory psychometric quality from a standard measurement perspective. However, the measurement scale faces methodological limitations regarding the scale measure and its one-dimensional character. The item ignores antecedents or consequences of attachment that should be able to use in order to understand the basics of affective relationships from various aspects and avoid dissociating various concepts discussed as in the multidimensional approach. In addition, the operational approach used in item creation only uses interpretive lines and item refinement by experts.

Furthermore, Thomson et al. (2005) and Park (2006; 2010) developed a scale of attachment with a multidimensional approach. Thomson et al. (2005) developed a scale of attachment based on emotional closeness with the brand. It consisted of three first-order factors which were labelled affection, passion and connection. Thomson et al. (2005) showed that attachment varied in strength associated with feelings or specific emotional factors on the brand. The individual will maintain closeness to the object as the attachment gets stronger. The strong attachment is associated with stronger feelings of affection (affectionate, loved, peaceful, friendly), connection (attached, bonded, connected) and passion (passionate, delighted, captivated). However, this multidimensional measure has been debated by some researchers (Park et al. 2010; Albert et al. 2009; Bergkvist and Bech Larsen 2010 and Sarkar et al. 2012) because of the similarities in the use of love item which is a dimension of interpersonal theory in measuring brand love.

Despite being multidimensional, Park et al. (2006) revealed that the measurement of Thomson et al. (2005) only reflected the affect component of brand self-connection so that the measurement only represented a part of the brand attachment factor. Park et al. (2006) proposed not only the brand-self relationship but also the automaticity of thoughts. The two dimensions are considered to be able more to describe and represent the state of mind when consumers are very

attached to the brand rather than using just one. Supporting the previous study, Park et al. (2010) re-developed measure scales which included brand-self cognitions, thoughts, and autobiographical memories that were more than emotions. Attachment includes brand-self connection (part of who you are and personally connected) and prominence (automatic thoughts/feelings and thoughts/feelings come naturally). Consumers will categorize the brand as part of themselves and will make the brand as top of mind from positive feelings and memories when consumers attach to the brand.

The measurement of brand attachment in marketing literature is divided into two approaches, namely affective approach and cognitive-affective approach. These approaches stemmed from two different conceptualizations of research that have operationalized the scale for measuring brand attachment. The affective or emotional approach seeks to measure attachment by focusing on the affective or emotional components (eg. Lacoeyuilhe 2000; Thomson et al. 2005; Shimul et al. 2019), meanwhile the cognitive-affective approach measures the brand attachment through cognitive and affective components (Park et al. 2006; 2010).

Affective Approach

Studies included in this group used the theoretical assumption that consumers emotionally attached to the objects of consumption. The strength of the relationship between consumer-brand is determined by the emotional component that can reflect the strength of consumers' attachment to the brand. Lacoeyuilhe (2000) used emotional criteria or overall affective reactions in the operationalisation of measurement scale of brand attachment such as affection, pleasure, connection, attraction, and comfort in owning the brand. The results of the study obtained five items which have been verified by using validity (discriminant and convergent) and reliability tests. Furthermore, the measurement of brand attachment has been adopted by several researchers (such as Belaid and Behi 2011; Bahri- Ammari et al. 2016; and Nashtae et al. 2017) in various contexts.

Belaid and Behi (2011) and Nashtae et al. (2017) used this measurement in the context of a product/brand. Belaid and Behi (2011) measured the attachment to utilitarian products in Tunisia by using four items which were measured using a Likert scale. The results show that one item needs to be deleted because it does not fit the context of the product. Meanwhile, Nashtae et al. (2017) still adopted five items by using a Likert scale. The results show that all items are valid and reliable in measuring attachment to durable goods and fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG). Furthermore,

Bahri-Ammari et al. (2016) used this measurement in the context of service in Tunisia. Like Belaid and Behi (2011), they also used four measurement items that were adapted to the research context. All items were measured by using a Likert scale and the results indicated that four items had good internal consistency.

Supporting the affective approach, Thomson et al. (2005) also identified a series of emotional items that reflected the strength of brand attachment. Using the premise that consumers could articulate the characteristic of emotional brand attachment, the study produced 10 items that reflected three factors labeled Affection, Passion, and Connection. The measurement of emotional attachment has been adopted by some researchers as in Table 2. Research have been conducted in various contexts such brands/companies, service and mobile app context. In the context of products/brands, most research was carried out on products/brands that have been purchased or owned by respondents, brands that have been used continuously and were non-switching for a long time. Meanwhile, in the context of service, the research was conducted on favorite services that have been used by respondents. In the mobile app context, it was conducted on mobile app used by respondents.

All items in each study were measured by using a Likert scale with a different number of items (brand attachment from Thomson et al. 2005) which were adapted according to each research context. Malar et al. (2011) adopted six items of attachment to various familiar brands in several industries. Meanwhile, Zhou et al. (2012) adopted the whole items from Thomson et al. (2005), which were 10 items in the context of brand community in China. Other researchers who used 10 items were Tran et al. (2021) in the mobile app context. Moreover, Dwivedi (2018) adopted seven items of brand attachment frequently used by Australian consumers on social media. Huaman-Ramirez and Merunka (2019) adopted nine items of attachment to several local brands in different services categories. Other researchers who used nine items were Torres et al. (2019) who measured the attachment to airline travel sector in the USA. Aboulnsr and Tran et al. (2018) adopted five items of attachment to the new products and well-known brand for technological advances in the US. Other researchers using five items were Ghorbanzadeh and Rahehagh (2020) who measured the attachment to smartphone and apparel brands in Iran. Hwang and Kandampully (2012) adopted three items of attachment to luxury fashion brands and other researchers who used three items were Loureiro et al. (2012). However, brand attachment measurement used by Loureiro et al. (2012) was

combined with other measurement items (Chang and Cheng 2006) apart from measurement from Thomson et al. (2005).

Another affective approach was developed by Shimul et al. (2019) in measuring attachment to luxury brands. The emotion, exclusivity and symbolic values of luxury became the basis for Shimul et al. (2019) to operationalizing the measurement scale of brand attachment. The research is conducted in the luxury brand context. Questionnaire items are emotional and measured using a Likert scale. The results show that the use of the luxury brand attachment scale is able to provide a better measure and understanding of consumer attachment to luxury brands compared to brand attachment in general.

Cognitive-affective Approach

The study from previous group ignored the cognitive dimension of BA construct. Park et al. (2010) suggested that the strength of a relationship between consumer and brand was not limited only on the feelings but also the brand-related thoughts and memories originating from rich memory networks or mental representations. Park et al. (2010) used cognitive and affective components as general starting point for measuring brand attachment. Park et al. (2010) developed and validated the more parsimony measure of brand attachment, tested the based assumption and showed that the measure indicated brand attachment. Park et al. (2010) measured the brand attachment by observing the consumers' responses towards 10-item scale on three different brands, namely Quaker Oats Meal, Apple iPod and a local university by using 10-point Likert type scale. The analysis result reduced 10 items into 4 items that are more parsimony and fit to the marketing practice. In the next Park et al. (2010) study, two-dimensional measurement (brand self-connection and prominence) of BA was tested by different variables, brands and respondents. The results indicated that four items that represented brand self-connection and prominence had a good internal consistency.

Several researchers also used the measurement items developed by Park et al. (2010) in their research nowadays as in Table 3. Park et al. (2010) measurement items have been used in the context of brands/companies (such as fashion, cars, riding events, apparel, bikes etc.) and service. The research was conducted to the respondents who already used the brands or became old costumers and had repeat purchases. Items have been adopted as a whole, such as 10 items from the sample study of Park et al. (2010), four items used by Park et al. (2010) in the results of their

final studies and in combination with other researchers. All items were measured by using a Likert scale.

Table 1. Research on Brand Attachment Measurement

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Lacoeuilhe (2000)	Uni-dimension (5 items)	-	France	Pantyhose, feminine deodorant, and laundry detergent
Thomson et al. (2005)	Multi-dimension: affection, passion and connection	7-point rating scale, ranging from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Very well. 10 items.		
Park et al. (2010)	Bi-dimension: brand self-connection Prominence (4 items)	11-point scale with 0 = Not at all and 10 = Completely	Europe	Quaker Oats Oatmeal, Apple iPod and local university, Apple iPod, Nike and retail bank costumers
Shimul et al. (2019)	Uni-dimensional (seven items)	Seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not representative at all, to 7 = Clearly representative	Europe	Luxury brand products: Louis Vuitton, Gucci, Giorgio Armani, Dolce & Gabbana, Swarovski, and Rolex Non-luxury brand products: Google, Apple (iPhone, Macbook), Nike, and Colgate

Source: the authors

Table 2. The Use of Scale Measurement of Brand Attachment Thomson et al. (2005)

Authors	Context	Country	Number of Items
Malar et al. (2011)	Fast moving consumer goods, durable consumer goods, service and retailing	-	Six items
Zhou et al. (2012)	Brand community	China	Ten items
Loureiro et al. (2012)	Car	Portugal	Three items
Hwang and Kandampully 2012	luxury fashion brand		Three items
Aboulnsr and Tran (2018)	New products and well-known brand for technological	US	Five items
Dwivedi et al. (2018)	Brand in social media	Australia	Seven items
Torres et al. (2019)	Airline travel sector	USA.	Nine items
Huaman-Ramirez (2019)	Service (leisure activity, hotel, restaurant, retail, travel, bank, movie theatre)	Peru	Nine items
Ghorbanzadeh and Rahehagh 2020	Smartphone and apparel.	Iran	Five items
Tran et al. 2021	Mobile app context	-	Ten items

Source: the authors

Table 3. The Use of Scale Measurement of Brand Attachment Park et al. (2010)

Authors	Context	Country	Number of Items
Yen et al. (2018)	Service (travel agency)	Taiwan	Ten items
Cheng et al. (2016)	Service (Hotel)	Taiwan	Ten items
Kauffman et al. (2016)	luxury fashion brand	Brazil	Ten items
Chu et al. (2016)	Brand in twitter	US	Ten items
Wu et al. (2017)	Product and service	China	Five items
Japutra (2018)	Some product categories (car manufacturers, electronics, food and beverages, fashion retailers and airlines.	UK	Four items
Lim et al. (2019)	branded apparel	Malaysia	Six items
Kumar and Nayak (2019) a	Brand community	India	Four items
Kumar and Nayak (2019) b	Brand community	India	Four items
Rajaobelina et al. (2020)	m-banking app	Canada	Four items

Source: the authors

Brand Love

The initial conceptualization of love in the marketing literature review has been studied by several researchers (Shimp and Maden 1988; Ahuvia, 1993; Whang et al., 2004) through the

consumer's relationship with an object. Most researchers (Shimp and Maden 1988; Ahuvia, 1993; Whang et al., 2004) used the theory of interpersonal love applied to consumer situations. Meanwhile, other researchers used the grounded theory (Batra et al. 2012) and parasocial (Fetscherin 2014). The construct of feelings of love in the marketing literature was introduced by Shimp and Maden (1988) from the relationship between consumers and objects of consumption (products, brands, shops, etc.) by using Sternberg's (1986) theory of interpersonal love. Although the consumer-object relationship is qualitatively different from the person-to-person relationship, there are many similarities to all relationships between the consumer and the object of consumption (such as product, brand, store, commercial etc.). Three components of love in the context of consumption which are longing, likes and decisions/commitments determine the nature of consumer's relationship with an object. Ahuvia (1993, 2005) also studied the concept of love in various objects of consumption. Ahuvia proposed that the consumer also felt love for an object other than people such as pets, computers, paintings, old cars and so on. Agreeing with Shimp and Maden (1988), in his subsequent research Ahuvia (2005) argued that consumer-object love had similarities with interpersonal love. This thinking is also in accordance with the previous research of Whang et al. (2004) that linked the theory of interpersonal love to products. Whang et al. (2004) showed a romantic relationship between consumers and products. Bikers' love for motorbikes is like a form of interpersonal love.

Furthermore, Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) introduced brand love as a new marketing construct that had a very strong affective or emotional focus on the brand. Brand love is the passionate and emotional feeling of a particular trade name (p. 81). Brand love involves the integration of the brand into self and consumer satisfaction which is the result of a long-term relationship with the brand. However, brand love cannot fully fit into the form of interpersonal love due to the looser use of the word love in commercial products. Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010) and Batra et al. (2012) stated explicitly that brand love was different from interpersonal love. Brand love and interpersonal love had different characteristics (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010 and Batra et al. 2012). Brand love is unidirectional while interpersonal love is two-way. The element of sexual intimacy (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010) and altruistic from consumers on brands and emotional feelings from brands to consumers could not be found in brand love (Batra et al. 2012).

Batra et al. (2012) revealed that brand love represented a high-level construct driven by emotional relationship and an overall positive attitude towards brands. Brand love was not just an emotion of love (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) that was short-term and episodic but a relationship that could last decades involving affective, cognitive and behavioral experiences (Batra et al. 2012, p. 2). Love for brands that is not completely irrational also gets support from Sarkar (2014) and Langner et al. (2015). Consumers will conduct a cognitive evaluation on a brand (Sarkar 2014) and are more often driven by rational profit (Langner et al. 2015). However, brand love plays an important role in maintaining the consumer relationship with brands. As stated in previous research, brand love can influence consumers to speak positively to other consumers (Batra et al. 2012, Albert and Merunka 2013), commitment, willingness to pay premium prices (Albert and Merunka 2013), brand loyalty (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012 and Algharabat et al. 2017) and customer engagement (Prentice et al. 2019).

Therefore, conceptualization of brand love has been studied by several researchers using different theoretical basis such as theory of interpersonal love (Albert, et al. 2008; Whang et al. 2004; Sarkar et al. 2012; Rossiter et al. 2012), parasocial (Fetscherin 2014) and the grounded theory approach (Batra et al. 2012). Brand love has become a important topic of marketing but there are just a few agreements on brand love (Albert et al. 2008). Based on the literature conducted, brand love includes:

- The long-term relationship with the brand (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012; Batra et al. 2012)
- Involving emotional and rational relationships (Batra et al. 2012; Sarkar 2014; Langner et al. 2015).
- Having affective and cognitive consistency (Fournier 1998; Carrol and Ahuvia 2006), a certainty, more frequent thinking and discussion on the object of attitude (Batra et al. 2012).
- Predicting the behaviors of brand in the future such as speaking positively to other consumers (Batra et al. 2012, Albert and Merunka 2013), commitment, willingness to pay premium prices (Albert and Merunka 2013), brand loyalty (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012 and Algharabat et al. 2017) and customer engagement (Prentice et al. 2019).

From our literature review based on Table 4, we assume that love includes emotional and rational relationships from a long-term relationship with the brand. Brand love arises from a long

history with brands involving affective, cognitive and behavior (Fournier 1998; Batra et al. 2012). Thus, supporting Batra et al. (2012), brand love is a high-level construct driven by emotional relationships and overall positive attitudes towards brands.

Table 4. Dimensions and Operationalization of Brand Love

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Carroll and Ahuvia (2006)	Uni-dimensional	Five-point Likert type scale	-	Consumer package goods such as soft drinks, soaps, and cereals
Albert et al. (2008)	Multidimensional: Passion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration of the relationship • Self-congruity • Dreams • Memories • Pleasure • Attraction • Uniqueness • Beauty • Trust • Declaration of affect 	-	Consumers in France and U.S.	Shoes, car, lingerie, wristwatch, perfume, food, music, cigarette, and furniture.
Albert et al. (2009)	Multidimensional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Passion: Duration, Dream, Memories, Intimacy, Uniqueness. - Affection: Idealization, Pleasure 	10-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 (does not apply at all) to 10 (totally applies)	-	clothes, perfume, grocery, car, cosmetics, hi-fi/ audio/ video, shoes, music, computers, lingerie, hygiene, various
Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010)	Uni-dimensional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two items: - expressed love sense of loss in case of unavailability. 		Australia	The brand of an iconic product category owned by many Australian consumers.
Sarkar (2011)	Bi-dimensional: Passion Intimacy	Five-point Likert type scale	undergraduate student in Indian universities	Product category that consumers remember
Rossiter (2012)	Using C-OAR-SE based measure	Five categories of representative answers "hate", "dislike", "neutral", "liking", and "love".	German	Laundry detergent, coffee, and computers, fashion clothing category
Fetscherin (2014)	Interpersonal love (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Lee 1977) Parasocial love (Perse and Rubin 1989)	5-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree; to 5 = strongly agree	As and Japan	Car

Continued from Table 4.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Product category
Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Multidimensional: 1. Self-brand integration 2. Passion-driven behaviors 3. Positive emotional connection 4. Long-term relationship 5. Anticipated separation distress 6. Attitude valence	7-point Likert type scale. Ranging from not at all to very much	USA	Popular clothing brand

Source: the authors

Brand Love Measurement

Construct of love already started from the research on the consumer relationship with the object in Shimp and Maden's (1988) research. Shimp and Maden (1988) adapted the theory of interpersonal love (Sternberg 1986) person-to-person to define the characteristic of consumer relationship with the objects of consumption. Three components of love adopted by Sternberg (1986) which are intimacy, passion and decision/commitment become longing, like and decision/commitment. However, the research was still conceptual, so that the development and empirical test related to the construct validity is still proposed for further research. Continuing to measure love in products, Whang et al (2004) developed a multidimensional measurement of love that was adapted directly from the interpersonal love style (love typology, Lee's 1977), namely passionate (Eros), possessive (Mania), and selfless (Agape).

Furthermore, several researchers started to specifically develop measurements for brands as shown in Table 4. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) developed quantitatively uni-dimensional measure on love construct of the consumer who was satisfied with a particular brand. The measurement model focuses on the affective components that consist of passion, attachment, positive evaluation, positive emotions and declaration of love. The construct test has fulfilled good discriminant validity, but the use of uni-dimension becomes a limitation when it is associated with the use of multidimensional interpersonal love literature (Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012). Additionally, the measurement overlaps with the attachment construct. This is because Thomson et al. (2005) use love in the attachment dimension, while Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) use attachment in the brand love dimension.

Overcome any overlaps with other constructs, Albert et al. (2009) developed the feeling measurement of brand love by using the qualitative and quantitative approach to explore the concept of love. Albert et al. (2008) stated eleven dimensions that described the feeling of brand love and a special kind of relationship they have with the brands they like. Those eleven dimensions include cognitive and affective components that comprise passion, duration of the relationship, self-congruity, dreams, memories, pleasure, attraction, uniqueness, beauty, trust and declaration of affect. Meanwhile for attachment, Albert et al. (2008) did not keep it as component of brand love. Moreover, Albert et al. (2009) also redeveloped the measurement scale of brand love based on the integration of various theories of interpersonal (the Passionate Love Scale, Hatfield and Sprecher 1986; the Triangular Theory Love Scale, Sternberg 1986; and the Romantic Love Scale Rubin, 1970) and the result of his study exploration. Consumers' real feelings of love for some brands are measured through 22 items and seven dimensions namely Uniqueness, Pleasure, Intimacy, Idealization, Duration, Dream and Memories. The seven factors offer a second order solution with two factors labelled Passion and Affection.

Several other researchers (Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010; Sarkar et al. 2012; Rossiter et al. 2012) focused on developing a measurement scale for brand love romantic to overcome overlaps with other constructs based on the theory of interpersonal love. Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen (2010) developed the measurement of brand love through two items namely expressed love which included in passionate love scales (Hartfield and Sprecher 1986) and feeling of loss from passionate or romantic love (Hartfield and Sprecher 1986 and Rubin 1970) to overcome any overlap with emotional attachment. However, as well as Carroll and Ahuvia's (2006) measurement, Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen's (2010) measurement was also uni-dimensional. Considering the lack of theory and methodology in the conceptualization of brand love, Sarkar et al. (2012) redeveloped the concept and measured consumer's feeling of love to a brand based on Sternberg (1986) Triangular Theory. Sarkar et al. (2012) re-conceptualized the brand love romantic based on interpersonal emotions and consumption. The romantic brand love is a multidimensional construct measured from two factors namely intimacy and passion. However, Rossiter et al. (2012) stated that the use of verb "love" on person-to-person could not be directly applied to an object like brand. The verb "love" has various meanings when it is used for different objects. Rossiter et al. (2012) developed a new construct measure of brand love with C-OAR-SE based. The measure of answer category is determined to define feelings from hatred to love so that the product (choices from respondents) is

differentiated according to the quadrant of the answer category. Another researcher Fetscherin (2014) used items from the love attitude scale by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986).

The use of interpersonal love theory in the research of brand love is already a standard, but the emotional traits equality of interpersonal love and brand love is still a debate (Batra et al. 2012 and Langner et al. 2015). Brand love has different characteristic from interpersonal love so that the researchers need to be discreet in transferring directly the theory and scale of interpersonal love to brand love (Batra et al. 2012 and Langner et al. 2015). However, Batra et al. (2012) argued that the researchers were still allowed to use the theory of interpersonal love as a source of hypothesis or supporting evidence in examining the consumer-brand relationship. Through qualitative study, Batra et al. (2012) revealed elements of brand love prototipe that produced seven core elements namely self-brand integration, passion-driven behaviors, positive emotional connection, long-term relationship, positive overall attitude valence, attitude certainty and confidence (strength), and anticipated separation distress. Meanwhile, another researcher Fetscherin (2014) developed another measurement adopted from parasocial love scale (Perse and Rubin, 1989) as comparison of interpersonal love scale (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986 and Lee 1977).

Furthermore, Bagozzi et al. (2017) redeveloped the scale that was parsimony and has been validated from the development of Batra et al. (2012) measurement scale which was only conceptual. The measurement scale of brand love is multidimensional that consists of three multilevel versions which are 26, 13 and 6 items. The differences of those three versions are based on two things that are the number of variances explained by each measure and the sub-dimensions in brand love. As well as the research of Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) and Batra et al. (2012), this study put the dimension of emotional attachment in the measurement scale of brand love.

Based on literature review, it can be revealed that the theory of interpersonal love is already used as basis to develop the measurement scale of brand love that is multidimensional (Whang et al. 2004; Albert 2008, 2009; Batra et al. 2012; Sarkar et al. 2012; Bagozzi et al. 2017). Furthermore, there was attachment dimension that has been used by researchers in measuring brand love (such as Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Batra et al. 2012 and Bagizzi et al. 2017). That overlapped when the love item has also been used by previous researchers (i.e. Thomson et al. 2005) in measuring brand attachment. Nevertheless, several researchers (Albert et al. 2008, 2009 and Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2010) previously have conducted another review to examine the scale item of brand love

and distinguish it from other constructs. Albert et al. (2008) conducted a review related to measuring brand love. Meanwhile, other researchers separated love and attachment items and did not use attachment as a measure of brand love (Albert et al. 2009; Bergkvist and Bech-larsen 2010; Loureiro et al. 2012).

The conceptualization of the use of measuring brand love has not been agreed to at this moment although brand love has become an important topic in current research. In general, as previously discussed, brand love has been measured using uni-dimensional and multidimensional scales. *First*, brand love was measured using a uni-dimensional measurement developed by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). *Second*, brand love was measured using a multidimensional measurement developed from several researchers such as Albert et al. (2009); Sarkar et al. (2012); Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2017).

Initially, the measurement of brand love was developed by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) which was uni-dimensional with ten-item scale. The research was conducted in the context of consumer-packaged goods that have been purchased regularly over a long period of time. The result shows that the measurement scale is already validated empirically as predictor variable of brand love. Moreover, Table 5 shows that that uni-dimensional measurement item has been used in the research of brand love in the various contexts such as context of brand/company, context of service-brand/company and platform online. Most research were conducted to respondents who already use the brand, service or platform (social media). Item was measured using Likert scale adopted with the number of items that vary for each researcher. The use of a different number of items is due to the presence of an item (which is attachment) in the measurement of brand love that is considered as independent construct, the use of an item that simply captures love with the brand (Loureiro et al. 2012), or a deleted item because it has factor loading $<0,5$ in the context of the research (eg. Hwang and Kandampully 2012; Ismail and Spinelli 2012; Islam and Rahman 2016; Wallace 2014; Wallace et al. 2017).

Some researchers have used the uni-dimensional measurement of Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) as stated above; however, other research use the multidimensional measurement to measure the brand love. Like uni-dimensional measurement, the multidimensional measurement scale of brand love is also used to measure love in various contexts such as context of brand/company, context of service and online platform. Albert et al. (2009) measurement scale was already used by

Hegner et al. (2017) in the context of fashion brand in Netherlands. The whole items (22 items) were measured using a Likert scale and the result showed that Albert (2009) measurement scale can be used in the context of love for fashion. Fetscherin et al. (2014) adopted the scale of interpersonal love (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Lee 1977) and parasocial love (Perse and Rubin 1989) to measure love for favourite brand with broad product categories such as soft drinks, mobile phones, (running) shoes, cars in Brazil. The result showed that the item has been well validated.

Furthermore, the item from the scale development of interpersonal love scale (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986) was used again by Fetscherin (2014) in the context of favourite brand which was cars in US and Japan. The research also used Likert scale and the result also shows that the item is well-validated. Items of other multidimensional measurements are measurement scales from Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2016). The multidimensional scales from Batra (2012) and Bagozzi (2016) have already used in the context of brand/company and service of the company. The measurement scales of the research were measured using Likert scale. The research was conducted to respondents who loved the brand, ever used the brand, or have experienced service of the brand/company.

Table 5. Summary of Past Empirical Studies for Brand Love

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Loureiro et al. (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree)	Portugal	Car owners	Car
Hwang and Kandampully (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale (e.g. 1= Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree).	United States	Student	Luxury fashion (Chanel, Louis Vuitton, Burberry and Polo Ralph Lauren)
Ismail and Spinelli (2012)	<i>Unidimensional</i> -7 items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert-type scale	UK	Student	fashion brand
Albert et al. (2013)	<i>Multidimensional</i> (Albert et al. 2009)	-	France	Consumer	consumer's favorite product brand category (i.e. the brand attached to it)
Chen et al. (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale (ranging from 1 = not at all descriptive" to 7= "extremely descriptive")	Facebook users in Taiwan	Facebook users	Facebook page

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Wallace et al. (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale	Ireland	Students (Facebook users)	Fashion brands, sportswear, soft drinks, alcohol, retailers, including fast food, other websites, music, including artists and equipment, cosmetics, and food brands
Sarkar and Sreejesh (2014)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Ten items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree)	India	Owners of premium car brands	Car
Vernuccio et al. (2015)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Seven items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)	Europe and USA	Facebook fans' pages	Facebook fan pages (Alcohol and energy drinks, Automotive, Fashion brands, Food brands, Luxury, Music, entertainment, including artists and equipment, Other categories Personal care and cosmetics Retailers, including fast food Soft drinks Sportswear)
Islam and Rahman (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items. (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (scale ranging from 1= strongly agree to 5 = for strongly disagree)	India	Students	Fashion apparel brands
Karjaluoto et al. (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Nine items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale (scale ranging from "1= strongly disagree" to "5= strongly agree")	Finnish	Consumers	Popular brand: Apple, Nike and Adidas
Roy et al. (2016)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) Ten items	7-point Likert type scale, ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree.	-	Online marketplace shopper.	online retailer brands

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Algharabat . (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Ten items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale	Jordan	Students	brands liked and followed on Facebook page: Fashion, food and tea/coffee, hair care and cosmetics, sportswear, music, including artists and equipment, sport, automotive and others.
Huang et al. (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Five items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree	Taiwan	Mobile phone customers	mobile phone
Wallace et al. (2017)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - Eight items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1=strongly disagree” to 7=strongly agree	Ireland	Facebook users who “Liked” brands	fashion, haircare and cosmetics, music, food and tea/coffee, sport, alcohol, sportswear
Hsu and Chen (2018)	<i>Unidimensional</i> Ten items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Seven-point, Likert-type scales ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree	Taiwan	Online bookstore users	online bookstore
Hegner et al. (2017)	<i>Multidimensional</i> 22 items (Albert et al. 2009)	seven-point scale	Netherlands	Respondents that indicated to have a favourite fashion brand	Fashion brand
Loureiro et al. (2017)	Bagozzi et al. (2014)	seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1= “strongly disagree” to 7= “strongly agree”	Germany	Online users (millennial generation)	Brand page on Facebook
Bairrada et al. (2018)	<i>26-item scale, is from Batra et al. (2012) and Bagozzi et al. (2016).</i>	seven-point Likert type scale	Portugal	Students and non-students	

Continued from Table 5.

Author	Dimension	Scale	Context	Sample	Product category
Junaid et al. (2019)	<i>Unidimensional</i> (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006) Ten items	Five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (strongly agree).	Pakistan	Muslim smartphone users	Smartphone brands
Prentice et al. (2019)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Five- Likert type scale, ranging from “very much” to “not at all”.	Europe	Passengers who have experienced air travel in Europe with low cost carriers and existing airlines	Airline
Rodriguez and Rodriguez (2019)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Bagozzi et al. (2017)	Five-point Likert type scale, with 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree	Portugal and Sweden	Students	traditional luxury and neo-luxury brands from different categories product: fashion, mobiles, watches, coffee and cars
Amaro et al. (2020)	<i>Unidimensional</i> - seven items (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006)	Five-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1= strongly disagree, to 5=strongly agree	Europe (Germany, Portugal, Spain, Italy)	A large group of international students (from the Erasmus program of the European Union)	Destination
Khan et al. (2020)	<i>Multidimensional</i> Sarkar et al. (2012)		Malaysia	Muslim users of halal branded restaurants	Restaurants

Source: the authors

Boundaries of BL and BA

BA and BL are the main factors in building the consumer relationship with the brand. Several researchers (Carroll and Ahuvia 2006; Thomson et al. 2005) have considered the two items to be identical. This is because those two variables (BA and BL) are constructs that have emotional content and are part of one of them. Thomson et al. (2005) defined that attachment was an emotion-laden target specific bond between a person and a specific object which was measured from

affection (affectionate, loved, peaceful, friendly), connection (attached, bonded, connected) and passion (passionate, delighted, captivated). Other than that, Fournier (1998) defined love as a rich affective foundation. Moreover, Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) also defined brand love as the level of passionate emotional attachment that a satisfied customer had with a particular trade name as measured through affective components consisting of passion, attachment, positive evaluation, positive emotions and declaration of love.

The recognition of affective dimensions, which is love on Thomson et al. (2005) and attachment on Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), has showed blurred boundaries between love and brand attachment. Although both constructs involve in emotions, but the two have different focuses (Park et al. 2013 and Palusuk et al. 2019). Brand attachment is the strength of the bond that connects the brand with oneself (Park et al. 2010) when the brand is relevant to the self, able to represent the consumers and able to increase the fulfillment of goals (Schultz et al. 1989; Park et al. 2018). Brand attachment is measured by the brand self-connection and prominence (Park et al. 2010). Meanwhile, brand love is driven by an emotional relationship and an overall positive attitude towards brands (Albert et al. 2009; Sarkar et al. 2012) when brands can provide intrinsic rewards such as providing happiness or excitement, or extrinsic rewards (such as great quality). Brand love is measured by passion (duration, dream, memories, intimacy, uniqueness) and affection (idealization, pleasure) (Albert et al 2009).

Furthermore, they also have a different origin and intensity of strength. On the attachment, the bond is strong due to the close relationship between the brand and self and the prominent thoughts and memories. The perceived attachment strength is relatively based on thoughts, feelings and behaviors towards a particular object (Schultz et al. 1989) or varies in strength (Thomson et al. 2005). Meanwhile on love, a strong bond is based on the emotional relationship (affection and passion) and positive attitude towards the brand. Brand love includes affective and cognitive consistency (Fournier 1998; Carrol and Ahuvia 2006), greater attitude extremity and intensity, more certainty and importance, affective–cognitive consistency, more frequent thinking and talking about the attitude object (Batra et al. 2012). In addition, the strong feelings consumers had for brands in brand love indicated that brand love had a very deep, lasting and irreplaceable strength (Albert et al. 2013), so that love would apply to a much more limited number of brands than attachment. Based on these evidences, BA and BL are two different but closely related constructs

which imply that an increase in one variable (BA) can influence the increase of the other variable (BL) (as in Loureiro et al. 2012).

Discussion and Implication of the Research

Previous conceptual discussion shows that brand attachment and brand love are two constructs that have emotional content and influence subsequent behavior to maintain the relationship with the brand. The research has recognized that attachment is a dimension of brand love whilst love has been admitted as a dimension of brand attachment. Several researchers (Albert et al. 2009; Loureiro et al. 2012; Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen 2012; and Sarkar et al. 2012) have attempted to address overlaps by separating the attachment items in measuring brand love. However, the difference between two types of constructs is needed so as not to confuse and lead to a poor understanding of the consumer-brand relationship.

BA is basically an affective state in the form of a bond that connects the brand with oneself. Then, it is relatively based on thoughts and feelings towards certain objects that can influence subsequent behaviors to the brand. The stronger attachments, the more intense the closeness to the object. In the attachment theory (Bowlby 1959), the emotional attachment to an object can predict subsequent behaviors of individuals with that object, such as committing, investing and making sacrifices for the object (Thomson et al. 2005). In contrast to brand attachment, brand love is a very rich and much stronger affective state that results from a long-term relationship between consumers and brands (Fournier 1998 and Carroll and Ahuvia 2006). In addition to strong affective state, BL includes cognitive consistency, great strength of positive attitudes, higher certainty and interest, more frequent thinking and talking about the object of attitude. Brand love comes from strong emotional relationship and positive attitude towards brands (Batra et al. 2012).

In marketing practice, this paper contributes to a better understanding on the behavior that comes from the relationship of consumer-brand. Understanding consumer behavior should understand the affective effect and cues of consumers. When a brand can evoke strong and positive it can motivate consumers to maintain their closeness to the brand, increase commitment, advocate and tell the brand voluntarily. Marketing communication and positioning play an important role in increasing emotional responses to build long-term relationship with consumers.

Commented [NAW1]: It should be separated in two sections:
- Result and discussion
- Recommendation for future research

References

- Ahuvia, A. C. (2005). Beyond the Extended Self: Loved Objects and Consumers' Identity Narratives. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32(1), 171-184.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2008). When consumers love their brands: Exploring the concept and its dimensions. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(10), 1062–1075.
- Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2009). The feeling of love toward a brand: Concept and measurement. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 36, 300–307.
- Albert, N., & Merunka, D. (2013). The role of brand love in consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(3), 258-266.
- Algharabat, R. S. (2017). Linking social media marketing activities with brand love: the mediating role of self-expressive brands. *Kybernetes*, 47(10), 1801-1819.
- Amaro, S., Barroco, C., & Antunes, J. (2020). Exploring the antecedents and outcomes of destination brand love. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(3), 433-448.
- Aureliano-Silva, L., Strehlau, S., & Strehlau, V. (2018). The Relationship between Brand Attachment and Consumers' Emotional Well-Being. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 17(1), 1-16.
- Aboulnasr, K., & Tran, G. A. (2019). Is love really blind? The effect of emotional brand attachment on the perceived risk of really new products. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 29(1), 81-96.
- Ball, A. D., & Tasaki, L. H. (1992). The Role and Measurement of Attachment in Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1(2), 155-172.
- Bagozzi, R., Batra, R., & Ahuvia, A. (2014). Brand love scales: Construct validity, managerial utility, and new conceptual insights. *working paper*, 1-18.
- Bairrada, C. M., Coelho, F., & Coelho, A. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of brand love: utilitarian and symbolic brand qualities. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(3/4), 656-682.
- Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(2), 1–16.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Batra, R., & Ahuvia, A. (2017). Brand love: Development and validation of a practical scale. *Marketing Letters*, 28(1), 1–14.

- Belaid, S., & Behi, A. T. (2011). The role of attachment in building consumer-brand relationships: an empirical investigation in the utilitarian consumption context. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 20(1), 37 – 47.
- Bergkvist, L., & Bech-Larsen, T. B. (2010). Two Studies of consequences and actionable antecedents of brand love. *Brand Management*, 17(7), 504-518.
- Bahri-Ammari, N., Niekerk, M. V., Khelil, H. B., & Chtioui, J. (2016). The effects of brand attachment on behavioral loyalty in the luxury restaurant sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 559-585.
- Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105-114.
- Carroll, B. A., & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some Antecedents and Outcomes of Brand Love. *Marketing Letters*, 17(2), 79-89.
- Chu, S.-C., Chen, H.-T., & Sung, Y. (2016). Following brands on Twitter: an extension of theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Advertising*, 35(3), 421-437.
- Chen, H., Papazafeiropoulou, A., Chen, T.K., Duan, Y., & Liu, H. W. (2014). Exploring the commercial value of social networks Enhancing consumers' brand experience through Facebook pages. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 27(5), 576-598.
- Cheng, J.-C., Luo, S.-J., Yen C.-H., & Yang, Y.-F. (2016). Brand attachment and customer citizenship behaviors. *The Service Industries Journal*, 36(7-8), 263-277.
- Chang, P.- L., & Chieng, M.- H. (2006). Building consumer-brand relationship: A cross-cultural experiential view. *Psychology and Marketing*, 23(11), 927-959.
- Dwivedi, A., Johnson, L. W., Wilkie, D. C., & Araujo-Gil, L. D. (2018). Consumer emotional brand attachment with social media brands and social media brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(6), 1176-1204.
- Fetscherin, M. (2014). What type of relationship do we have with loved brands?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 31(6/7), 430–440.
- Fetscherin, M., Boulanger, M., Filho, C. G., & Souki, G. Q. (2014). The effect of product category on consumer brand relationships. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 23(2), 78–89.
- Ghorbanzadeh, D., & Rahehagh, A. (2020). Emotional brand attachment and brand love: the emotional bridges in the process of transition from satisfaction to loyalty. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 15(1), 16-38.

- Gomez-Suárez, M. (2019). Examining Customer–Brand Relationships: A Critical Approach to Empirical Models on Brand Attachment, Love, and Engagement. *Administrative Sciences*, 9(10), 1-16.
- Gumparthy, V. P., and Patra, S. (2020). The Phenomenon of Brand Love: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 19(2), 93-132.
- Hatfield., Elaine., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring Passionate Love in Intimate Relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, 9(4), 383-410.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman, D. (1999). *Pair bonds as attachments: Evaluating the evidence*. In J. Cassidy and P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 336–354). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hegner, S. M., Fenko, A., & Teravest, A. (2017). Using the theory of planned behaviour to understand brand love. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 26(1), 26–41.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 392-402.
- Huaman-Ramirez, R., & Merunka, D. (2019). Brand experience effects on brand attachment: the role of brand trust, age, and income. *European Business Review*, 31(5): 610-645.
- Huang, C. (2017). The impacts of brand experiences on brand loyalty: mediators of brand love and trust. *Management Decision*, 55(5), 915-934.
- Hsu, C. L., & Chen, M. C. (2018). How gamification marketing activities motivate desirable consumer behaviors: Focusing on the role of brand love. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 88, 121–133.
- Hwang, J., & Kandampully, J. (2012). The role of emotional aspects in younger consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 21(2), 98–108.
- Islam, J. U., & Rahman, Z. (2016). Examining the effects of brand love and brand image on customer engagement: An empirical study of fashion apparel brands. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 7(1), 45-59.
- Ismail, A. R., & Spinelli, G. (2012). Effects of brand love, personality and image on word of mouth: The case of fashion brands among young consumers. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 16(4), 386–398.
- Japutra, A., Ekinci, Y., & Simkin, L. (2018). Positive and negative behaviours resulting from brand attachment: The moderating effects of attachment styles. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52 (5/6), 1185-1202.

- Junaid, M., Hou, F., Hussain, K., & Kirmani, A. A. (2019). Brand love: the emotional bridge between experience and engagement, generation-M perspective. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28(2), 200-215.
- Khan, A., Mohammad, A. S., & Muhammad, S. (2020). An integrated model of brand experience and brand love for halal brands: survey of halal fast food consumers in Malaysia. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*.
- Karjaluoto, H., Munnukka, J., & Kiuru, K. (2016). Brand love and positive word of mouth: The moderating effects of experience and price. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 25(6), 527-537.
- Kaufmann, H. R., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Manarioti, A. (2016). Exploring behavioural branding, brand love and brand co-creation. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 25(6), 1-23.
- Kumar, J., & Nayak, J.K. (2019). Consumer psychological motivations to customer brand engagement: a case of brand community. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 36(1), 168-177.
- Kumar, J., & Nayak, J.K. (2019). Brand engagement without brand ownership: a case of non-brand owner community members. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28 (2), 216-230.
- Lacoeuilhe, J. (2000b). L'attachement a la marque: proposition d'une echelle de mesure. *Recherche et Application en Marketing*, 15(4), 61-77.
- Langner, T., Schmidt, J., & Fischer, A. (2015). Is It Really Love? A Comparative Investigation of the Emotional Nature of Brand and Interpersonal Love. *Psychology and Marketing*, 32(6), 624-634.
- Lee, J. A. (1977). A Typology of Styles of Loving. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 173-182.
- Loureiro, S. M. C., Ruediger, K. H., & Demetris, V. (2012). Brand emotional connection and loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(1), 13-27.
- Loureiro, S. M. C., Gorgus, T., & Kaufmann, H. R. (2017). Antecedents and outcomes of online brand engagement: The role of brand love on enhancing electronic-word-of-mouth. *Online Information Review*, 41(7), 985-1005.
- Lim, X.-J., Cheah, J. -H., Cham, T. H., Ting, H., & Memon, M. A. (2019). Compulsive buying of branded apparel, its antecedents, and the mediating role of brand attachment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 32(7), 1539-1563.
- Malar, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W.D., & Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional brand attachment and Brand personality: the relative importance of the actual and the ideal self. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 35-52.
- Moussa, Salim (2015). I may be a twin but I'm one of a kind. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 18(1), 69-85.

- Nashtae, M. S., Hanzaei, K.H., & Mansourian, Y. (2017). How to develop brand attachment in various product categories? *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 29(5), 1198-1220.
- Palusuk, N., Koles, B., & Hasan, R. (2019). All you need is brand love: a critical review and comprehensive conceptual framework for brand love. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 35(1-2), 97-129.
- Park, C. W., MacInnis, D. J., & Priester, J. (2006). Beyond attitudes: Attachment and consumer behavior. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 12(2), 3-35.
- Park, C. W., MacInnis, D. J., Priester, J., Eisingerich, A. B., & Lacobucci, B. (2010). Brand attachment and brand attitude strength: Conceptual and empirical differentiation of two critical brand equity drivers. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(6), 1-17.
- Park, C. W., Eisingerich, A. B., & Park, J. W. (2013). Attachment-aversion (AA) model of customer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(2), 229–248.
- Park, C. W., & MacInnis, D. J. (2018). Introduction to the Special Issue: Brand Relationships, Emotions, and the Self. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 3(2), 123-129.
- Prentice, C., Wang, X., & Loureiro, S. M. C. (2019). The influence of brand experience and service quality on customer engagement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 50, 50–59.
- Rajaobelina, L., Tep, S.P., Arcand, M., & Ricard, L. (2021). The relationship of brand attachment and mobile banking service quality with positive word-of-mouth. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*.
- Rodriguez, C., & Rodriguez, P. (2019). Brand love matters to Millennials: the relevance of mystery, sensuality and intimacy to neo-luxury brands. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 28(7), 830–848.
- Rossiter, J. R. (2012). A new C-OAR-SE-based content-valid and predictively valid measure that distinguishes brand love from brand liking. *Marketing Letters*, 23(3), 905–916.
- Roy, P., Khandeparkar, K., & Motiano, M. (2016). A lovable personality: The effect of brand personality on brand love. *Journal of Brand Management*, 23(5), 97-113.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(2), 265-273.
- Sarkar, A. (2014). Brand love in emerging market: a qualitative investigation. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 17(4), 481-494.
- Sarkar, A., & Sreejesh, S. (2014). Examination of the roles played by brand love and jealousy in shaping customer engagement. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 23(1), 24-32.

- Sarkar, A., Ponnampalath, A., & Murthy, B. K. (2012). Understanding and measuring romantic brand love. *Journal of Customer Behaviour, 11*(4), 325-348.
- Schultz, S.E., Kleine, R. E., & Kernan, J.B. (1989). These are a few of my favorite things: toward an explication of attachment as a consumer behavior construct. *Advances in Consumer Research, 16*(1), 359-366.
- Shimp, T. A., & Madden, T. J. (1988). Consumer-Object Relations: A Conceptual Framework Based Analogously on Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love. *Advances in Consumer Research, 15*, 163- 168.
- Shimul, A. S., & Phau, I. (2018). Consumer advocacy for luxury brands. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 26*(3), 264-271.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review, 93*(2), 119–35.
- Thomson, M., MacInnis, J., & Park, C. W. (2005). The ties that bind: Measuring the strength of consumers' emotional attachments to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15*(1), 77-91.
- Tran, T. P., Furner, C. P., & Albinsson, P. A. (2021). Understanding drivers and outcomes of brand attachment in mobile branded apps. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 38*(1),113–124.
- Torres, J. L. S., Rawal, M., & Bagherzadeh, R. (2020). Role of brand attachment in customers' evaluation of service failure. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 30*(3), 377-391.
- Whang, Y-O., Allen, J., Sahoury, N., & Zhang, H. (2004). Falling in love with a product: the structure of a romantic consumer-product relationship. *Advances in Consumer Research, 31*, 320-327.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & Chernatony, L. D. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 23*(1), 33–42.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & Chernatony, L. D. (2017). Consumers' self-congruence with a "Liked" brand: Cognitive network influence and brand outcomes. *European Journal of Marketing, 51*(2), 367-390.
- Wu, J., Chen, J., & Dou, W. (2017). The Internet of Things and interaction style: the effect of smart interaction on brand attachment. *Journal of Marketing Management, 33*(1-2), 61-75.
- Yen, C. -H., Chen, C.-Y., Cheng, J.-C., & Teng, H.-Y. (2018). Brand attachment, tour Leader attachment, and Behavioral intentions of tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 42*(3), 365 –391.
- Zhou, Z., Zhang, Q., Su, C., & Zhou, N. (2012). How do brand communities generate brand relationships? Intermediate mechanisms. *Journal of Business Research, 65*(7), 890–895.

