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## ABSTRACT

**Background**  
Millennials, or Generation Y, represent one of today’s most prominent age cohorts: with their increasingly stronger purchasing power and importance in the global economic landscape, it is no wonder that marketers are striving to find new ways to appeal to the taste of this peculiar generation of consumers. Among the various modern research fields in business, one in particular is offering incredibly interesting insights to both scholars and professional marketers: the concept of nostalgia proneness in consumer behavior. While several studies examine the dynamics of this phenomenon, none of them so far examined the impact of nostalgia proneness in shopping behavior, especially examining the dynamics on a sample of Generation Y consumers.

**Purpose**  
This study was conducted in order to explore the dynamics of nostalgia proneness, linking the constructs to both desire for uniqueness and shopping behavior, using the framework provided by the Consumer Styles Inventory (Sproles & Sproles, 1990).

**Method**  
After a theoretical review on the matter, several hypotheses and a conceptual model were developed to serve as the core framework of the quantitative analysis. The data, obtained from a convenience sample of 222 respondents, were subsequently examined using several statistical techniques (ANOVA, correlation and factor analysis), with the intent to test the hypotheses and shed light on the research questions. The outcome was then presented and interpreted using both the theoretical background and other complementary relevant literature.

**Conclusion**  
The results showed a positive relationship between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness, with both variables being further connected to several shopping traits of the Generation Y consumer. The cluster and factor analysis eventually showed patterns that could be interpreted using the theory of hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

“Everything can be killed except nostalgia for the kingdom: we carry it in the color of our eyes, in every love affair, in everything that deeply torments and unties and tricks.”

Julio Cortazar

1.1 Background

Nostalgia, a word first used to describe a condition in which the yearning for something geographically or temporally distant becomes so pervasively strong that it might present pathological implications. Given this fact, it is no wonder that marketers and scholars have started to dedicate such a particular attention to this phenomenon in their branding and communication strategies, with commentators beginning to use the term “nostalgia marketing” (Fromm, 2014; Brown, 2013). Theory demonstrated that this particular kind of emotion presents a vast array of effects that brands and products can benefit from. Nostalgia seems to make us less price sensitive (Lasaleta et al., 2014), change our brand perceptions and attitudes (Chen et al., 2013) and eventually make us purchase more (Marchegiani & Phau, 2010). While long considered a mere historical thing, nostalgia has come to be theoretically recognized as a multi faceted concept that can be found independently of someone’s own past experiences (Holbrook, 1991), thus suggesting that the possibilities for uses in marketing ventures might actually be more complex and extensive than once thought.

Millennials, or Generation Y, are currently one of the hippest demographic cohorts to target for marketers (Bolton et al., 2013). “One of the largest generations in history is about to move into its prime spending years […] Millennials are poised to reshape the economy” according to Goldman Sachs’ latest report (2015). Despite the enthusiasm, several challenges are posed in the way of this potential marketing bonanza. One of the most market and information aware generations, Millennials are hard consumers: they tend not to be loyal customers, they are very price sensitive (with 57% of them comparing prices in store) and they strive to search for value beyond the power of established brands (Goldman Sachs, 2015; Sheares, 2013). In this quest to get the most money out of Millenials’ pockets (or, as some would say, “extract value from customers”), some began to notice a peculiar trend in companies: the extensive use of strategies to position products under a nostalgic light (Brown, 2013; Jansen, 2015; Parish, 2015). Given these dynamics at play, we felt the importance of a research that could shed more light over the nostalgic trend among Millennials, covering in specific the context of shopping behavior. To achieve this, a quantitative approach conducted under the framework of the Consumer Shopping Inventory (CSI) model developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) was adopted, linking also the construct of desire for uniqueness endorsed by Lynn and Harris (1997).
1.2 Research
Though research conducted on nostalgia and marketing has steadily increased, some gaps in literature can still be found. First, to our knowledge, there seems to be no example of studies predominantly focusing on Millennials, nostalgia and shopping behavior. Given the presence of evidence pointing at the potential benefits of marketing nostalgia to Generation Y (Jansen, 2015; Fromm, 2014), a research on the matter needs to be conducted. Furthermore, the peculiar characteristics of Millennials seem to highlight a set of potentially interesting collateral relationships to be investigated alongside with nostalgia. Due to their high degree of technological knowledge, their socially connected nature (Goldman Sachs, 2015), their already mentioned quest for value and identity in brands (Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2013), Millennials represent the perfect segment on which to examine the dynamics of shopping behavior in conjunction with desire for uniqueness. To achieve this, a prominent model originally developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986; 1990) was used: the Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI model). The model is noteworthy for recognizing eight different shopping behaviors that help profiling consumer behavioral patterns in the shopping environment. Stemming from these theoretical considerations, our research tries to empirically investigate the presence and significance of those eight dimensions in the phenomenon of nostalgia and desire for uniqueness among Millennials. By using a conceptual model that combines all of these dimensions, we tried to gather insights that would hopefully be useful for both marketers trying to leverage on these consumer traits and scholars interested in the field.
To guide the process, we developed a set of research questions:

1) RQ1. Confirm that nostalgia proneness is not influenced by age, gender and education levels.
2) RQ2. Assess whether a relation between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness exists
3) RQ3. Understand whether nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness have an influence on shopping behavior

1.3 Contributions & limitations
Our research’s first aim is to empirically evaluate the impact of proneness to nostalgia and desire for uniqueness in the shopping environment by using the framework provided by the CSI model. Second, we want to investigate the potential relationship already highlighted by previous researchers (Zimmer et al., 1999) between nostalgia and desire for uniqueness, examining it both conceptually and quantitatively. Lastly, the presence of proneness to nostalgia in groups differing by characteristics such as gender, age and education is analyzed in order to strengthen the theoretical knowledge on the matter (Marchegiani & Phau, 2010).

It is worth considering the set of limitations that this study might bear. First of all, given the constrained time and physical resources of the authors, procedural issues are present, primarily undermining the quality of the sampling process (a convenience sample was used) and the completeness of the study above all. The drawing of theoretically diverse elements in an attempt to better interpret the difficult matter of nostalgia measurement also constitutes a drawback for this...
empirical work. Lastly, being the scope limited to a single age cohort, obtained results might yield implications that are hard to use in broader contexts, especially age-wise.

1.4 Key definitions

- Nostalgia: individual’s yearning for the past and their longing for yesterday (Holbrook, 1993). 
  Personal Nostalgia - Stern (1992) and Havlena & Holak (1991) define personal nostalgia a feeling that is generated from a personally remembered past of an individual.

- Desire for uniqueness: a construct developed by Lynn & Harris (1997) that measures an individual’s yearning for unique experiences in consumption contexts. A person with high levels of desire for uniqueness constantly looks for non standard items and services.

- Millennials: the Millennials is a new age cohort that are otherwise recognized as Generation Y. They are individuals who were born between 1981 and 2000 (Becker, 2012; United Nations, 2010) with access to technology and high purchasing power.

- Hedonic Shopping Value: hedonic shopping value is perceived as a playful, fun and festive activity. Reflecting upon the value and emotions derived from a pleasurable shopping experience. It is perceived as an adventure and form of escapism from reality (Babin, Darden, and Griffin 1994).

- Utilitarian Shopping Value: utilitarian shopping value lies on the premise that one’s shopping task is a perceived as an “errand” or “work.” As it is a functional task which is only successful once completed (Babin, Darden, and Griffin 1994).

- CSI model: a model developed by Sproles & Kendall (1986; 1990) that aims at describing the patterns and characteristics of a consumer when shopping. It comprises eight dimensions, each representing a behavioral trait.
II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

“Only a thoughtless observer can deny that correspondences come into play between the world of modern technology and the archaic symbolic world of mythology.”

Walter Benjamin

The research commences with providing a detailed theoretical treatment of the elements later used for the process of the empirical research. After a thorough treatment of the literature of nostalgia and desire for uniqueness theory, the characteristics of our research target, the Generation Y, are presented. The chapter continues with an explanation of the hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations, also presenting the CSI model. The research questions and the hypotheses are then developed, concluding the section.

2.1 Nostalgia as a marketing phenomenon

Nostalgia in marketing literature is commonly associated with the individual’s yearning for the past and their longing for yesterday (Holbrook, 1993). It is recognized as a bittersweet or wistful emotion, mood or feeling that will create positive functions for an individual (Baker & Kennedy, 1994; Belk, 1990; Wildschut et al., 2010; Wildschut et al., 2011). Nostalgia enhances the individual’s positive attitude, self-regard, any form of social connection, and their existential meaning (Hepper et al., 2012). The individual’s nostalgic memories are those that are highly emotional, consistent and therefore idealized.

Nostalgia and its social connection with the individual and the frequency that it is involved in one’s everyday life is perceived by Belk (1990) and Stern (1992) as a preference or desire for people, places, or things (e.g., media) - this is however from a distinct time or decade in the past, even before one’s birth. These nostalgic memories do not entail one’s experiences, but create their attitude towards a past era (i.e. 1960s or 1970s) and the life, culture and conditions of the society at that time, creating an attitude in their belief that time was more superior to the present (Stern, 1992). It is important that nostalgia can be associated with any person, regardless of their gender, age, ethnicity, social class or any other form of social grouping (Greenberg, Koole & Pyszczynski 2004).

The concept of nostalgia

Consumer behavior field has started to study nostalgia in terms of what is its definition, its origin and characteristics. Its definition is bound to the psychoanalytic literature, where the term signifies a bittersweet longing for home (Holak & Havlena 1992). Nostalgia is perceived as an emotional state of an individual who yearns for an idealized or sanitized experience of an earlier time period. This is conveyed by the individual's attempt to recreate an element of the past into their present life via
reproduction of past activities or by recollection of any symbolic representations of the past in memory. However, the idealized past is one that either never existed or the individual’s idealized perception of it automatically erases any negative traces (Hirsch 1992). The individual’s uncertainty is encapsulated in Jacoby’s (1985) definition of nostalgia, defining it as an individual’s longing for a psychically utopian version of the past.

Consumer behavioral research has often implied the importance of nostalgic appeals for highly effective and persuasive marketing and advertising techniques (Baker & Kennedy 1994; Havlena & Holak 1991; Muehling & Sprott 2004; Pascal, Sprott, & Muehling, 2002). It is often referenced in marketing as “a preference (general liking, positive attitude, or favorable affect) toward objects (people, places, or things) that were more common (popular, fashionable, or widely circulated) when one was younger (in early adulthood, in adolescence, in childhood, or even before birth)” (Holbrook & Schindler, 1991, p. 330). Nostalgia has been exhibited as a tool to significantly influence many consumer reactions essential to marketing and advertising. These include brand loyalty and meaning, self-concept, the human senses, affecting their attitude formation, their cognition and memory process, the consumer’s preferences, emotions, collective memory and literary criticism (Muehling & Sprott, 2004; Naughton & Vlasic, 1998). Nostalgia also has been found to affect people regardless of their gender, age, ethnicity, or any other demographic variables (Greenberg et al., 2004).

Stern (1992) implies that the nostalgic appeals in marketing and advertising trigger into the consumer’s array of memories by reviving products, their packages and promotions associated with the past. Advertisers claim effective use of nostalgia helps to capitalize on the brand equity possessed via its recycled advertising (Winters, 1990). This concept allows the consumers to recreate the past through the nostalgic consumption despite that they cannot literally return to the past.

Nostalgia is connected with brand equity, and in particular brand heritage. A brand’s heritage tells a sublime tale (Merchant & Rose, 2013), bearing great importance for building the image of corporate products as described by Aaker (2004), who cited Coca Cola, Budweiser and Ivory as examples of companies that often leverage on brand heritage to help bolster their products. This is important for brands as consumers often associate a brand’s longevity and its stability with the brand’s heritage (Urde, Greyser, & Balmer, 2007). Therefore, it appears that to strengthen the brand it is instrumental to evoke its heritage (George, 2004) and brand personality (Keller & Richey, 2006). Nostalgic advertising creates the reassurance for consumers by providing a sense of security (Boyle, 2009). These ads can instigate the consumer’s desire for their lived past (referred as personal nostalgia) (Sullivan, 2009) or elicit emotional feelings for a past era before the consumer’s birth (historical nostalgia). There are numerous brand service or product examples that utilize the latter nostalgia (historical), such as Levi’s jeans, Total cereal, and Volkswagen (Elliott, 2002 & Horovitz, 2011).

A nostalgic liking may be elicited by various elements such as the individual’s liking towards music, movies or events perceived as unique or peoch making, and photographs. Among the commercial elements it entails advertisements, retailing, clothing, brand heritage, people’s appearance, gifts or furniture. “Close others” (including family members, friends, partners), political ambiance or any

Debatably there are marketers and researchers who believe that a brand’s ability to capitalize on this nostalgic phenomenon is only short-lived. The "fin de siecle effect" (Stern, 1992, p. 12) suggested that as the twenty-first century approached it was not only the end of a century and a millennium, but it was ideal situation to capitalize by media as a nostalgic theme to attract and satisfy the public's need for continuity. This "end of the century" effect ascertains the idea that cultural anxiety exists when a century comes to an end. Hence, naturally a century is metaphorically dying, society feel the nostalgic need for the past and so find emotional support and security (Stern, 1992). This concept indicates that nostalgia is a short-lived infatuation. However, some authors believe there is a segment of consumers who are positively inclined toward the historical branding strategies. Therefore, there are individuals for whom these nostalgic strategies create an enduring appeal that is beyond the end of a century or millennium. Stern (1992) suggests that effective exploration and usage of nostalgia in advertising is likely to contribute to a more effective consumer response and a better greater understanding of the advertising stimuli. In addition, marketers can thereby potentially use this collation of information for further consumer segmentation strategies including their tastes (Holbrook, 1993). The two concepts of nostalgia (personal and historical) are identified in greater detail below. Many authors perceive personal nostalgia with autobiographical memory or the individual’s self-referencing/personal connections (Brewer, 1986; Conway & Fthenaki, 2000; Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000; Neisser, 1988; Rubin, 1986; Sheen et al., 2001; Tulving, 1972, 1984). Therefore, it is identified as the nostalgia type that relates to “the way I was” (Stern, 1992).

Whereas, historical nostalgia is perceived as an individual’s collective memory and so it is generated from a time they did not experience directly themselves, a time before they were born (Halbwachs, 1950, 1992; Pennebaker et al., 1997; Zelizer, 2008). Therefore it is discussed as the nostalgia type referring to “the way things used to be” (Stern, 1992).

**Personal Nostalgia**

Personal nostalgia for the individual encompasses a longing for their lived past (Natterer, 2014). Stern (1992) notes that personal nostalgia provides the individual an opportunity to re-shape incidents and relationships that are stored in their memory, thus experiencing pleasure in the recollection of memory, even if they were not pleasurable experiences at the time they were experienced. In accordance with other nostalgia researchers, the main purpose of this “selective” memory is to help create and sustain an individual’s identity. Hence, help to enhance one’s positive perception of oneself (Baker & Kennedy, 1994; Belk, 1991; Davis, 1979). Holak and Havlena (1992), for example, discovered that music, movies, events or family members are some of the few factors that evoke nostalgic reflections among individuals. Stern (1992) recognizes that personal nostalgia allows the individual to re-shape incidents and relationships stored in their memory to ensure they only yield pleasure when recollected, despite if they were not actually pleasurable when they were experienced. Nostalgia researchers argue that the purpose of this “selective” memory is to help
enhance and/or maintain one’s individuality. Thereby, it elevates one’s positive perception of oneself (Baker & Kennedy, 1994; Belk, 1991; Davis, 1979). Muehling and Sprott (2004) hypothesized in their study that memories of an individual’s personally experienced event alike to those that are anticipated under personal nostalgia conditions can produce higher levels of positive affect. The scholars claimed that due to the self-referencing nature of personal nostalgic thoughts they will be more salient and positive. Hence, they are more effective in generating favorable liking towards either the advertisement or advertised brand. As part of their study; Muehling and Sprott (2004) collated individuals’ cognitive responses that were exposed to either a nostalgic or non-nostalgic advertisement. It is worth to mention that the results identified there was a greater number of positive nostalgic thoughts that were generated via a nostalgia condition than via a non-nostalgia condition.

**Historical Nostalgia**

The nostalgic appeal is not limited to the persons who have experienced either that time period, product or lived through the experience being depicted (Marchegiani & Phau, 2013). In business it is one of the key elements of historical nostalgia that aims to attract the younger consumers via highlighting the nostalgic appeal from times they did not experience directly. Beard (2009) cites William Higham (the founder of UK Next Big Thing and a futurologist), who stated the wish for heritage-inspired items is conveyed by Gen Y, those who have been brought up with technology surrounding them but now they are interested in manufacturing of other products and how things were done before. Real (personal) nostalgia refers to an individual’s longing for a realized and lived past, whereas another form of nostalgia refers to an individual’s yearning for an indirectly experienced past. This latter form of nostalgia is also referred to by Stern (1992) and others as “historical” nostalgia, defining the past as a time before the individual was born.

Historical nostalgia, examines the individual by emotionally connecting them to associations of the past by creating a fantasy about experiences and associations from past eras they have not lived (Stern, 1992). Other research studies create a link between historical nostalgia and creating an individual’s positive attitude towards an advisement and brand (Marchegiani & Phau, 2011; Muehling, 2011). Whereas, Rose and Wood (2005) allude to fantasy elements in historical nostalgia. Previous studies have identified how historical nostalgia can positively influence the purchase of an array of products like automobiles (Leigh, Peters & Shelton, 2006), cigarettes (Holak, Matveev & Havlena, 2008), beverages, sneakers & apparel (Horovitz, 2011). Companies frequently attempt to create historical nostalgia through advertising across a range of products, some of these include alcoholic beverages (Jack Daniel’s), non-alcoholic beverages (Mountain Dew) and cars (Chrysler, Chevrolet). The concept is that historical nostalgia in fact helps to build, detail, and thus reinforce the heritage of the advertised brand in the eye of the consumer. Study conducted by Merchant and Rose (2013) results showed that consumer emotions and perceptions of brand heritage can be related to ad-evoked historical nostalgia. An example is from the response of one consumer (Merchant & Rose, 2013) that states that “watching the Jack Daniel’s ad, it felt nice. I felt a connection with Jack’s time period, it felt like a connection with something that doesn’t exist now...its an all American brand (Dave, 29 years old,)” (p. 2622). This form of historical nostalgia is integrated into historical branding
strategies that create a foundation for newly launched products by supporting them with a background or heritage of several decades. This helps them to both establish a sense of authenticity and credibility in the market (Zimmer, Little & Griffiths, 1999). Nostalgic branding strategies help to evoke those nostalgic feelings and memories in consumers via the use of familiar associations and old images attached to the new product. The advertising created through historical nostalgia creates a positive experience for the individual and therefore enhances a consumer's comprehension and their understanding of the brand's message, which leads to enhancing their emotional attachment to the brand. Due to the multitude of conceptual definitions given to the phenomenon of nostalgia, we provided a theoretical summary retrievable in table 1.

Table 1: nostalgia definitions in literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belk</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>&quot;A wistful mood that may be prompted by an object, a scene, a smell, or a strain of music.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollrenk &amp; Schindler</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>&quot;A preference (general liking, positive attitude, or favorable affect) toward objects (people, places, or things) that were more common (popular, fashionable, or widely circulated) when one was younger (in early adulthood, in adolescence, in childhood, or even before birth).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holak &amp; Hardina</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>&quot;Nostalgia as an emotion contains both pleasant and unpleasant components&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>&quot;An emotional state in which an individual yearns for an idealized or sanitized version of an earlier time period.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; Kennedy</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>&quot;Nostalgia will be defined as a sentimental or bittersweet yearning for an experience, product, or service from the past&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divard &amp; Robert-Demontrond</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>&quot;Nostalgia is a bittersweet affective reaction possibly associated with a cognitive activity. It is felt by an individual when an external or internal stimulus has the effect of transposing him/her into a period or event from an idealized past that is or is not part of the individual’s past.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muehling &amp; Sprott</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>&quot;Advertisements containing visual or verbal nostalgic cues are capable of evoking nostalgic thoughts in individuals, that these thoughts will be salient and positively valenced.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettleton &amp; Lovell</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Adrian Troy, head of marketing, Barr Soft Drinks, AG Barr &quot;part of the interest in nostalgia brands is being driven from this base of positive past experiences and associations. &quot;In a world of increasing complexity, I also think that there is a desire for simpler times with people looking for the safety and comfort to be found in the past.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildichut, Sedikides, Routledge, Arndt, &amp; Cordaro</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>&quot;We propose that nostalgia, too, can serve as an indirect strategy to bolster social connectedness.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>&quot;15 years ago, when I first started writing about retromarketing, I reckoned the &quot;nostalgia boom&quot; was a passing fad. I distinctly remember thinking that it would be all over bar the shouting before I managed to publish a few papers on the phenomenon... How wrong can you be? Because here we are, well into the second decade of the twenty-first century and retromania is still going strong...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We tried to provide for a thorough treatment on the literature regarding nostalgia, its heritage and utilization in a marketing context as well as how it can be an influential factor in one’s shopping behavior. As we theorized an important link between nostalgia and desire for uniqueness, it is imperative to gauge an understanding of the element of uniqueness and how it interlinks with the above sub chapter of nostalgia, especially considering the implications for the shopping motivations of the Generation Y age cohort.

2.2 Desire for uniqueness
The theory of uniqueness by Snyder and Fromkin (1980) identifies how people would react both emotionally and via their reactions to information about how similar they may be perceived to others. Dependent of the level of either similarity or dissimilarity, they perceive it to be objectionable, thus seek to find ways to be moderately dissimilar to others (Lynn & Harris, 1997). However, ways to become distinct vary between person to person. There are some who practice the desire to be unique via their personal characteristics and others who seek uniqueness via consumption. Tian et al. (2001) defines the need to be unique as “the trait of pursuing differentness relative to others through the acquisition, utilization and disposition of consumer goods for the purpose of developing and enhancing one’s social and self-image” (p. 52). The level of one’s uniqueness in society is determined by their personal perception of how unique they view themselves in comparison to others in their societal circle (Jordan & Simpson, 2006). Thus, it is identified by Khuong and Tran (2015) that the consumer’s need for uniqueness is interlinked with products that illustrate a symbolic meaning of supplementing one’s self and social image as a form to express their uniqueness, with advertising being one of the marketing mechanisms that commonly utilize the need for uniqueness to attract consumers.

An example of an advertisement in Fortune magazine follows: “at 650 dollars a bottle, not many people have the opportunity to experience the exceedingly rare The Glenlivet’s 21 year-old single malt Scotch” (Lynn & Harris, 1997, p. 1861). This type of advertisement is one of many that marketers use to appeal to the consumers motive to be unique. The theme of the advertising can vary from prestige pricing, product differentiation or the unique and exclusivity of its distribution (Lynn & Harris, 1997). The study of the scholars found that the consumer’s desire to be innovative is closely linked to their desire to be unique, therefore, the latter can be an effective marketing tool to attract consumers to new products. However, it is important to understand that this element of uniqueness that consumers desire via product purchase is constrained by their need to be socially affiliated and approved as well. Thus, it is imperative that the uniqueness theory implemented in product purchases helps address this societal element to ensure consumers do not feel isolated from society or create any form of disapproval (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980).

It is argued that personal possessions are perceived as an extension of oneself (Belk, 1989; James, 1890), thus to allow one to distinguish from others is by owning unique consumer products (Fromkin, 1971; Snyder, 1992). Consumers can benefit from obtaining products that are scarce, unpopular or new to help supplement their expression of self-uniqueness. A study by Burns and
Warren (1995) discovers that consumers make purchases of fashionable clothing to enhance their level of uniqueness. Other ways to pursue this element of self-uniqueness is finding smaller, less popular stores or customizing products that are more common (Lynn & Harris 1997). As the choice of stores is vast and product availability escalates with time, one deciding factor of where to shop is the search and need for uniqueness. Products such as clothing or music records are perceived to be more attractive if found with elements of scarcity (Brehm et al., 1966; Szybillo, 1973, 1975).

Further studies on vintage clothing and contemporary consumption showed that individuality was a key element for consumers to purchase vintage clothing (Gladigau, 2008). This peculiarity represents a greater chance for consumers to be distinct, amplifying their personal uniqueness more than in the case of mainstream fashion. Thus consumers with stronger desire to be unique make more non-traditional choices by purchasing from secondhand stores as opposed to popular shopping malls (Guiot & Roux, 2008, 2010). Overall, these forms of shopping behavior identify the consumers need to be unique which is interlinked with nostalgia via their desire to shop for products that are scarce or vintage. The element of nostalgia is closely associated with vintage clothing purchases and uniqueness as nostalgic consumers also have a preference towards objects (people, places or things) that were from the past (Holbrook & Schindler, 1991) thus making them unique.

Having gained a sound understanding of the fundamental elements of nostalgia and desire for uniqueness, we now progress by discussing the relevant literature regarding the characteristics of the specific age cohort in question: the Millennials. The following sub chapter will define who the Millennials are and how nostalgia and desire for uniqueness fit into their lifestyle. This is imperative as the focal aim of the research is to uncover how nostalgia and uniqueness can be utilized as determinants of shopping behavior among this specific age group.

2.3 Specific age cohort: the Millennials

Millennials are distinguished as homogenous segments, being individuals who are of a distinct age cohort and thus born within a specific time period, sharing similar experiences and key moments during their childhood (Meredith & Schewe, 1994). They subsequently tend to display similar values, views, and preferences. It is essential for companies to understand and thus consider their consumer behavior during their marketing practices (Parment, 2012; Twenge & Campbell, 2008). In particular, there is evidence claiming how this age cohort is incredibly impacting today’s world and market (Bolton et al., 2013). More in specific, Millennials, or Generation Y, are individuals who were born between 1981 and 2000 (Becker, 2012; United Nations, 2010). Many commentators noted how this group of young consumers has been greatly affected and molded by an array of environmental and societal conditions during its childhood (Cone Communications, 2013; Parment, 2012; United Nations, 2010; Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2013).

It is worth to consider how, among the many environmental conditions that helped shaping the Millenial behavior, an ever-increasing product choice and an incredibly crowded consumption space represent key aspects of Generation Y’s lives (Parment, 2012). Arguably, this overchoice in the market place does not threaten them, but on the contrary Millennials seem to be more information
receptive than other age cohorts, also being more fond of the abundance of choice available to them (Cone Communications, 2013). Considering how much Millennials constantly strive for making fast and informed decisions that lead to satisfactory outcomes, marketers appear to be particularly challenged by this new generation, peculiar in terms of mindset and characteristics (Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2013).

In addition to that, it is recognized that Millennials prefer the element of convenience in their daily life and thus they prefer to put in as little effort as necessary to attain any of their objectives (Parment, 2012; Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2013). However, this does not excuse the idea that they often use an interrogative-based decision-making approach to their purchases as they are fully aware of the brand offerings and thereby they are sure to investigate between distinct cues to help lead to a sound purchase decision (Viswanathan & Jain, 2013). However, being brought up in this highly competitive society today, with focus on one's success, the Millennials are keen to ensure they position themselves as being special, unique or raising their opinions (Van den Bergh & Behrer, 2013). To support their desire to be unique it can be argued they strive to make purchases that help them feel more unique and peculiar in society.

Howe & Strauss (2009) argued how every cohort and generation possesses an intrinsic important history and perceived collective biography. This trait connects to the already developed concept of historical nostalgia, and nostalgia proneness in general. Brown et al. (2003) also recognize the existence of this dynamic, noting how specific generations might possess both inner nostalgic elements and uniqueness seeking behaviors, with both elements present in a collective manner.

This nostalgic and uniqueness components seem to represent potentially useful tools for marketers interested in Millennials. As the Generation Y consumers have a high purchasing power and also hold strong influence upon the other generations, the endeavor of trying to appeal to them also in the shopping context is crucial (Göschel, 2013; Maggioni et al., 2013). This reinforces the need to assess whether less common behavioral traits, such as nostalgia and desire for uniqueness, represent viable strategies for marketers to target the Millennial individual.

These latter consideration, alongside with the previous ones, highlight that the analyzed age cohort in question can be an influencing factor for the marketing strategies that businesses may conceptualize to enhance their shopping motivations. Following this reasoning, we feel the importance to proceed in the next chapter in order to better understand the motivations of customers in the shopping scenario. This is why we present a prominent theory to interpret these dynamics: the hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivation theory. In addition to that, we employ the insights provided by the CSI model, in order to better identify useful measures to uncover the decision-making styles of consumers. The rationale of this is to support our empirical research by gaining a better understanding of nostalgia, uniqueness and these shopping motivations, evaluating how they all interlink as marketing mechanisms to attract the Millennials age cohort.
2.4 Shopping motivations

Prior research conducted on shopping has often focused upon the utilitarian aspects revolved around one’s shopping experience. These are often perceived as task-related and thus rational (Batra & Ahtola, 1991). These experiences help accomplish one’s product acquisition “mission” (Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994). This dimension is then completed with the hedonic one. As researchers in fact started to contemplate more the worth of shopping’s hedonic aspects such as entertainment and emotional elements, a great scientific interest in this area of research has developed over the last two decades (Babin et al., 1994; Wakefield & Baker, 1998; Carpenter et al., 2005; Khuong & Tran, 2015). Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) describe hedonic consumption as facets of one’s behavior which pertain to the emotive, fantasy and multisensory elements of consumption. Thus, they argue that these elements suggest that one’s consumption is led by the fun element they have in consuming the product. Therefore, their criterion for “victory” is exquisite by nature.

The main comparison made by Babin et al. (1994) between task oriented utilitarian and hedonic shopping motives is the task element involved, where the task in hedonic motives is experiencing amusement, fun, and fantasy and creating sensory stimuli. Their research depicted the sense of escapism consumers experience during their shopping, claiming how the shopping experience represents an adventure in which purchasing the intended item is not the primary goal (Babin et al. 1994). This also resembles closely to the concept of historical nostalgia, creating the element of fantasy by illustrating an emotional attachment to the past (Stern, 1992). The connection between hedonic shopping motivations and historical nostalgia exemplifies how these emotional constructs can lead to positive influence on purchase behavior as identified in the historical nostalgia sub chapter. Moreover, another study by Triantafillidou and Siomkos (2014) highlights the relation between hedonic shopping behavior dimensions and nostalgia proneness. Thus the consumer’s fantasies and imaginations in their shopping experience might yield room for nostalgic influence. Conclusively, Triantafillidou and Siomkos (2014) depict that regardless of the nature of nostalgia being pleasurable, imaginative and an attentive remembrance experience of the past in most situations is also hedonic in nature.

Another interesting trait of shopping behavior can be traced in the work of Tauber (1972), who identified the importance of the social element (i.e., social experiences, communication, and attractiveness amongst peer group, creating a status or authority that arguably helps identify them as unique or different). The scholar noted two trends: one where shopping is an experience that consumers conduct when they feel the need for specific item and, on the contrary, another one where they conduct the experience in the need for attention, desire to impress their peers or use this opportunity to socialize (Tauber, 1972). This element of self need and attention interlinks closely with the idea of creating “selective” nostalgic memory to help sustain one’s individual self-identity and thus enhance their positive perception of themselves (Baker & Kennedy, 1994; Belk, 1991; Davis, 1979). It also ties with the unique theory defined by Tian et al. (2001) illustrating one’s need to be unique via the nature of their consumed goods to help sustain and improve a social self-image.
In regards to online shopping, Brown et al. (2003) identified how companies may benefit from strategies that aim at leveraging both on a consumer’s uniqueness desirability and nostalgia proneness. In the study, the scholars stressed on the importance of employing these traits in marketing strategies for online communities, where word of mouth and niche campaigns appeared to yield great results. The research concludes with recommendations suggesting to engage nostalgia shoppers by clever use of historic background illustrated with new products and brands which help sustain an element of authenticity for the consumer, important dimension of the uniqueness seeking customer.

More specific in the context of shopping motivations, Westbrook and Black (1985) recognized that some of these motivations are more utilitarian than others in nature despite the general belief that all motivations consist of both elements. While some shoppers enter the marketplace for the mere purpose of fulfilling their shopping requirements, a large number of customers take into account various emotions in the store, consequently influencing the purchase decision (Dawson et al., 1990). The researchers claim that those customers influenced by more hedonic elements consider the store attributes such as in-store promotions and visual merchandise to help process their decision-making. These hedonic elements act as the same tool nostalgia plays in significantly influencing the consumer’s reaction towards marketing and advertising in-store. These include the strategies such as brand loyalty and self-concept that influence attitude, preferences, emotions and memory process (Muehling & Sprott, 2004; Naughton & Vlasic, 1998). Such as in Fischer and Arnold’s study consumers find themselves playing the role of a child, enjoying the experience of toy shopping “because of the little kid in me” (1990, p. 334). This idea of creating a fantasy or escapism for the consumer can also be identified from the means of utilizing nostalgic approaches in-store. Holbrook and Schindler (1991) identified in their study that marketing is referenced as a predilection toward objects that were more common in an individual’s past experience. Stern (1992) also implied how nostalgic appeals in marketing and advertising help to trigger the consumer’s array of memories by reviving packages and products associated with the past, similar to the appeals of hedonic values. Furthermore, scholars highlighted interesting linkages with a consumer’s desire for uniqueness, as a dimension closely reflecting the one of the hedonic purchase (Khuong & Tran, 2015).

The CSI approach

Another prominent approach to shopping motivations is brought by the measurement of consumer decision-making styles of Sproles and Sproles (1990). This model also encompasses the preliminary work conducted on the mental orientation that characterizes the customers’ approach in making consumption choices, as defined by Sproles and Kendall (1986). Notably, the model stemmed from a great variety of literature on the matter. These include the consumer typology approach, the lifestyle approach and finally the consumer characteristics approach (e.g. Bettman, 1979; Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Maynes, 1976; Miller, 1981; Sproles, 1984; Wells, 1974; Westbrook & Black, 1985). Using these as their foundation, Sproles and Kendall employed an analytical validation of their CSI, resulting in eight measures of decision-making patterns listed below. As Sproles and Sproles describe them:
1) “Perfectionist/High Quality Conscious: the degree to which a consumer searches carefully and systematically for the best quality in products.

2) Brand Consciousness/Price Equals Quality: a consumer’s orientation toward buying the more expensive, well-known national brands.

3) Novelty and Fashion Conscious: consumers who appear to like new and innovative products and gain excitement from seeking out new things.

4) Recreational and Shopping Conscious: the extent to which a consumer finds shopping a pleasant activity and shops just for the fun of it.

5) Price Conscious/Value for the Money: a consumer with a particularly high consciousness of sale prices and lower prices in general.

6) Impulsiveness/Careless: one who tends to buy on the spur of the moment and to appear unconcerned about how much he or she spends (or getting “best buys”).

7) Confused by Overchoice: a person perceiving too many brands and stores from which to choose and who likely experiences information overload in the market.

8) Habitual/Brand Loyal: a characteristic indicating a consumer who repetitively chooses the same favorite brands and stores” (1990, p. 137).

The development of the CSI model by Sproles (1985) and Sproles and Kendall (1986) was further exercised by many scholars in the decades ahead. According to one of the more recent scholars, Bakewell and Mitchell (2003) the CSI represents a systematic attempt in developing a robust methodology for measuring consumers’ shopping orientations and behaviors. It is worth to mention how in Bakewell and Mitchell’s study, the model is used to examine Generation Y consumers’ shopping styles. In addition to that, the model proved its validity across different cultures, broader demographic cohorts and other various marketing contexts (McDonald, 1993; Wickliffe, 2004; Tarnanidis, 2015). Overall, this previous literature on the CSI signifies the usefulness of the model even today. This is the reason why we used the CSI model as the core measurement of shopping motivations in our empirical research in connection with nostalgia and desire for uniqueness.

To summarize, in this sub chapter we detailed the background on the types of shopping motivations and their link with both nostalgia and the desire for uniqueness. In parallel to this, we also offered a treatment of the CSI model and its measures, arguing for the importance in our empirical research. Given the thorough treatment of the theoretical elements, we can now progress to the illustration of the conceptual model we developed, theorizing the links between all the marketing constructs investigated in this study.

2.5 Conceptual model and hypotheses

In figure 1 it is possible to retrieve the conceptual model that we developed out of the theoretical discussion in the previous sub chapters to support our study with a visual aid of how the literature review and concepts are intertwined.

Consequently, we developed a set of hypotheses below to guide our research. In table 2 it is possible to retrieve the summary of our research outline.

14
To investigate the dynamics of nostalgia proneness, we first investigated how nostalgia proneness represents a common phenomenon, regardless of gender, age, social class or other forms of social grouping (Greenberg et al., 2004). This resulted in hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c:

- **H.1a.** No significant differences of nostalgia proneness are present across different gender groups among Millennials.
- **H.1b.** No significant differences of nostalgia proneness are present across different age groups among Millennials.
- **H.1c.** No significant differences of nostalgia proneness are present across different education levels among Millennials.

To investigate the relation between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness (Zimmer et al., 1999) we developed the following hypothesis:

- **H.2.** Nostalgia proneness and need for uniqueness present a positive correlation among Millennials.

To research the link between the shopping motivations and nostalgia (Babin et al., 1994), we developed this hypothesis:

- **H.3.** Nostalgia proneness has a positive influence on one or more dimensions of shopping behavior.

To identify the link between the desire for uniqueness theory and consumers purchase decision-making process (Tauber, 1972) we composed the below hypothesis:

- **H.4.** Need for uniqueness has a positive influence on one or more dimensions of shopping behavior.
Table 2: research questions and hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To confirm that proneness to nostalgia is not affected by demographic variables</td>
<td>$H.1a$ No nostalgia differences across genders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H.1b$ No nostalgia differences across age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H.1c$ No nostalgia differences across education levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To investigate the connections between need for uniqueness and nostalgia</td>
<td>$H.2$ Nostalgia is positively correlated with desire for uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To research the impact of nostalgia proneness on shopping behavior</td>
<td>$H.3$ Nostalgia is correlated with certain CSI profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To research the impact of need for uniqueness on shopping behavior</td>
<td>$H.4$ Uniqueness is correlated with certain CSI profiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above set of research questions and hypotheses, developed from the literature review and theorizing the linkages proposed in the conceptual map (figure 1), provided us with the right framework to proceed in the empirical analysis.

2.6 Summary

In summary, the above chapter strived to provide a detailed theoretical background, reviewing the relevant literature in order to lay the foundation for the actual empirical research to come. As a development from the background provided, we have then presented the research questions and the hypotheses to investigate the dynamics of nostalgia proneness, the relationship of it with desire for uniqueness and the linkages with shopping behavior among Millennials. We now proceed by discussing in depth the method of our research.
III. METHODOLOGY

“I prefer the mystic clouds of nostalgia to the real thing, to be honest.”

Robert Wyatt

This section provides a detailed discussion of the chosen methodological approach, alongside with a treatment of the procedural aspects of our research. This comprises an examination of the research philosophy, the research approach, data collection, as well as both the research design and method. The chapter ends with a discussion on the overall quality of the conducted study.

3.1 Research philosophy & approach
Saunders et al. (2009) describe research philosophy as both the development and nature of knowledge. It is the means for developing knowledge in any particular field of work, regardless of how modest it may be. The assumptions formed via this method are the basis of the researcher’s view of the world. Thus these underpin the foundation of the research strategy and the most appropriate methodology applicable. Johnson and Clark (2006) reiterate the importance of understanding the philosophical commitments formed via the research strategy as it creates a significant impact on the study at hand.

As stated by Saunders et al. (2009), four different formations of the research philosophy can be identified: these are positivism, interpretivism, pragmatism and realism. A researcher who relies on the resources embraces the positivism philosophy for the development of knowledge with a philosophical stance on the study. The researcher who primarily conducts their study on the feelings element and depicts the importance to distinguish differences between the roles humans enact in society ideally adopts the interpretivist philosophy. With the pragmatist philosophy, the research stresses on the importance of thoroughly determining the ontological, epistemological and axiological aspects of the study. Finally, research conducted under realist philosophy encompasses the importance in linking absolute truth and perceived reality, based on the concept that “what the senses show us as reality is the truth: that objects have an existence independent of the human mind” (Saunders et al., 2009, p.114).

This research is conducted under positivist philosophy. It is essential to use the positivism philosophy as it allows the examination of existing theories and facts to explain one’s behavior and lead to credible data (Veal, 2006). However, elements of interpretivist philosophy are also essential. As the social world of management and business is too diverse and multi-faceted to be described in theories and strict rules, there are consequently different truths and relative meanings and interpretations of an occurrence (Johnson & Christensen, 2010). Thus, following this premise, the researcher’s duty is to make sense of collected data being aware of the uncountable variables that
influence the study and are in turn influenced back by it. Thus considering these several facets of reality and its facts it makes it unlikely to take a totally positive approach on the matter (Saunders, 2003). However, the positivism philosophy adapted to the study is firmly linked to the research approach addressed below.

The research approach is dependent upon the purpose of the literature within the study (Saunders et al., 2009). There are three types of research approaches that can be utilized: deductive, inductive or abductive. The deductive approach is based on the concept of applying a deductive approach where the literature helps to identify any theories and ideas that will be used to test the data. Therefore, a development of either theoretical or conceptual framework is a necessity to test the data collated. On the other hand Saunders et al. (2009) identify the inductive approach as a formation that is conceptualized by the idea of exploring the data collated and thus developing theories from the results and relating them to the literature.

The nature of this study implies an abductive kind of approach in which, even with the presence of an already formulated theory, the premises of it render a completely deductive approach difficult to sustain (Saunders et al., 2009). Thus, despite the several studies highlighted in the theoretical background on nostalgia, there is little if any study formulated to examine the connection between nostalgia and shopping motivations. By keeping this into consideration, we leave room for a more flexible interpretation of the results that examine if the hypotheses are rejected or accepted (Malhotra, Birks, & Wills, 2012). In addition to this, considerations are necessary regarding the limitations posed by the empirical application of a complex theoretical review.

It is essential to use a collaboration of both positivism philosophy and an abductive kind of approach (sustaining elements of deductive approach) to help form the research design of the study. The following paragraph leads to the most appropriate method relevant to the previously discussed direction of philosophy and approach for the study.

3.2. Data collection method
There are two definitive methods of data collection; these are primary and secondary data (Saunders et al., 2009). Primary data is formulated on the basis of collecting new data that is originated by the researchers for their study’s unique purpose (Malhotra et al., 2012). On the contrary secondary data is based on the collection of previously formulated measurements (Saunders et al., 2009). This is data that is readily available, such as corporate data, articles, books, government-sourced secondary data etc.

The study consists of a strong foundation of existing literature supporting elements of nostalgia, desire for uniqueness as well as both hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations. There are also various theories conceptualized to support the study at hand; thus giving a better overview of the topic (Adams & Brace, 2006). This alongside with the conceptual model is created as the means for forming the hypotheses. However, the core dimension of our study implies the collection and use of primary data, which is the representative of the deductive approach previously addressed. This is vital
as there is minimal research conducted to test the connections among the considered variables at play. Thus this study generated primary data and a review of existing theories. Conclusively, the importance of utilizing both elements of data collection was crucial for the production of our work. This is why, first the theoretical background was formulated to provide a solid foundation and background of the topic, while later the collection primary data was undertaken to reveal new information on the topic at hand. Having explicated this, we present the research design in the following subchapter, a critical element for the success of the project (Malhotra et al., 2012).

3.3 Research design

There are various research designs that can be utilized, each naturally having its own pros and cons. The aim is to establish the most appropriate research design to ensure the optimum results are delivered. Two major types of design forms are exploratory and conclusive (Saunders et al, 2009). The exploratory research design entails a more non-standardized approach, usually being of qualitative type (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). The second approach, the conclusive design, helps to test the hypotheses set and examine relationships formed, if any (Malhotra, 2012). It often consists of a quantitative approach, bearing a type of research which is more formal and structured. Primarily, due to the nature of how the research we conducted, it is important that the conclusive approach design is considered. The study at hand relies highly upon a quantitative method with a formal and structured survey format that tested hypotheses set (table 2). It aimed at measuring the relationships between nostalgia proneness, desire for uniqueness and shopping behavior variables via the use of theoretically discussed, analyzed and confirmed scales. However, due to the conceptual nature of our research that endeavored on studying fields that have not been thoroughly investigated yet (especially considering H.4), we felt that our study also entailed elements of exploratory nature. One of the focal points of our research is to provide a foundation for further studies, leaving considerable room for debate. In addition to that, the factor and cluster analysis performed in this study were primarily intended for preliminary interpretation of the observed patterns rather than a highly generalizable output.

Nevertheless, given the several conclusive aspects of this research design, we feel the need to further understand the implications of this methodological approach. Conclusive researches, in fact, can be descriptive or causal (Malhotra et al., 2012). A descriptive design was entailed by the characteristics of our research questions and due to the fact that no causality was implied in them. This led us to target a larger sample and the use of a questionnaire to acquire data instead of an experiment (Malhotra et al., 2012). Moreover, two sub categories of the descriptive design are noticeable: longitudinal and cross-sectional (Malhotra et al., 2012). The longitudinal design approach involves a fixed sample of respondents, assessed by repeated measurements. On the other hand the cross-sectional design collates information from a sample that is measured only once. As explained by Malhotra et al. (2012), the latter is the most frequent design applied in marketing research. This is further categorized into single cross-sectional and multi cross-sectional. As its name suggests, multi cross-sectional allows multiple samples of participants but the data is only extracted once. The single cross-sectional design instead entails one sample of participants from the target group, with data
being obtained from them only once. With these considerations at hand, we adopted a single cross-sectional study.

In conclusion the most appropriate research design for this study was mainly conclusive, but bearing also elements of exploratory. Furthermore, the descriptive approach was the chosen type. Finally, having considered the research questions and the procedural limitation, we collected data via a sample of participants, under a single cross-sectional method. With these considerations in mind, we present the next section where a treatment of the employed research method is retrievable.

3.4 Research Method
Being our research conclusive and quantitative, the data gathering process was conducted via the use of a self-completion online questionnaire. Qualtrics’ Research Suite online platform was used to develop the questionnaire and to collect the responses. The research tool consisted of all the variables implied in the conceptual map (figure 1) with an additional measurement on a set of demographic variables. It is worth to mention that we adopted a filter in the questionnaire to make the response valid only for Millenial respondents (birth date between 1981 and 2000). To ensure a correct administration of the research, confidentiality and anonymity were granted to all the set of respondents. On the other hand, Qualtrics’ force response option were be enabled to minimize the risk of having large numbers of incomplete, unusable responses. Moreover, given the inherent risk of incompleteness of response, a threshold of 75% of questionnaire completion was set to render the entry valid. The rationale for this was to have a more usable, cleaner dataset to employ in the analysis stage.

It is possible to retrieve the elements of the questionnaire in table 3. The scales used to measure nostalgia were the Holbrook’s Nostalgia Scale (1994) and the Southampton Nostalgia Scale, a 7-item scale that were used to provide a double measure on the matter of nostalgia (Barrett et al., 2010). As identified by Hallegatte and Marticotte (2014), the most profoundly used scale for nostalgia proneness measurement in marketing research is currently the Holbrook’s Nostalgia Scale (1994). Holbrook was among the first scholars to study the phenomenon in marketing fields. This endeavor resulted in a scale developed to measure a respondent’s preference for the past, especially in contrast with the present and future period (Holbrook & Schindler, 1991). The concept of nostalgia proneness rapidly developed into the ideology of one’s attitude towards the past (Holbrook & Schindler, 1994).

An alternative approach on the matter is represented by the Southampton Nostalgia Scale (SNS), consisting of a nostalgia proneness measure that is considerably satisfactory in terms of internal validity (Barrett et al. 2010; Juhl et al. 2010; Routledge et al. 2008). Despite the presence of other nostalgic proneness scales, the SNS represent an interesting alternative to Holbrook’s also due to its more direct linkage to the emotional aspect of the phenomenon. In addition to that, scholars such as Hallegatte and Marticotte (2014) strongly stressed on the superiority of the SNS over Holbrook’s in measuring nostalgia proneness, given both the higher internal consistency and the more complete conceptual assumptions. Due to these reasons, and considering also the inherent theoretical
limitations of measuring a hard to define phenomenon such as nostalgia proneness, we adopted both the SNS and the Holbrook’s scale, reserving the right the further evaluate the measurements in the analysis stage, considering aspects such as the distribution of the responses.

Table 3: outline of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filter for Millennials</td>
<td>Age = 16-36</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived financial situation</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Holbrook Nostalgia Scale</td>
<td>7-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton Nostalgia Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Shopping Inventory</td>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>7-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confusion Shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for uniqueness</td>
<td>Desire for uniqueness scale</td>
<td>7-Likert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This inherent consumer trait of nostalgia was then used in connection with the Sproles and Kendall (1986) CSI 39-item model. Originally, the CSI was formed with 48 items to reflect upon the eight styles mentioned in the previous chapter, thus resulting in six items per style. However, after a thorough analysis with a large sample this was abbreviated to the final formation 39 item model measuring the eight shopping styles. This was the version we adopted for our study. For transparency concerns, we feel to mention that the original CSI construct was intended in a 5-point Likert format, but given that 5-point and 7-point do not appear to significantly diverge in terms of output, and considering that we wanted to maintain consistency in the format of the scales for purpose of obtaining a more homogeneous dataset (Krosnick & Presser, 2010), we transposed the model to be measured in 7-point Likert scales.

The Desire for Uniqueness scale (Lynn & Harris, 1997) represents the last construct of our questionnaire. As it appears from literature, uniqueness is a concept that is best treated from the consumer’s side, being for many scholars an inherent characteristic rather than something affected by brand strategies (Ruvio et al., 2007; Tian et al., 2001; Cheema & Kaikati, 2010). Given the satisfactory conceptual assumptions of the Lynn and Harris’ scale, and given the high internal validity, we employed this construct to measure this variable in our research.
3.5 Sampling method

Naturally, there are limitations to any form of study and thus due to the limitations at hand here, the target group selected is that whom is easily accessible and understand the theoretical concepts of nostalgia and hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations. The target group has been further selected by its age group (16-35) to address the targeted Millennials age cohort. To estimate a minimum optimal number of sample size, the online platform Sample Size Calculator provided by Raosoft (2016). Since our population of interest is composed by Millennials, we retrieved secondary data provided by the Population Division of the Department of Economics and Social Affairs of the United Nations (2016) in order to estimate the size of the demographic cohort. Data retrieved from the latest World Population Prospect (2015) were employed, using global statistics regarding people between 15 and 35 of age. Calculations can be retrieved in table 4.

Table 4: numbers of individual require for sample accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired sample size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the output and considering the operational and temporal limitations, the minimum target is set at 100, with a desirable goal of N = 200 for necessities regarding statistical procedures such as factor analysis (Guilford, 1954). Given the time and economic constraints, a convenience sample will be used (Malhotra et al., 2012). Given the risks of biased samples that might result from this practice, we will ethically employ our best effort to diversify both geographically and demographically the sample (Gravetter and Forzano, 2015). The questionnaire would be administered by means of mails and social platforms in order to ensure the digital consistency of data inside the Qualtrics’ platform. Limitations related to the sampling technique will nevertheless be discussed in the last chapter.

3.6 Research quality

It is critical that the study accomplishes both reliability and validity factors to ensure the scientific quality of the research. Thus, to reduce the possibility of concluding a study implying unintended measurements, reliability measures such as the Chronbach Alpha (Saunders et al., 2009) have been considered and displayed (table 5). According to Malhotra et al (2012) this represents a good measure to assess the extent to which a scale able to produce the same level of consistency in its results if the process were to be repeated. The following questions composed by Saunders et al (2009) help to define reliability which will in turn help to positively test the study’s reliability at hand:

The questionnaire in the survey at hand helps to guarantee standardization and thus reliability via the process of asking each respondent the same set of questions. However, testing the reliability alone is insufficient thus it is important to analyze the study’s validity, especially regarding the conceptual quality (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). This is why a thorough discussion of the limitations is
implemented in the final chapter. Validity is also determined by the degree of transparency of the method of collecting and analyzing data. This was taken into consideration during the analytical phase, implying that we endeavored in presenting the result in a transparent way. Content validity tests the adequacy of questions in a questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2009). To help evaluating the content validity of the study, we strived to compile the theoretical framework supporting the scales in the most complete and clear manner, highlighting whenever alternative approaches were possible. Criterion-related validity tests the ability to measure the accuracy of the questions’ prediction. Following the guidelines by Saunders et al. (2009), we considered this when choosing the set of the research tools, using scales that have been cross-tested and confirmed. In addition to this, we included a discussion on the differences between the statistical characteristics of Holbrook’s and SNS. This allowed us to assess whether the two measurements differed and did not respect the required criterion validity for our study. Lastly, construct validity, measuring that no discrepancies are present between the theorized phenomenon and the measured one, was take into consideration during our study (Saunders et al., 2009). Apart from the already discussed conceptual aspects that we treated both in theoretical background and this chapter, a pre-test with a small sample of respondents was employed. The feedbacks of the tested individuals were then collected and used to further assess whether the questionnaire had been interpreted in the intended way. In conclusion, we tried to keep into considerations all the several dimensions of this study’s validity at each stage of the development and production of it.

3.7 Summary
In this chapter we presented the methodological process behind the conception of our study. The research is based on the positivist philosophy with components of interpretivist philosophy. Utilizing an abductive approach, we employed both primary and secondary data, following the framework of a primarily conclusive research design and nuances coming from a more approach. This resulted in a quantitative single cross-sectional type of study. Following the reasoning, we eventually opted to use a questionnaire as the primary research tool of this study. The employed scales and sampling method stemmed directly from these considerations alongside with the assumptions discussed in the theoretical framework. Finally, the issue of validity was discussed, completing the methodological discussion of the chapter.
IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

“I’m terribly nostalgic, but I’m with the Elizabethans who thought nostalgia was a disease. It’s a dangerous place to be because you can get caught up in it.”

Mark Gatiss

In this part of the paper, we present the process of the analysis and the results obtained. After an introductory chapter describing the tools used for the data extraction process, the section progresses with the actual discussion of the undertaken quantitative analysis. At the end, a summary of the findings is retrievable.

3.1 Data extraction

The questionnaire was conducted using an online Survey Service provided by Qualtrics. After the development process of the questionnaire was completed, a pre-test of \( N = 21 \) was conducted using the respondent debriefing method. The pretest was carried out in order to assess the experiential quality of the survey for the respondents. Given the overall positive feedbacks, the questionnaire was then digitally administered to the final sample via social networks and e-mails. The final questionnaire remained active for a time period of one week during which 269 total responses were collected. After the data were converted to a SPSS file for analysis, 49 individual responses were found to be incomplete or did not respect the required filter (age between 18 and 36), thus resulting in a final usable sample of \( N = 222 \). Given our minimum required target of 150 responses, due to temporal and operational constraints, we deemed the sample size to be satisfactory and therefore we proceeded to a further labelling and refining phase of data. After the conclusion of this phase, the analysis was conducted using the in-software tools of IBM’s SPSS software.

3.2 Demographics and sample

Before proceeding to the core part of the analysis, we present in this section the univariate statistics related to our sample. Four variables measured the gender, the age, the education level and the financial situation of our sample. The final studied group consisted of \( N = 222 \), of which 119 were males and 103 females, giving a balanced proportion of 54% and 46% respectively. In terms
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of age, the target group was Millennials, thus comprising individuals born between 1980 and 2000. As it is possible to see in figure 2, inside the chosen age cohort the distribution followed an approximately normal shape, presenting a mean age of $M = 24.59$, with 29% of the respondents being 25 years of age.

The education levels can be retrieved in figure 3. Individuals possessing a Bachelor degree represented the majority of the sample (41%), followed by Master graduates (25%). As it is evident here, the sample was a considerably high educated one, thus bearing potential limitations for the validity of the study. Nevertheless, this might also reflect the highly educated nature of Millennials (Stilwell, 2014).

The last descriptive variable were employed to self-assess the perceived financial situations of the respondents. Though the item is not intended as a substitute of wage levels, it nevertheless provided us with a rough form of assessment of the financial groups in our study. As it is possible to retrieve in figure 4, the sample was divided into five different categories according to the self-perceptions of respondents. The vast majority of the sample recognized to have an average financial situation according, with 47% of the individuals present in this age cohort. The rest of the results show 31% of the respondents defining their own economic situation as above average and 22% below. Moreover in appendix 1 it is possible to retrieve the geographical distributions of the respondents.

3.3 Constructs reliability and distribution of variables

In this section of the study, a discussion on the reliability of the used constructs is present. The rationale for this section lies in the fact that, even though the research tools of our study completely derived from the relevant theoretical literature and thus were already tested for reliability levels, we wanted to strengthen the internal validity of the study. In doing this, we hope to offer further room for support on the validity of the original constructs, while being transparent about the procedural quality of our research. Out of the different items used in the questionnaire, 11 variables were used in the final study by aggregating the relevant questions. This resulted into two constructs measuring nostalgia, the Southampton Nostalgia Scale (Barrett et al. 2010) and the Holbrook scale (Holbrook
one measuring desire for uniqueness (Lynn & Harris, 1997), and the eight constructs of the original CSI model (Sproles and Kendall, 1986, 1990). The tests were conducted assessing the Cronbach Alpha levels of the 11 aggregated variables.

Table 5: internal validity of constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Southampton scale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holbrook scale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>Desire for uniqueness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Shopping Inventory</td>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand consciousness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion consciousness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational shopping</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price consciousness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive shopping</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over choice confusion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is possible to see in table 5, reliability levels show satisfactory levels with a > 0.7 (Knapp, 1991) for seven of the eleven constructs, while exhibiting acceptable levels for the remaining four with a > 0.5. In appendix 2 it is possible to retrieve the frequency distributions for each of the scales. Due to the Gaussian shape of the distributions, we can state that the variables are approximately normally distributed, thus allowing the opportunity to use several parametric methods in our analysis. Given that the conceptual validity of the scales has been already discussed by the original authors, we will now progress and discuss the issue of measuring nostalgia.

Among the various commentators debating the inherent problems of nostalgia measurement, we already mentioned Hallegatte and Marticatte (2014) who distinguishably compiled a critical review of Holbrook’s nostalgia scale, highlighting how it fails to consider the emotional dimension of the phenomenon, thus resulting in measuring more belief in decline than nostalgia. The scholars supported on the other hand the use of the Southampton Nostalgia Scale. In our study we chose to measure both in order to assess the measuring differences of the two scales. While we may see the logic underlying the critics of Holbrook, we felt to include it given its theoretical prominence and its extended use.
To better evaluate the scenario, univariate descriptives are now presented together with an evaluation of the distribution of the two variables and a final assessment on the potential correlation between them using Pearson’s correlation.

Table 6: nostalgia scale analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Holbrook’s nostalgia scale</th>
<th>Southampton nostalgia scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. deviation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. error</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution

Correlation

\[ r (4) = .10 \; , \; p < .10 \]

The output retrievable in table 6 shows mixed results. While the difference in terms of mean does not appear to be considerable (3.89 and 4.28), the standard deviation appears considerably higher for the Southampton scale (1.33 against 0.806) while the reverse is true in terms of construct reliability (0.93 for Southampton and 0.69 for Holbrook). In terms of correlation, a statistically significant Pearson coefficient suggests modest levels of correlation (0.172). Since these results did not highlight the superior strength of a scale against the other, the mean values did not differ considerably, and also considering the already discussed conceptual limitations of both scales, we decided to aggregate both variables into a new construct. This resulted in a new variable \((M=4.29, \; SD=0.84)\) with a considerably normally shaped distribution (retrievable in figure 5). Due to a better shaped distribution, an acceptable level of variance and a conceptually satisfying rationale, we used this variable for measuring nostalgia throughout the whole study.
4.4 Nostalgia characteristics

One of the objectives of our study was to assess whether the phenomenon of nostalgia varies across different groups defined by gender, age, financial situation and education. Though there is evidence that nostalgia represents a common feeling that transcends differences such as in age, gender and backgrounds (Tierney, 2013; Holbrook, 1993), we investigated the matter specifically relating to the cohort of Millennials while including also the variable indicating the level of education (H.1a, H.1b and H.1c respectively).

Table 7: proneness to nostalgia across genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We first analyze the gender differences regarding nostalgia to test for H.1a and, as we see in table 7, the mean does not vary across the two groups. It is safe to claim that there are no observable differences in the magnitude of nostalgia between males and females. This is consistent with previous scientific findings (Marchegiani & Phau, 2010; Tierney, 2013). Millennials thus do not differ in the way they experience nostalgia across genders.

The second variable we tested with levels of nostalgia was the age of respondents. To test differences in the groups, we employed one-way ANOVA analysis to test our H.1b. Prior to this, we first created a new age variable that segmented the item into 4 different age cohorts intervalled at every 5 points.

Table 8: proneness to nostalgia across age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics of nostalgia in the different age groups can be retrieved in table 8. As it is possible to see, no noteworthy differences are present. This is confirmed by the result of the ANOVA test $F (3, 218) = 1.36, p = .10$. Thus it is possible to claim that no differences in levels of nostalgia are encounterable across different age groups among Millennials. This is in line with
previous findings on the matter (Holbrook, 1995; Marchegiani & Phau, 2010). The final test on nostalgia influence regards the variable education (H.1c). To our knowledge, no prior studies have been conducted to assess this linkage. In order to study this relation, we again used one-way ANOVA. The results can be observed in Table 9.

Table 9: proneness to nostalgia across different levels of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>90% Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional diploma</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is possible to observe, interestingly this variable presents some differences between groups, especially in the PhD level. To better investigate this, we further proceed in the analysis with H1 claiming that the difference in the means across groups is statistically significant, and H0 where it is implied that all the means are equal. We first conducted a test on the homogeneity of variance using the Levene’s test (Leven, 1960). Since the result was significant at the level $p = 0.60$, the homogeneity of variance was violated and thus we proceeded in the analysis by employing the Welch’s test (Zimmerman, 2004). This time the results led us to reject H0 ($p < 0.10$) allowing us to go further to assess the results of the one-way ANOVA. The results of the test highlighted a significance: $F (4, 215) = 2.715, p = 0.31$. Thus we reject H0 and we accept H1. To highlight where the difference takes place, we used a post-hoc test under Tukey honest significant difference (HSD) method (Montgomery, 2013). The results of the test can be extensively consulted in appendix 3. It is thus claimable that there might be a higher level of experienced nostalgia across different education levels, with particular importance in PhDs. It is however to be noted that...
broader conclusions might be hard to draw given the small size of the group (N = 5). The plotted mean nostalgia levels can be retrieved in figure 6. We thus confirmed that nostalgia appears to be a widespread phenomenon that does not bear considerable differences among gender and age groups, but that might present further ground to research regarding different education levels.

4.5 Patterns in the CSI model

In this section we examine the core dimension of our analysis: the relation between nostalgia, need for uniqueness and the Consumer Shopping Inventory Model (Sproles and Kendall, 1986). To assess the linkages of the different variables, we use the Pearson’s correlation coefficient as a measure of the strength of the relationship (Cohen, 1988).

The first linkage we theorized in our conceptual model was a relationship between nostalgia and need for uniqueness (H.2). Since we hypothesized the existence of linkage, we set H2 to be valid in case the correlation analysis shows any significant level of (r > 0.2). The null hypothesis would otherwise be accepted in case of non-significant relationship.

Table 10: nostalgia/uniqueness correlation levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nostalgia Proneness Index</th>
<th>Need for uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares and Cross-products</td>
<td>75.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is possible to see from table 10, the results give a correlation of \( r = .32, p < 0.10 \). This output can be interpreted as a notable level of positive correlation (Cohen, 1988) with medium strength (Evans, 1996). Thus, we can reject H0 and accept H2 claiming that there exists a considerable positive correlation between need for uniqueness and nostalgia proneness in Millennials.

In terms of CSI dimensions, H.3 and H.4 required us to investigate if there exists a relationship between nostalgia, uniqueness and the CSI model and, if so, which shopping dimensions appear to be more prominent in the linkage. Theoretically, we hypothesized that there is a positive linkage between nostalgia proneness, need for uniqueness and the CSI consumption patterns. To investigate them, we use once again the Pearson’s correlation coefficient. Thus H.3 and H.4, to be true, require that a significant positive correlation level in Pearson’s coefficient (\( r > 0.20 \) according to Evans, 1996) appears in the result of the test. On the contrary, we will be forced to reject H3 and accept H0 in case no significant levels of correlation appear between the variables.
Table 11: nostalgia and uniqueness / CSI correlation levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfection shopping</th>
<th>Brand conscious shopping</th>
<th>Fashion conscious shopping</th>
<th>Recreational shopping</th>
<th>Price conscious shopping</th>
<th>Impulsive shopping</th>
<th>Confused shopping</th>
<th>Habitual shopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia proneness index</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>67.17</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>21.251</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>22.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cov.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need For Uniqueness</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td></td>
<td>118.41</td>
<td>163.41</td>
<td>120.74</td>
<td>120.74</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>64.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cov.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the multiple correlation test are retrievable in table 11. It is worth to note that several correlations appear to be true at different magnitude levels. The relevant linkages, according to the threshold set for $H.3$ and $H.4$, are highlighted in green colors. According to the output, nostalgia seems to be positively correlated with 3 dimensions of the CSI model, in particular habitual shopping ($r = .32$), fashion conscious shopping ($r = .27$) and perfection shopping ($r = .21$). Thus, under these 3 dimensions, we accept $H3$ and reject the null hypothesis that no relation exists between nostalgia and the CSI dimensions.

Regarding need for uniqueness, the linkages with the CSI model appear to be more prominent, with significant correlations present in 5 dimensions of the framework. Fashion conscious shopping ($r = .51$) and brand conscious shopping ($r = .43$) appear to be particularly positively correlated with need for uniqueness, while perfection shopping ($r = .39$), recreational shopping ($r = .32$) and impulsive shopping ($r = .24$) exhibit less important but still significant medium correlation levels (Cohen, 1988).

Thus also in this case we can reject the null hypothesis $H.0$ and accept $H.4$, while claiming that need for uniqueness has an importance in several dimensions of the consumer shopping behavior. For sake of completeness, in figure 7 it is possible to retrieve the plots of the significant correlations.
To better interpret the obtained correlations, we progress by using hierarchical clustering methods applied on all the variables of the CSI model together with nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness. The criterion used for the clustering method is the within group method, with squared Euclidean intervals (Everitt et al., 2001). By implementing this process, we obtained the dendrogram retrievable in figure 8. At \( l = 25 \), we identified 3 notable clusters. One encompassing fashion conscious shopping, recreational shopping, brand conscious shopping and perfectionist shopping. The second cluster comprises price conscious shopping and habitual shopping. Combining the remaining dimensions of the CSI model, impulsive shopping and confusion shopping formed the last cluster. While interpretations might differ, we recognized in the first and last clusters the classical dimensions of hedonic and utilitarian shopping behaviors particularly prominent in the marketing literature (Bloch & Richins 1983a; Hirschman 1983), with the second cluster representing a dimension to be further analyzed in the next chapter. To better
assess the patterns, a principal component factor analysis was conducted under the Varimax rotation method. This resulted after 5 iterations in the items showed in Table 12. As it is possible to retrieve, 3 components resulted from the process, with fashion shopping, perfectionist shopping, recreational shopping, brand conscious shopping forming factor 1, impulsive shopping and confusion shopping being factor 2 and price conscious shopping and habitual shopping forming the last component, factor 3. The weak coefficients (factor loading < 0.5) were suppressed from the output. This outcome, confirming what the preliminary clustering analysis suggested, bears considerations to discuss in the next chapter.

Table 12: rotated component matrix of the factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fashion conscious shopping</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist shopping</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational shopping</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand conscious shopping</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price conscious shopping</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Summary and comments
As it is possible to retrieve in Table 13, all of the posed hypotheses were confirmed to be true. Regarding H.1c, though the ANOVA analysis confirmed the significance, it is to be taken into consideration that the size of the groups made the procedure prone to several doubts and thus further more specific researches would be needed to better analyze and evaluate the influence of education levels on nostalgia proneness. All the hypotheses tested with correlation methods (H.2, H.3 and H.4) showed positive outcomes that to be further examined in the next chapters.

Table 13: hypotheses confirmation status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.1a</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>No nostalgia differences between genders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1b</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>No nostalgia differences between age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1c</td>
<td>To be further assessed</td>
<td>No nostalgia differences between education levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Nostalgia is positively related with desire for uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Nostalgia has an influence on shopping behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Desire for uniqueness has an influence on shopping behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

“Nostalgia is like a grammar lesson: you find the present tense, but the past perfect.”

Owens Lee Pomeroy

In this last section of the paper we will discuss the outcome of the research and we will draw the conclusions of our study. In addition to that, the research’s limitations will be presented alongside with several suggestions for further studies. The chapter will end with a set of managerial recommendations to be drawn from the aforementioned conclusions.

5.1 Discussion

We will now present a discussion of each of the research questions we originally introduced in the theoretical framework, guided by both the results of the statistical analysis and the insights provided by the theoretical literature.

Nostalgia levels and demographic variables

In the first part of our research we examined whether levels of nostalgia proneness differed based on several demographic variables. Since previous research highlighted this potential pattern in nostalgic behavior (Holbrook, 1993; Sedikides, 2008), we analyzed it in order to extend the knowledge on the matter. We conducted tests on the groups defined by gender (H.1a), by age (H.1b) and by education levels (H.1c). Our initial hypotheses implied no differences in the means of nostalgia proneness among the different groups, and this was in particular confirmed by the results of H.1a and H.1b. Regarding H.1c, the ANOVA analysis showed the presence of potential differences in nostalgia proneness across education levels, but given the limited size of a few groups, we would feel safer to leave the matter to be settled by further more in depth studies.

Though nostalgic feelings might traditionally be associated with older individuals (Sedikides, 2008), research on the matter have so far indicated that this does not seem to be the case. Variables such as gender, age and education levels do not seem to hold direct connections with levels of nostalgia proneness, and our study managed to reinforce this view. Given that the scope of our research was restricted to the Millennials generation, and considering the fact that no prior studies to our knowledge addressed the nostalgic behavior of Generation Y, we felt that we succeeded in providing evidence on the matter. As it is possible to retrieve in figure 5, the distribution of the nostalgia proneness index across our sample bears some attractive implications to mention. The outcome of the nostalgic index, in fact showed considerable levels of nostalgia in Millennials ($M = 4.29$). Despite further studies should replicate the measurements to better assess the general scenario, this fact seems to be in line with previous findings that affirmed the strength of nostalgic feelings in individuals (Holbrook, 1993; Marchegiani & Phau, 2013). Considering the outcome of our study
alongside with support from literature, we can claim that the effects of nostalgia are not merely restricted to small consumer niche or group. But they can be found to be present in the general population, regardless of specific demographic variables such as gender, age and education levels. In addition to that, the measurement we adopted, combining both the Holbrook and Southampton’s original scales, proved to be a valid research tool that among the already discussed theoretical qualities, provided us with the advantage of having a normally distributed variable. We thus suggest further researchers to consider using this method of measurement when the Holbrook or Southampton scales alone do not result as conceptually satisfying for the study, as it previously happened (Hallegatte & Marticotte, 2014).

Nostalgia and need for uniqueness patterns
Our second research question addressed the relationship between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness. With previous research showing connections between the two constructs (Zimmer et al., 1999), we tried to understand if any correlation was present. The result of our correlation analysis showed the presence of a positive relationship between the variables with a medium strength (Evans, 1996), being \( r = .32 \). Though the strength is not in the highest range, we can state that the Pearson’s coefficient provided us with reason to claim that a positive relationship is present (Cohen, 1988). The statistical evidence is further supported by previous scientific works (Zimmer et al., 1999; Brown et al., 2003) that already highlighted a connection between the two constructs. With the relationship that we hypothesized in our conceptual model, we tried to use a quantitative approach to provide evidence for the nature of nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness. Brown et al. (2003) in particular noted in his empirical work how successful retro marketing strategies seem to leverage considerably on the uniqueness seeking behavior of consumers.

Nevertheless, it is to be noted that the weak strength of the correlation might pose considerations regarding the relationship. In addition to that, previous literature has not yet, to our knowledge, provided ground for more specific discussion on the matter, given the fact there is lack of researches that specifically addressed this topic in depth. With our contribution, we wanted to highlight some interesting room for further research that might more specifically study the relationship between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness. In the CSI model that we used to profile shopping styles across our sample, Sproles and Kendall (1986) identified traits that would later be further examined under the theories of hedonic and utilitarian shopping styles (Babin et al., 1994). The hedonic dimension of shopping behavior seems to be connected with nostalgia proneness (Triantafillidou & Siomkos, 2014) as also with need for uniqueness (Khuong & Tran, 2015; Carpenter et al., 2005). This commonality across the two constructs leads us to claim that, even considering the already discussed strength of correlation, there is room for believing that an interesting, deeper connection might be presented, and thus would be of interest for future research.

Considering that previous research remarkably examined the prominence of desire for uniqueness in consumers (Ruvio et al., 2008; Cheema & Kaikati, 2011), establishing a clearer linkage with nostalgia proneness might help in finding ways to both predict and analyze the presence of these two traits in consumers. Among the several interesting implications, the connection with word of mouth dynamics (Cheema & Kaikati, 2011) provides an area of research not to be understated. With also
Brown et al. (2003) mentioning the strong relationship between retromarketing strategies and word of mouth phenomena, we can strengthen our initial assumptions and claim that establishing a connection between nostalgia and need for uniqueness would likely provide both academics and marketers with useful tools to understand and predict consumer behavior.

**Nostalgia and CSI profiles**

The last part of our research was focused on analyzing the relationship between nostalgia, desire for uniqueness and shopping behavior, categorized under the already mentioned CSI model. After theorizing a positive connection between shopping types and nostalgia proneness alongside with desire for uniqueness in Generation Y consumers, we used correlation analysis to investigate the matter. Nostalgia proneness showed significant Pearson’s coefficients with perfectionism shopping, fashion conscious shopping and, above all, habitual shopping. Given the weak level of the first two correlations (Evans, 1996), we found habitual shopping to be the most prominent shopping pattern to examine. According to the definitions originally given by Sproles and Kendall (1986) we are able to understand the characteristics of the analyzed shopping behavior. Habitual shopping, in fact, represents a type of shopping behavior that describes a customary type of consumer, who prefers brands that are well known to him. This finding is consistent with the profile of a nostalgia prone individual, who by definition has a prominent yearning for the past (Belk, 1990; Stern, 1992). With this fact in mind, we can state that brands focusing their marketing efforts on retro marketing strategies, should be aware that shopping contexts may prove to be difficult environments for them. Nostalgic customers, in fact, are apparently related with a habitual shopping style that makes it hard for new products to be successful. Thus, other marketing channels may be used by marketers to try and persuade nostalgic customers into buying their products. Brown et al. (2003) noted how successful retro marketing strategies involved the thorough use of online communities, word-of-mouth strategies and campaigns tailored to niche markets. Our findings confirm this, but also shed light upon the fact that nostalgic consumers are most likely related with habitual shopping patterns, thus they might prove to be loyal and repetitive long-term customers once a product enters their consumption routine. This behavior suggests that highly nostalgic individuals could represent a profitable segment for marketers willing to gain a more loyal and stable customer base in the shopping context.

A particular mention must be made regarding the other two positively correlated CSI dimensions: perfectionism shopping and fashion conscious shopping. Since significant correlations, despite their lower strength, are present, we have to consider the implications of these findings. As these two dimensions are more prominent in relationship with desire for uniqueness, as we will see in the next section, we might argue that these shopping traits might derive from the fact that nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness themselves were found to be modestly correlated with each other. This already highlighted hedonic dimension is thus the reason for the presence of perfectionism shopping and fashion conscious shopping in nostalgic individuals. Triantafillidou & Siomkos (2014), in fact, provided previously this kind of conclusion, relating nostalgia and hedonic shopping practices. Nevertheless, due to the low strength of resulted correlations, further research is encouraged to shed light on the matter.
Desire for uniqueness and CSI profiles

Regarding desire for uniqueness, five significant correlations were found, with four of them being more prominent in strength \( (r > 0.3) \). In order of level of correlation, from the highest to the lowest, they are: fashion conscious shopping, brand conscious shopping, perfection shopping and recreational shopping. In addition to that, impulsive shopping presents a weak, but still significance correlation (table 11). Interestingly, all these shopping dimensions exhibit characteristics of the hedonic shopping behavior that we both theoretically discussed and empirically examined with the factor analysis. The results translate into a peculiar shopping profile for the uniqueness needy consumer: a type of individual that is heavily fashion oriented, prone to attraction for new trends (fashion conscious) and ready to pay more for brands and perceived value (brand conscious). In addition to that, their profile suggests that they spend a significant amount of time shopping carefully for different alternatives (perfection shopping), while having fun from the shopping activity (recreational shopping). All these traits were recognized by scholars to be typical traits of the hedonic behavior (Arnolds & Reynolds, 2003; Babin et al., 1994), and thus strongly support our theorized relationship in uniqueness seeking individuals.

The implications for marketers are several. Consumers particularly prone to desire for uniqueness seem to represent an interesting target for marketers willing to focus their promotional efforts on shopping environments, given the fact that these hedonic customers seem to be inclined to spend more time in these settings, experiencing more positive emotions, and considering a broader range of products in the process. Moreover, the CSI dimension of impulsive shopping tends to imply that this consuming behavior might be related to low price sensitivity. Marketers should thus be aware that this connection between desire for uniqueness and the aforementioned CSI traits highlights the presence of a customer segment that could be highly profitable for both retailers and producers.

Some considerations, nevertheless, should be made regarding the fact that nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness, even though being positively correlated, seem to be connected with different types of CSI dimensions. First, nostalgic consumers exhibited a habitual type of shopping behavior that was not present in their uniqueness searching counterpart. This is compensated by a stronger tendency in unique seeking customers to be more inclined to follow new trends, place more value on brand (brand conscious) and have a more hedonic attitude towards the shopping activity in general (recreational shopping). Triantafillidou & Siomkos (2014) already noted that other external variables might be responsible for the difference in behaviors, but nevertheless similarities also should be considered. Two of the four hedonic CSI types (according to our factor analysis), in fact, were found to be common in both nostalgic and uniqueness prone Millennials. Thus, we can safely claim that these findings reinforce the initial theorized assumptions of the connections between need for uniqueness and nostalgia proneness (figure 1). Future studies should study more in depth the shopping patterns of the two analyzed consumer types, specifically addressing the concept of hedonic shopping dimension in both of them.

Shopping profiles dimensions

In the original CSI model, Sproles & Kendall (1986) empirically recognized eight types of shopping traits. While on one hand the prominence of the model cannot be understated, as we previously...
discussed in the theoretical background the importance of the scientific literature developed on the matter of hedonic and utilitarian shopping behavior. A great amount of both theoretical and empirical evidence has lead several scholars to call for the importance of implementing these views into the study of consumer behaviors (Babin et al., 1994; Roy, 1994; Wakefield & Baker, 1998). Given both these facts and the already discussed theoretical connections with nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness, we tried to implement this view in our analytical process in order to explore whether a pattern could be traced in the CSI model. To achieve this, both factorial and clustering methods were employed in an empirical attempt to find a deeper level of knowledge of shopping behavior in nostalgic and uniqueness seeking individuals, using the tools provided by the hedonic and utilitarian approach. The results interestingly highlighted three notable dimensions in the factor analysis, also detected by the clustering process. Factor one, comprising fashion conscious shopping, brand conscious shopping, perfection shopping and recreational shopping, shows in fact the interesting traits typical of the hedonic behavior (Markin, Lillis, & Narayana 1976; Bloch et al., 1986; Muehling & Sprott, 2004) and thus can be safely interpreted as a composite indicator of such hedonic practices. Experiencing the shopping act in a primarily entertaining dimension, focusing more prominently on products that appeal on the fashion seeking, trendy taste of consumers, can arguably represent the quintessential hedonic dynamic.

The other two produced factors respectively comprise confusion shopping and impulsive shopping on one hand, and habitual shopping and price conscious shopping. Regarding the first factor, previous studies already recognized the existence of a relationship between confusion and impulsiveness in shopping (Wickliffe, 2004), showing significant correlations between the two traits. According to these findings, shoppers that tend to show impulsive purchasing behaviors might derive this pattern from the confusion experienced in the retailing environment, potentially caused by lack of clarity regarding product information. Xueming (2005) noted how this peculiar behavior might be exacerbated by larger in store assortments, and by the presence of peers when shopping. Finally, the last considered factor comprises habitual shopping and price conscious shopping. We interpreted these two traits as potential indicators of utilitarian shopping behaviors. Previous studies, in fact, already pointed at the importance of both price sensitivity (Alavi et al., 2015; Irani & Hanzae, 2011) and habitual patterns (Pahnilla & Warsta, 2010) in the definition of the utilitarian dimension. Moreover, Arnold and Reynold (2003) already discussed the implications of choice optimization in utilitarian shopping behavior, implying a consumption pattern that actively supports the connections with habitual, price sensitive aspects. We can thus better profile the prominence of a factor that stresses on the strive for certain customers to avoid uncertainty risks by employing repetitive shopping patterns that hold in high regard the price element. This implies, if more scientific consensus will be obtained in the future, that marketers should be aware of the risk adversity behavior of utilitarian shoppers and the potential consequent difficulty of pitching new product lines to them in the retailing space. Still, a comment must be made in this regard, given the habitual nature found in relationship with nostalgic prone consumers. Lasaleta et al. (2014), in fact, empirically found that nostalgic feelings appear to have a negative effect on customers’ price sensitivity. This finding is in contrast with the utilitarian dimension that we found to be associated with the factor comprising habitual shopping and price consciousness. Further research is recommended to better understand the relationship between the CSI
traits and hedonic and utilitarian behavior in order to shed more light on the matter. Having considered that, we also have to comment on the fact that nostalgia proneness did not exhibit significant correlations with the *price conscious shopping* trait itself. Thus, the correlation analysis provided results that are more in line with the findings of Lasaleta et al. (2014), leaving room for further debates on the relationship between price sensitivity, nostalgia and utilitarian patterns.

With all of the previously discussed results at hand, we can state that the output obtained from both the factor and cluster analysis depict specific dynamics that we interpreted under the theory of utilitarian and hedonic shopping. Nevertheless, we are aware of the limitations to be considered, regarding the complex nature of the hedonic and utilitarian practices and also contemplating the fact that the original CSI model did not directly imply an interpretation of this type. Yet we believe that both the provided theoretical evidence, alongside with the presented empirical findings, favor the conceptual explanations that we produced. Once again, the exploratory traits of some of our research questions lead us to call for more researches to be done on the matter in order to provide more data and, possibly, to establish more consensus.

5.2 Conclusions

With both shopping practices and scenario becoming more and more complex (Childers, 2015), and given the challenges brought by the future prominence of the peculiar Generation Y age cohort (Hendricks, 2014), both academics and marketers need to focus their efforts on trying to better understand the behaviors of future consumers. In this study, we theorized the potential importance of nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness in shopping patterns and dynamics. Our theoretical and empirical endeavor strived to shed light on the nature of the proposed variables, while trying to offer practical implications to be adopted for professional marketers. The obtained findings confirmed the existence of a linkage between nostalgia proneness, desire for uniqueness and certain shopping patterns that we attempted to interpret using both conceptual and analytical methods. We concluded that the initially theorized links are indeed existent, thus validating a conceptual model that we encourage to further employ and assess in future researches.

5.3 Limitations and further research

Several delimitations are to be considered in the assessment of this work. In this section we will explicit them, while recommending further research to address the exposed issues. First, as we already commented in the theoretical background, we encountered several conceptual limitations, mostly due to the inherent problems of debating phenomena such as nostalgia and desire for uniqueness, as previously pointed out by scholars (Holbrook, 1994; Tian et al., 2001). While it is to be mentioned that the employed scales were chosen also due to their theoretical prominence, conceptual consensus nevertheless still represents a matter of debate (Hallegatte & Marticatte, 2014; Ruvio et al., 2008). We hope that future researches will help to better settle the situation. In addition to that, we wanted to encourage a more critical assessment and consequent use of the mentioned scales. In fact, while on hand we recognized the importance of the Holbrook nostalgia scale, and the underlying the groundbreaking work it followed, on the other we found that the Southampton
nostalgia scale developed by Barrett et al. (2010) were both theoretically and practically more suitable for the measurement of nostalgia, as also noted by Hallegatte and Marticatte (2014). Eventually we employed an index that combined both scales that provided more satisfying outcomes in our opinion. Yet, we feel to claim that scholars should focus their efforts towards the goal of reaching a more broadly shared concept of nostalgia, alongside with a better fitting scale to measure the phenomenon. Regarding the CSI model, even though its broad scientific use seems to highlight the validity of the concept, several alternative models are present to measure shopping behavior (among the many: Pappas et al, 2016; Putrevu & Ratchford, 1997). Thus it would need to be assessed whether the use of different shopping models would yield different results. In addition to that, evidence shows that online shopping contexts might need to be treated considering different dynamics, and thus would be suitable for different models (Wu & Ke, 2015). Further studies are hence welcome to replicate the study considering the implications of brick & mortar shopping environments versus online contexts.

In terms of methodology, the major drawback of the sampling technique cannot be, unfortunately, understated. While we tried to proceed in a manner that could limit as most as possible problems in the obtained convenience sample (bias, skewedness), the technique holds inherent issues that are likely to lower the external validity of the study (Boxil et al., 1997). Due to this reason, we would strongly encourage more studies using different sampling technique, possibly employing random datasets. Still, given our strict temporal and economical resources, we used the most feasible procedure, striving to be as transparent as possible in discussing the characteristics of the sample (see both the chapter on methodology and analysis). Empirically room for improvement might be found in the statistical techniques used. Given the exploratory traits of the research, inference methods and more advance correlation techniques were hard to both operate and argue for. A future study would ideally try to employ regression techniques in order to confirm the relationships in the model. Moreover, addition of other constructs are suggested to investigate whether other variables of consumer behavior play a role with nostalgia proneness, desire for uniqueness and the CSI dimension.

Lastly, a qualitative approach on the topic would be highly useful in our opinion. Ideally, the retrieved findings might assist the investigation of hedonic and utilitarian aspects of the CSI model. This would result in a deeper understating of the shopping motivations of nostalgic prone and uniqueness-seeking individuals. Finally, replications of the research across different age cohorts, geographic areas and more specific shopping scenarios are warmly suggested.

5.4 Managerial implications

With Millennials about to demographically move into their prime spending time (Cone Communications, 2013), marketers are striving to find new methods to promote their brands and products appealing to new behavioral and demographic variables in order to identify new market segments to target (Goldman Sachs, 2015). Nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness represent two increasingly prominent fields of study for behavioral researchers, as the effects of these phenomena seem to bear powerful implications for marketers as previously discussed in the theoretical background. Our study highlighted how nostalgia represents a common trait of
individuals, and not just the peculiarity of a niche market. Millennials seem to be particularly prone to experiencing it, making it an ideal variable to consider in marketing efforts. In addition to that, the other examined variable, desire for uniqueness, also represents a worth to mention dynamic of the Millennials consumer, especially given its connection with nostalgia proneness.

The core part of our study focused on finding shopping patterns within the aforementioned variables that might yield a better profile of both the nostalgic and uniqueness-seeking individual. The profile of the nostalgic shopper, in fact, revealed that it might be hard to promote new product lines in the shopping context, given their habitual shopping behavior. The discussed evidence suggests instead focusing on using alternative marketing channels, such as online communities, spending more efforts in trying to create word of mouth phenomena. Once achieved that, the nostalgic customer potentially represents a valuable type of segment given their more loyal long-term relationship with the products used. Yet, hedonic practices seem to be present in their type of decision making process, especially relating to trendy and fashionable products. This closely relates with the connection between nostalgia proneness and desire for uniqueness, thus suggesting that these traits in Generation Y consumers potentially present ground to leverage upon. Providing value is an important characteristic for both the traits, as their shopping behaviors seem to be correlated with a prominent quest for value and quality, beyond the price element.

The economic element, in fact, did not show to be significant in their shopping motivations. Brown et al. (2003) progressed on this reasoning by highlighting several recommendations for successfully creating value for the nostalgic customer. An element of authenticity is apparently a core dimension of these customers’ taste. Creating credible stories behind new products and brands, in fact, might prove to be the correct strategy to establish a relationship in nostalgic shoppers. Also the hedonic element is not to be understated, thus retailers are encouraged to employ ways to interact more with their customers, especially for the uniqueness-seeking individuals. Finally, the equity of the brand might prove to be a core tool to get noticed in the shopping context, as consumers, like Millennials in general (Goldman Sachs, 2015) are particularly prone to focus more on the perceived quality of a product, assessing the package, the brand reputation and the general perceptions of the item more than the mere price. In conclusion, we believe that following the recommendations provided by this study, marketers could make the most out of their nostalgic and uniqueness-seeking shoppers.
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VII. APPENDIX

Appendix 1 – Geographical distribution of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2 - Distribution of the CSI variables

Distributions of the CSI aggregated variables

- Perfectionist shopping
- Brand conscious shopping
## Appendix 3 – Tukey HSD post-hoc test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tukey HSD post-hoc test</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lower Bound</strong></td>
<td><strong>Upper Bound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/professional diploma</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/professional diploma</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-1.22*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/professional diploma</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-1.27*</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/professional diploma</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/professional diploma</td>
<td>1.22*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>1.27*</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>