

Otterbein University

Digital Commons @ Otterbein

Undergraduate Distinction Papers

Student Research & Creative Work

Spring 4-23-2020

They Don't Make Bourbon Like They Used To: Nostalgia as a Predictor Towards Attitude, Likelihood of Consumption, and Usage Occasion in True, Retro, Heritage, and False Nostalgia Brands

Montana McKnight

Otterbein University, montana.mcknight@otterbein.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.otterbein.edu/stu_dist



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), and the [Marketing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McKnight, Montana, "They Don't Make Bourbon Like They Used To: Nostalgia as a Predictor Towards Attitude, Likelihood of Consumption, and Usage Occasion in True, Retro, Heritage, and False Nostalgia Brands" (2020). *Undergraduate Distinction Papers*. 85.

https://digitalcommons.otterbein.edu/stu_dist/85

This Distinction Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research & Creative Work at Digital Commons @ Otterbein. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Distinction Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Otterbein. For more information, please contact digitalcommons07@otterbein.edu.

THEY DON'T MAKE BOURBON LIKE THEY USED TO:
Nostalgia as a predictor towards attitude, likelihood of consumption, and usage occasion in
true, retro, heritage, and false nostalgia brands.

Montana McKnight
Department of Business, Economics, & Accounting
Department of Psychology
Otterbein University
Westerville, OH

23 April 2020

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
graduation with Distinction

Advisory Committee:

Michael A. Levin, Ph.D.
Distinction Advisor

Advisor's Signature

Cynthia Laurie-Rose, Ph.D.
Second Reader (or Co-advisor if applicable)

Second Reader's Signature

Carla Corroto, Ph.D.
Distinction Representative

Distinction Rep's Signature

Acknowledgments

Completing this project was more difficult than I thought and more rewarding than I could have ever imagined. None of this would have been possible without the love and support of others. I would like to thank Otterbein University for providing me with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities in order to complete this project, and the Student Research Fund for providing financial support.

I would also like to thank my parents and friends for talking me of the cliff so many times. Thank you to all the extremely understanding teachers over the past year and a half. Thank you to Dr. Laurie-Rose for encouraging me to do this project since I first stayed after class with her.

Most importantly, I want to thank Dr. Levin for all of the time, patience, knowledge, understanding, early mornings, late nights, cups of coffee, and dedication that he put in to helping me succeed.

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship of brand nostalgia, brand attitude, likelihood to purchase the brand, and usage of the brand, based upon a four-way classification of nostalgia. Using multigroup analysis, a difference between types of nostalgia for the predictiveness of brand nostalgia is found in attitude and purchase likelihood. Managerial implications and future research directions are discussed.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	6
METHOD	10
DOMAIN.....	10
NOSTALGIA BRANDS	11
SURVEY	11
SAMPLE	12
RESULTS.....	13
ANOVA.....	13
<i>Brand Nostalgia</i>	13
<i>Attitude Towards the Brand</i>	14
<i>Purchase Intention</i>	15
<i>Usage Occasion</i>	15
REGRESSION	16
MUTLIGROUP ANALYSIS.....	16
DISCUSSION.....	17
LIMITATIONS	19
DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	19
REFERENCES	21
APPENDIX	26
TABLE 1.....	26
TABLE 2.....	30
TABLE 2.....	31
TABLE 3.....	32
TABLE 4A.	33
TABLE 4B.....	33
TABLE 4C.....	33
TABLE 4D	33
TABLE 5A.	34
TABLE 5B.....	34
TABLE 5C.....	34
TABLE 5D.	34
TABLE 5E.....	34
TABLE 6A.	35
TABLE 6B.....	35
TABLE 6C.....	35
TABLE 6D.	35
TABLE 6E.....	35
FIGURE 1.....	36
FIGURE 2.....	37

They Don't Make Bourbon Like They Used To:

Nostalgia as a predictor towards attitude, likelihood of consumption, and usage occasion in true, retro, heritage, and false nostalgia brands.

The concept of nostalgia dates to the 17th century when it referred to a mental condition experienced by traveling soldiers. Characterized by madness, insomnia, and chest pain, the cause was said to be fear and longing for a past time (Hammond, 1883). Much of the recent research on nostalgia in psychology has focused on the social components of nostalgia. These include nostalgia being influenced by attachment-related avoidance, nostalgia increasing feelings of belongingness, and nostalgia decreasing feelings of loneliness (Abeyta et al., 2015; Cox et al., 2015; Wildschut et al., 2006; Zhou et al., 2008). In marketing, though, nostalgia often refers to a pleasant memory (Holbrook & Schindler, 1994, 1996) with more recent discussion adding place and time (Gineikiene, 2013).

Nostalgia by marketers has gained interest as means to appeal to older consumers who could have experienced the brand when younger and by younger consumers who are looking for a connection to past that they heard about but did not necessarily experience. For example, Champion brand relaunches its original crew neck sweater and starts favoring items from 1970s era collections and later reported a 22% increase in sales revenue. Similarly, Nike's Air Max 97 "Silver Bullet" takes inspiration from the Nintendo 64, a gaming console popular in the late 1990s. Sally Hansen releases a line of nail polish using colors and wrappers from Crayola to evoke a response to when consumers began coloring in their much younger days. Motorola re-introduces a flip phone that appears similar to its 1990s era model but includes modern technology such as full-length touch screen, fingerprint passcode protection, and a 16-megapixel

sensor camera with night-mode. These examples highlight different attempts at including nostalgia in marketing.

Although nostalgia has been considered a unidimensional concept (Holbrook & Schindler, 1994, 1996), more recent research has treated nostalgia as a multidimensional concept (Batcho, 1995; Roussau & Venter, 1999, 2000) comprised of lower order effects. Holak, Havelana, and Matveev (2006) organize nostalgia around four types and conclude that each could generate different responses by individuals.

Much of the quantitative research on nostalgia centers on attitude with little consideration given to consumption-related outcomes such as a likelihood to purchase and usage occasion (Gineikiene, 2013; Roussau & Venter, 1999, 2000). The consumption-related outcomes provide a more complete understanding the role of nostalgia in consumers' behavior.

Hence, the overarching purpose of this papers remains to determine if the different types of branding exist within a specific product category and how nostalgia related to each type of brand can impact associated attitudes and behaviors specific to the type of brand. Specifically, this research effort first determines a difference in brand type for four psychographics, including: (1) brand nostalgia, (2) brand attitude, (3) likelihood to purchase the brand, and (4) usage of the brand, and second measures the difference between brands for the predictiveness of brand nostalgia.

Literature Review

While nostalgia was originally considered a mental condition similar to PTSD, Davis (1979) argues for positive elements associated with nostalgia that Wildschut et al. (2006) confirms. Sierra and McQuitty (2007) note tangibles such as an product or picture and

intangibles such as a song or scent can evoke nostalgia and, in turn, can influence intention to purchase a product associated with the favorable time.

Holbrook and Schindler (1994) provide the initial conceptualization of nostalgia in the marketing literature. However, Rousseau and Venter (1999, 2000) among other research note that Holbrook and Schindler's conceptualization of nostalgia appears more consistent with memory than nostalgia. Hallegatte & Marticotte (2014) argue against this conceptualization, stating that this "view of nostalgia conflates the cause (nostalgia) and consequences (preferences)." While a positive memory could be associated with nostalgia, other elements should be considered when conceptualizing nostalgia (Pascal et al., 2002). Specifically, the element of time.

Holak et al. (2006) provide separate and distinct forms of nostalgia, including (1) personal nostalgia, (2) interpersonal nostalgia, (3) cultural nostalgia, and (4) virtual nostalgia (see Table 1). In this view, nostalgia can be experienced directly by the individual or indirectly through interpersonal communication with older members of society or from entertainment such as movies and books. Furthermore, nostalgia can exist within individuals or among a group. Extending from Holak et. al. and from Holbrook and Schindler (1994, 1996), nostalgia is defined *here* as the longing for an idealized past regardless if the individual experienced it.

Consistent with this definition, types of brands can be assigned to four distinct categories, including (1) true nostalgia, (2) retro nostalgia, (3) heritage nostalgia, and (4) false nostalgia. In true nostalgia, the brand and product has existed unchanged over time and that the individual did experience the brand (Baker & Kennedy, 1994; Davis, 1979). For example, Levis 501 button fly jeans remain unchanged since the brand's introduction in 1873. In retro nostalgia, the brand has been updated over time to reflect current or modern sensibilities or demands (Brown et al.,

2003a, 2003b). For example, the Porsche 911 has updated its look and features to incorporate knowledge about aerodynamics, advances in safety features such as front and side air bags, and engines capable of generating more torque. In heritage nostalgia, a new brand takes cues from a specific era or timeframe (Muehling, 2013). However, the brand did not exist in that era or timeframe. For example, the Chrysler PT Cruiser relies on design cues to evoke a car from the 1930s. However, the brand did not exist in 1930s. Finally, in false nostalgia, a brand does not exist but the individual considers to it exist. For example, as part of *Stranger Things*' third season, Scoops Ahoy ice cream shop appears throughout the trailer and season and mixed in with real brands. Scoops Ahoy did not exist though. This type of nostalgia draws from the concept of confabulation, or false memory.

Outcomes associated with brand nostalgia include attitude and consumption. Gineikiene (2013) argues for attitude as an overserved outcome and consumption as underserved outcome. Baker and Kennedy (1994), Pascal et al. (2002), Muehling and Spratt (2004), Reisenwitz et al. (2004) and Muehling and Pascal (2011) examine attitude toward a product, brand, or advertisement as an outcome related to brand nostalgia. Support exists for a positive relationship between the two concepts. That is, as an individual's level of brand nostalgia increases the attitude toward the product, brand, or advertisement increases.

In consumption research, Lambert-Pandraude and Laurent (2010) conclude that brand nostalgia has a small impact on preference for a brand and actual ownership. That is, an individual's level of nostalgia for a specific brand has little influence on whether the individual prefers that brand or owns the brand. Given the established link between brand nostalgia and attitude, this research effort attempts to replicate that link. Furthermore, given the little research on consumption related to brand nostalgia, this research effort attempts to extend this work by

including likelihood to purchase the brand and the occasion for using the brand. The latter constructs extending the brand nostalgia research into consumption outcomes.

Consistent with Holak et al. (2006), it would be expected that the four types of brand nostalgia would involve different responses to these three outcomes. Attitude toward the brand is defined *here* as the individual's beliefs about a specific brand in a certain product category. Nostalgia toward an advertisement or product. Pascal et al. (2002), Muehling and Sprott (2004), and Muehling and Pascal (2011) determine that nostalgia evoked by an advertising increase attitude for the specific item in the advertisement and likelihood to purchase the specific item. Finally, drawing from Pascal et al. and Loveland et al. (2010), different nostalgia brands would invoke different usage based on the occasion. Formally,

- H1a. A difference between types of nostalgia exist for brand nostalgia.
- H1b. A difference between types of nostalgia exist for attitude toward the brand.
- H1c. A difference between types of nostalgia exist for purchase intention of the brand.
- H1d. A difference between types of nostalgia exist for usage occasion of the brand.

As Gineikiene and Rousseau and Venter (1999, 2000) discuss, little research exists on the predictiveness of brand nostalgia on attitude and consumption outcomes. Lambert-Pandraud and Lauraent (2010) find a small effect of nostalgia as a predictor of purchase. It would be expected that brand nostalgia would that as brand nostalgia increases feelings toward the brand would increase given the overall positive nature associated with nostalgia. Furthermore, brand nostalgia should impact positively the likelihood that an individual would purchase the brand because the individual would likely treat the brand as a stimulus associated with nostalgia. Finally, as brand nostalgia increases, the occasion that the individual uses the brand should increase because of the brand should evoke nostalgia and the associated memory, place, and time. Formally,

H2a: brand nostalgia should positively relate to attitude toward the brand
H2b: brand nostalgia should positively relate to purchase intention of the brand
H2c: brand nostalgia should positively relate to occasion to use the brand
Different types of products such as automobiles (Rindfleisch et al., 2000), perfume

(Lambert-Pandraud & Laurent, 2010), and photography equipment (Muehling & Pascal, 2011; Muehling & Sprott, 2004; Pascal et al., 2002) have been examined. Previously popular entertainment, household items, and durable goods have been considered (Loveland et al., 2010). Differences exist between the types of products and the attending attitudinal outcomes. Holak et al. (2006) expect that a difference exists in responses given different types of nostalgia brands. Hence, the predictiveness of brand nostalgia on brand attitude, likelihood to purchase the brand, and the occasion to use the brand should vary by the type of nostalgia brand. Formally,

H3a-f: a difference exists between brand nostalgia and to attitude toward the brand based on the type of nostalgia.

H4a-f: a difference exists between brand nostalgia and purchase intention of the brand based on the type of nostalgia.

H5a-f: a difference exists between brand nostalgia and to occasion to use the brand based on the type of nostalgia.

Method

Domain

Four Bourbon brands are selected to represent the four types of nostalgia, including: (1) true nostalgia, (2) retro nostalgia, (3) heritage nostalgia, and (4) false nostalgia. Bourbon could be considered a suitable domain for research on nostalgia because it the product has been on the market for more than 200 years. Also, bourbon as a domain appears consistent with other products incorporated in brand nostalgia research (Loveland et al., 2010; Pascal et al., 2002).

Bourbon generates an estimated \$8.6 billion in economic activity to Kentucky, where most of the worlds' Bourbon is distilled (Kentucky Distiller's Association, 2019). Bourbon exports account for \$363 million (Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, 2017) and drives tourism to towns that boast a distillery ((Kentucky Bourbon Trail, 2019). Given the paucity of

research involving Bourbon as a domain, its corresponding longevity in the market, and consistency with other products involved in brand nostalgia research, Bourbon appears as a suitable domain.

Nostalgia Brands

Jim Beam bourbon is selected as a true nostalgia brand because the product appears unchanged since its launch in 1935. The sour mash, which gives the product its taste, and the label remain the same. Rebel Yell bourbon is chosen as a retro nostalgia brand. The brand was launched in 1936 and was considered a bottom shelf or value product. In 2015, the bottle and label were redesigned in a more contemporary style and the sour mash is tweaked to appeal to a younger consumer (Weinstock, 2015). Hence, Rebel Yell fits the conceptualization of retro nostalgia brand (Brown et al., 2003b). High West bourbon is selected as a heritage brand. While the brand is launched in 2006, its bottle and label design draw inspiration from the frontier times of the American west and marketing material focus on the 19th century expedition of Lewis Clark to map and chart this territory (Caskers, n.d.). Finally, Country Hills bourbon is chosen as false nostalgia brand. While the bottle and brand draw inspiration from older, more established bourbon brands, the product does not exist.

Respondents were shown an image that included both the bottle and label of each brand along with corresponding scale items related to brand nostalgia, attitude toward the brand, purchase intuition of the brand, and usage occasion.

Survey

The overarching purpose of this paper remains understanding the types of brand nostalgia and its predictiveness of attitude and consumption-related outcomes. To test these hypotheses, a survey is created (see Figure 1). Brand Nostalgia appears as a six-item, nine-point Likert scale

and is extended from Muehling and Pascal (2011). Attitude Toward the Brand remains a five-item, nine-point semantic differential scale and is extended from Rossiter and Percy (1980) and Rosenberg, Pieters, and Wedel (1997). Purchase Intention appears as a three-item, nine-point Likert scale and is extended from Kilbourne (1986). Usage Occasion remains a six-item, nine-point Likert scale extended from Desai and Hoyer (2000).

Five respondents who would be eligible to complete this survey review the survey for misleading questions, unclear wording, and ambiguous statements. The survey is refined based on comments.

Sample

Responses in this study are collected through Amazon's M-Turk, which serves as electronic consumer panel (Buhrmester et al., 2011). The survey is launched Monday evening. The survey is closed when 250 completed responses are recorded. The survey is available for 48 hours before closing. Respondents received \$1.25 for completing the survey.

Of the 250 responses, fifty are removed due to signals that could reflect lack of engagement by the respondents. Such signals include unusually short response times, missing data, and/or lack of variation to responses to items. Hence, 200 responses are retained for analysis.

Respondents were required to be 21 years or older to participate in the study. That is, the respondent could legally purchase the product that is used in this study's domain.

Results

ANOVA

To test H1a-c, an ANOVA is conducted with the four types of brand nostalgia serving as the independent variable and brand nostalgia, attitude toward the brand, purchase intention of the brand, and usage occasion included as the dependent variables.

It is determined that there were outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot for values greater than 1.5 box-lengths from the edge of the box. To deal with the outliers, four responses are removed due to measurement errors. All other outliers were determined to be genuinely unusual variables and are retained in the analysis.

All four dependent measures lack normality as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$). To correct for this lack of normality, a log transformation is computed for the dependent measures. The logged values are used in the regression analysis as well.

Brand Nostalgia. The degree of nostalgia evoked by the brand (Brand Nostalgia score) is highest for true nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.22$), followed by heritage nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.46$, $SD = 0.3$), Retro Nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.3$), and lowest for false nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.3$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .000$). The amount of nostalgia evoked by the brand was statistically different for the different types of brands, Welch's $F(3, 428.383) = 6.045$, $p < .001$.

Bonferroni post hoc analysis reveals that the mean increases from true nostalgia to retro (0.087, 95% CI [0.0116, 0.1620]) was statistically significant ($p = .014$), as well as the increase from true to heritage (0.076, 95% CI [0.0011, 0.1515], $p = .045$), and true to false (0.089, 95% CI [0.0139, 0.1643], $p = .011$).

A simple contrast is conducted to determine whether there is a difference between two groups of our independent variable. There is a statistically significant decrease in Brand Nostalgia score from true ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.22$) to retro ($M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.3$), a mean decrease of 0.086 ($SE = 0.03$), $p = .001$, a statistically significant decrease in Brand Nostalgia score from true ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.22$) to heritage ($M = 1.46$, $SD = 0.3$), a mean decrease of 0.076 ($SE = 0.03$), $p = .004$, and a statistically significant decrease in Brand Nostalgia score from true ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.22$) to false ($M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.3$), a mean decrease of 0.089 ($SE = 0.03$), $p = .001$. H1a is supported.

Attitude Towards the Brand. The perceived quality of the brand (Attitude Towards the Brand) was highest for true nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.1$), followed by heritage nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.095$), retro nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.098$), and lowest for false nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.49$, $SD = 0.15$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances is violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .000$). The perceived quality of the brand appears statistically different for the different types of brands, Welch's $F(3, 429.084) = 4.007$, $p = .008$.

Bonferroni post hoc analysis revealed that the mean increase from true nostalgia to false (0.044, 95% CI [0.0139, 0.0748]) was statistically significant ($p = .001$), as well as the increase from retro to false (0.033, 95% CI [0.0028, 0.0636], $p = .024$), and heritage to false (0.037, 95% CI [0.0063, 0.0671], $p = .009$). There is a statistically significant decrease in Attitude Towards the Brand score from true ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.1$) to False ($M = 1.49$, $SD = 0.15$), a mean decrease of 0.044 ($SE = 0.01$), $p = .001$, a statistically significant decrease in Attitude Towards the Brand score from retro ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.098$) to false ($M = 1.49$, $SD = 0.15$), a mean decrease of 0.033 ($SE = 0.01$), $p = .011$, and a statistically significant decrease in Attitude Towards the

Brand score from heritage ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.095$) to false ($M = 1.49$, $SD = 0.15$), a mean decrease of 0.037 ($SE = 0.01$), $p = .005$. H1b is supported.

Purchase Intention. Purchase Intention (likelihood to purchase) is highest for true nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.28$, $SD = 0.146$), followed by heritage nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.26$, $SD = 0.168$), retro nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.25$, $SD = 0.183$), and lowest for false nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.22$, $SD = 0.179$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$). Purchase Intention is statistically different for the different types of brands, Welch's $F(3, 429.976) = 4.386$, $p = .005$. H1c is supported.

Bonferroni post hoc analysis reveals that the mean increase from true nostalgia to false (0.063, 95% CI [0.0156, 0.1109]) is statistically significant ($p = .003$). There is a statistically significant decrease in Purchase Intention score from true ($M = 1.28$, $SD = 0.146$) to retro ($M = 1.25$, $SD = 0.183$) a mean decrease of 0.037 ($SE = 0.02$), $p = .026$, and a statistically significant decrease in Purchase Intention score from true ($M = 1.28$, $SD = 0.146$) to false ($M = 1.22$, $SD = 0.179$), a mean decrease of 0.063 ($SE = 0.02$), $p = .001$.

Usage Occasion. Usage Occasion is highest for true nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.57$, $SD = 0.17$), followed by heritage nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.55$, $SD = 0.18$), retro nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.19$), and lowest for false nostalgia ($n = 196$, $M = 1.51$, $SD = 0.23$). The assumption of homogeneity of variances is violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .000$). Usage Occasion is statistically different for the different types of brands, Welch's $F(3, 431.038) = 3.331$, $p = .001$. H1d is supported.

Bonferroni post hoc analysis shows that the mean increase from true nostalgia to false (0.062, 95% CI [0.0100, 0.1134]) was statistically significant ($p = .01$). There was a statistically

significant decrease in Usage Occasion score from true ($M = 1.57$, $SD = 0.17$) to false ($M = 1.51$, $SD = 0.23$), a mean decrease of 0.062 ($SE = 0.02$), $p = .002$.

Regression

To test H2a-c, a bivariate weighted least squares (WLS) regression analysis is performed. WLS regression is selected because the assumption of heteroscedasticity is violated. That is a small change in the independent variable can predict a large change in the dependent variable. Brand Nostalgia serves as the independent variable.

Brand Nostalgia statistically significantly predicts Attitude Towards the Brand, $F(1, 782) = 581.07$, $p < .001$. H2a is supported. Brand Nostalgia accounts for 42.6% of the variation in overall attitude towards the brand with adjusted $R^2 = 42.0\%$.

Also, brand Nostalgia statistically significantly predicts Purchase Intention, $F(1, 194) = 116.88$, $p < .001$. H2b is supported. Brand Nostalgia accounted for 37.6% of the variation in overall likelihood to purchase the brand with adjusted $R^2 = 37.3\%$.

Finally, Brand Nostalgia statistically significantly predicts Usage Occasion, $F(1, 194) = 107.74$, $p < .001$. H2c is supported. Brand Nostalgia accounted for 35.7% of the variation in overall brand usage with adjusted $R^2 = 35.4\%$.

Multigroup Analysis

To test H3a-f, H4a-f, and H5a-f, a multigroup analysis is conducted. The unstandardized beta coefficient for each relationship is tested for each group using a t-test. Brand Nostalgia as a predictor of Attitude Towards the Brand appears statically significantly different when comparing Country Hill to Rebel Yell ($t = 2.76$, $p < .05$) and Country Hill to High West ($t = 2.63$, $p < .05$). H3e and H3f are supported. Also, Brand Nostalgia as a predictor of Purchase Intention appears statically significantly different when comparing Country Hill to Jim Beam ($t =$

2.55, $p < .05$), Country Hill to Rebel Yell ($t = 3.79$, $p < .05$) and Country Hill to High West ($t = 2.28$, $p < .05$). H4d, H4e and H4f are supported. All remaining hypothesized relationships lack statistical significance and are not supported.

Discussion

The research presented in this paper fills needed gaps in the literature on nostalgia. Broadly, types of nostalgia brands exist. Not all nostalgia is the same. Specifically, by including consumption measures along with attitudes, the role of brand nostalgia as a predictor can be better understood.

The results of this study indicate a difference between the four types of nostalgia brands and four psychographics. Not surprisingly, true nostalgia evokes more brand nostalgia compared to the other three types. Consistent with Holak et al. (2006), people who experience directly the brand at a previous time would most likely hold strong feelings of nostalgia toward that brand. Individuals appear more likely to purchase a true nostalgia brands or heritage nostalgia brand compared to retro nostalgia and false nostalgia. By evoking a link to either a direct experience in the case of true nostalgia brand or to an indirect experience in the case of heritage nostalgia brands (Holak et al.), individuals could express evocation through purchase.

Individuals held no attitude toward the false nostalgia brand while maintaining similar attitudes toward the other three types. Without actually experiencing the brand, individuals held not attitudes about it. That is, the false nostalgia brand did not create a false impression. Similarly, individuals unlikely to consume a false nostalgia brand compared to true nostalgia brand or a heritage nostalgia brand.

For managers, this analysis offers some potential insights. Retro brand nostalgia could require more promotional than simply a redesigned product and package. Without making

individuals aware of the updated brand, individuals could rely on previously held knowledge and beliefs about the product.

Also, managers should consider how to make a brand a part of the individual's life as early as possible. Over time, as the individual could be more likely to consider consuming brands that evoke nostalgia. By waiting to become a part of the individual's early experiences, the brand could forgo later sales.

Brand nostalgia also predicts individuals' attitude toward the brand, purchase intention of the brand, and usage occasion of the brand. A one percent increase in the individual's brand nostalgia increases attitude toward the brand by five percent, increases purchase intention by six percent, and increases usage by almost eight percent. Broadly, managers could develop advertising and promotion campaigns that emphasize a brand's history and relevance. Such a theme could increase an individual's nostalgia associated with the brand.

Compared to types of nostalgia brands, false nostalgia brand predicts attitude toward brand compared to heritage nostalgia brand and retro nostalgia brand. This result suggests a first impression affect or simply asking individuals for an attitude creates an attitude where none existed. Among the other three types of nostalgia brands, an increase would improve attitude regardless of type. That is, an advertising and promotion campaign's themes centered on nostalgia would have equal and likely impact on true nostalgia brand as for a heritage or retro nostalgia brand.

Individuals appear unlikely to purchase a false nostalgia brand compared to the other three types of nostalgia brands. Individuals though are just as likely to purchase the other three types. However, the four types of nostalgia brands do not differ on usage occasion.

For manager, introducing an established or existing brand into a new market should eschew an advertising theme that emphasizes the history of the brand because it will not resonate with individuals in terms of likelihood to purchase. Instead, managers should generate trialability in the form of sales promotion because individuals appear more likely to use the product compared to other forms of nostalgia brands.

Limitations

There are several limitations associated with this study. The brands selected for this study could reflect individual's knowledge or perceptions related to the brand's retail price. That is, individuals could have relied on price as a surrogate for quality.

Also, this study could have measured the level of awareness maintained over time through advertising and promotion budgets. That is, Jim Beam has long been the best selling bourbon in the United States' market. It enjoys multimillion-dollar marketing support from its owner, Beam-Suntory. Rebel Yell and High West lack such budgets.

By extension, individual's biases toward a particular bourbon brand or brands could have influenced the individual's response. Finally, this study relied on self-report measures related to perceptions, attitudes, and consumption with individuals recruited from a panel.

Directions for Future Research

This study points toward several possible research extensions. The results should be verified using a sample recruited from other sources in addition to MTurk. Also, the bourbon brands involved in this study should be changed to verify the role of the four types of nostalgia brands. Correspondingly, other product categories such as soft drink, toothpaste, or other consumer package good should serve as the domain. This effort would improve the generalizability of the study's findings.

Finally, objective data such as sales data as well as advertising and promotion expenditures would improve the predictiveness of the model and reduce the bias from relying on individuals' perceptions, attitudes, and consumption.

References

- Abeyta, A. A., Routledge, C., & Juhl, J. (2015). Looking Back to Move Forward: Nostalgia as a Psychological Resource for Promoting Relationship Goals and Overcoming Relationship Challenges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(6), 1029–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi00000361029>
- Baker, S. M., & Kennedy, P. F. (1994). Death By Nostalgia: A Diagnosis of Context-Specific Cases. *Advances in Consumer Research, 21*, 169–174.
- Batcho, K. I. (1995). Nostalgia: A psychological perspective. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 80*, 131–143.
- Brown, S., Kozinets, R. V., & Sherry, J. F. (2003a). Sell Me the Old, Old Story: Retromarketing Management and the Art of Brand Revival. *Journal of Customer Behaviour, 2*, 133–147.
- Brown, S., Kozinets, R. V., & Sherry, J. F. (2003b). Teaching Old Brands New Tricks: Retro Branding and the Revival of Brand Meaning. *Journal of Marketing, 67*, 19–33.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New Source of Inexpensive, Yet High-Quality, Data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- Caskers. (n.d.). *High West American Prairie Bourbon Whiskey*. Caskers: Take Pride In What You Drink. Retrieved March 22, 2020, from <https://www.caskers.com/high-west-american-prairie-bourbon/>
- Cox, C. R., Kersten, M., Routledge, C., Brown, E. M., & Van Enkevort, E. A. (2015). When past meets present: The relationship between website-induced nostalgia and well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*, 282–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12295>
- Davis, F. (1979). *Yearning for Yesterday: A sociology of Nostalgia*. Free Press.

- Desai, K. K., & Hoyer, W. D. (2000). Descriptive Characteristics of Memory-Based Consideration Sets: Influence of Usage Occasion Frequency and Usage Location Familiarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(3), 309–323.
- Distilled Spirits Council of the United States. (2017). *DISTILLED SPIRITS - EXPORTS BY VALUE DECEMBER 2017*. Distilled Spirits Council of the United States.
<https://www.distilledspirits.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Distilled-Spirits-Exports-Value-December-2017-1.pdf>
- Gineikiene, J. (2013). Consumer Nostalgia Literature Review and an Alternative Measurement Perspective. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, 4(2).
- Hallegatte, D., & Marticotte, F. (2014). Does Holbrook's Nostalgia Index Measure Nostalgia Proness? *AMA Winter Educators' Proceedings*.
- Hammond, W. A. (1883). *A Treatise on Insanity in Its Medical Relations*. Appleton and Company.
- Holak, S. L., Havlena, W. J., & Matveev, A. V. (2006). Exploring Nostalgia in Russia: Testing the Index of Nostalgia-Proneness. *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 7, 195–200.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Schindler, R. M. (1994). Age, Sex, and Attitude Toward the Past As Predictors of Consumers' Tastes for Cultural Products. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 412–422.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Schindler, R. M. (1996). Segmentation Based on Age and Attitude Toward the Past: Concepts, Methods, and Findings Concerning Nostalgic Influences on Consumer Tastes. *Journal of Business Research*, 23(3), 326–350.

- Kentucky Bourbon Trail. (2019, February 6). *MAKE IT A DOUBLE: NEW STUDY SHOWS BOURBON INDUSTRY HAS DOUBLED ECONOMIC IMPACT IN 10 YEARS*. Kentucky Bourbon Trail. <https://kybourbontrail.com/make-it-a-double-new-study-shows-bourbon-industry-has-doubled-economic-impact-in-10-years/>
- Kentucky Distiller's Association. (2019, February 6). *Make It A Double: New Study Shows Bourbon Industry Has Doubled Economic Impact In 10 Years*. Kentucky Distiller's Association. <https://kybourbon.com/make-it-a-double-new-study-shows-bourbon-industry-has-doubled-economic-impact-in-10-years/>
- Kilbourne, W. E. (1986). An Exploratory Study of the Effect of Sex Role Stereotyping on Attitudes Toward Magazine Advertisements. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14(4), 43–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009207038601400407>
- Lambert-Pandraud, R., & Laurent, G. (2010). Why Do Older Consumers Buy Older Brands? The Role of Attachment and Declining Innovativeness. *Journal of Marketing*, 74, 104–121.
- Loveland, K. E., Smeesters, D., & Mandel Naomi. (2010). Still Preoccupied with 1995: The Need to Belong and Preference for Nostalgic Products. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(3), 393–408.
- Muehling. (2013). The relative influence of advertising-evoked personal and historical nostalgic thoughts on consumers' brand attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 19(2), 98–113.
- Muehling, D. D., & Pascal, V. J. (2011). AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF PERSONAL, HISTORICAL, AND NON-NOSTALGIC ADVERTISING ON CONSUMER RESPONSES. *Journal of Advertising*, 40(2), 107–122.

- Muehling, D. D., & Sprott, D. E. (2004). The Power of Reflection: An Empirical Examination of Nostalgia Advertising Effects. *Journal of Advertising*, 33(3), 25–35.
- Pascal, V. J., Sprott, D. E., & Muehling, D. D. (2002). The Influence of Evoked Nostalgia on Consumers' Responses to Advertising: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 24(1), 39–47.
- <https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2002.10505126>
- Reisenwitz, T. H., Iyer, R., & Cutler, B. (2004). Nostalgia Advertising and the Influence of Nostalgia Proneness. *Marketing Management Journal*, 14(2), 55–66.
- Rindfleisch, A., Freeman, D., & Burroughs, J. E. (2000). Nostalgia, Materialism, and Product Preference: An Initial Inquiry. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 27(34–35).
- Rosenberg, E., Pieters, R., & Wedel, M. (1997). Visual attention to advertising: A segment-level analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(3), 305–314.
- Rossiter, J. R., & Percy, L. (1980). Attitude Change through Visual Imagery in Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(2), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1980.10673313>
- Roussau, G. G., & Venter, D. J. L. (1999). The Influence of Nostalgia on Consumer Preference. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 25(2), 36–42.
- Roussau, G. G., & Venter, D. J. L. (2000). The Relationship Between Nostalgia and Consumer Preference: Replication and Extension. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 26(2), 32–36.
- Sierra, J. J., & McQuitty, S. (2007). Attitudes and Emotions as Determinants of Nostalgia Purchases: An Application of Social Identity Theory. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 99–112.
- Weinstock, S. (2015, April 27). *Whiskey Review: Rebel Yell Bourbon*. The Whiskey Wash. <https://thewhiskeywash.com/whiskey-styles/bourbon/whiskey-review-rebel-yell-bourbon/>

Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Arndt, J., & Routledge, C. (2006). *Nostalgia: Content, Triggers, Functions*. *91*(5), 975–993. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.975>

Zhou, X., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., & Gao, D.-G. (2008). Counteracting Loneliness On the Restorative Function of Nostalgia. *Psychological Science*, *19*(10), 1023–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02194.x>

Appendix

Table 1. Summary of Previous Nostalgia Studies

Researchers	Types of Nostalgia	Antecedents	Moderator or Mediator	Outcomes	Stimulus	Field
Aytekin (2018)	Nostalgia	NA	NA	Semiotical analysis	Print Ads	Marketing
Wang, Keh & Chao (2018)	Nostalgia	NA	Social connectedness	Consumer preference, consumption	Indulgent foods	Marketing
Barauskaite & Gineikiene (2017)	Nostalgia	Innovativeness	NA	Consumer purchasing decisions, Product judgement	Consumer goods, cultural products	Marketing
Sedikides, Cheung, Wildschut, et al. (2017)	Nostalgia	Age, geographic location	Positive affect	Meaning in life	Goals	Psychology
Shields & Johnson (2016)	Nostalgia	Nostalgia Proneness	Brand Nostalgia	Perception, Consumption	Consumer goods	Marketing Psychology
Hallegatte (2014)	Nostalgia,	NA	NA	Revitalization vs. Retrobranding	NA	Marketing
Scola & Gordon (2014)	Nostalgia, Retro Marketing	NA	NA	Consumption	Sports imagery, merchandise, venue, promos, ads	Marketing
Merchant, Latour, Ford & Latour (2013)	Personal Nostalgia	NA		Personal Nostalgia Dimensions	Ads	Advertising
Muehling (2013)	Personal, Historical Nostalgia	NA	NA	Attitude toward the ad, Attitude toward the brand	Print ads for a fictitious brand of digital camera (Foton)	Marketing
Muehling & Pascal (2011)	Personal, Historical Nostalgia	NA	Positive affect	Positive Feeling, Attitude towards ad, Attitude towards brand, Message recall	Ad for fictitious brand of digital camera	Marketing
Loveland, Smeesters, & Mandel (2010)	Nostalgia	Need to belong	NA	Exposure Selection Consumption	Movies, TV programs, cookies, crackers, shower	Psychology Marketing

					gel, soup, candy, and cars	
Lambert-Pandraud & Laurent (2010)	Nostalgia	Age	Innovativeness, attachment	Preference for brand, Actual ownership	Perfume	Marketing
Evans, Hart, Cicala, & Sherrell (2010)	Traditional Nostalgia, Progressive Nostalgia	Risk, gender, age	NA	Celebrity attitude scale	Deceased celebrities	Marketing
Ford & Merchant (2010)	Personal Nostalgia	NA	NA	Levels of emotions Donation intentions	Charity donations	Advertising
Chou & Lien (2010)	Nostalgia	NA	NA	Ad related thoughts and ad attitude	cookie bar and chocolate	Marketing
Sierra & McQuitty (2007)	Nostalgia	attitudes about the past, yearning for the past	NA	Intentions to purchase nostalgic products	Music, Toy, Literature, Movie, Artwork, Clothing, Sports, Memorabilia, Candy, Furniture, Vehicle, Technology, Outdoor, Equipment, Firework, Home, Perfume	Marketing
Holak, Havlena, & Matveev (2006)	personal nostalgia, interpersonal nostalgia, cultural nostalgia, virtual nostalgia	Age	NA	Nostalgia classification in Russia	Writing down nostalgic experiences related to objects, events, and persons	Marketing Psychology
Reisenwitz, Iyer, & Cutler (2004)	Societal, Individual Nostalgia	Age, gender	NA	Feeling of nostalgia toward the ad Feeling of nostalgia toward the brand	Advertising for 2 low-involvement product categories	Marketing
Muehling & Sprott (2004)	Nostalgia	Age, gender	NA	attitudes toward the ad	Print	Marketing

				attitudes toward the advertised brand	advertisement of photo product	
Brown, Kozinets, & Sherry Jr (2003)	Nostalgia, Retro brands	NA	NA	Brand Meaning, retro branding, retro marketing	Disney movies, vehicles,	Marketing
Schindler & Holbrook (2003)	Nostalgia	Gender, age, product type	NA	Liking of the product	Automobiles	Marketing
Pascal, Sprott, & Muehling (2002)	Nostalgia	NA	NA	Advertising outcomes: attitudes towards advertising, brand attitudes, likelihood of purchase	Advertisement of durable and non-durable photo products	Marketing
Goulding (2001)	First-order Nostalgia, Vicarious Nostalgia	Occupied roles, degree of alienation in the present, desire for social contact, selective recall of the past	NA	NA	Visiting living museum	Marketing Psychology
Roussau & Venter (2000)	Nostalgia	Language, age, income, education	NA	Consumer nostalgic preference, Vintage/antiques propensity, Progressiveness	Arts, consumer products, fashion, furniture, music	Psychology
Rindfleisch, Freeman, & Burroughs (2000)	Nostalgia	Materialism	NA	Product preference	Automobiles	Marketing
Rousseau & Venter (1999)	Nostalgia	Individual, Environmental Demographic, Psychographic variables	Progressiveness	Consumer Preference, Purchases Consumption patterns	Arts, cultural entertainment, consumer products, technology, fashion and clothing, collection of antiques	Psychology
Batcho (1995)	Nostalgia	Age, World View	NA	Nostalgia Proneness	20-item scale	Psychology

				Scale Development		
Holbrook & Schindler (1994)	Nostalgia	Age, Gender		Preference towards movie stars	Movie stars photos	Marketing
Baker & Kennedy (1994)	Real, Simulated, and Collective Nostalgia	NA	NA	Attitude towards advertising	Print advertisement	Marketing
Holbrook (1993)	Nostalgia	Age, Gender		Movie preference	Movies	Marketing
Holak & Havlena (1992)	Personal, Historical Nostalgia	NA	NA	NA	Family, home, persons, objects, events, sights, smells, tastes	Marketing Psychology
Stem (1992)	Personal, Historical Nostalgia	NA	NA	NA	Advertisements, periodicals, and direct mail catalogues	Advertising
Holbrook (1991)	Nostalgia	Age		Preference	Music	Marketing
Holbrook & Schindler (1989)	Nostalgia	Age		Preference	Music	Marketing

Table 2. Demographic Variables

Sex	Count	%
Male	112	56.00%
Female	88	44.00%
Prefer not to say	0	0.00%
Age	Count	%
21 - 24	8	4.00%
25 - 34	97	48.50%
35 - 44	41	20.50%
45 - 54	30	15.00%
55 - 64	20	10.00%
65 - 74	4	2.00%
75 - 84	0	0.00%
85 or older	0	0.00%
Marital Status	Count	%
Married	136	68.00%
Widowed	4	2.00%
Divorced	6	3.00%
Never married	39	19.50%
Domestic relationship or common law marriage	15	7.50%
Work Status	Count	%
Employed part time (i.e., less than 35 hours a week)	32	16.00%
Employed full time (i.e., 35 hours or more a week)	151	75.50%
Retired	2	1.00%
Unemployed	8	4.00%
Self employed or independent contractor	7	3.50%

Table 2. Demographic Variables Cont.

Income	Count	%
Less than \$20,000	16	8.00%
\$20,000 - \$39,999	55	27.50%
\$40,000 - \$59,999	41	20.50%
\$60,000 - \$79,999	44	22.00%
\$80,000 - \$99,999	23	11.50%
\$100,000 - \$119,999	9	4.50%
\$120,000 - \$139,999	5	2.50%
\$140,000 - \$159,999	4	2.00%
\$160,000 - \$179,000	0	0.00%
\$180,000 - \$199,999	1	0.50%
\$200,000 or more	2	1.00%
Education	Count	%
Less than high school	0	0.00%
High school graduate	11	5.50%
Some college but no degree	12	6.00%
2 year degree (e.g., AA, AS, AAS)	15	7.50%
4 year degree (e.g., BA, BS)	143	71.50%
Graduate/Professional degree (e.g, MBA, JD, PhD, MA)	19	9.50%

Table 3. Analysis of Variance in the Dimension of Brand Nostalgia in Response to Type of Brand.

		SS	df	MS	F	p
Likelihood to Purchase Type of Brand	Between Groups	0.400	3	0.133	4.193	0.006
	Within Groups	24.790	780	0.032		
	Total	25.190	783			
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Brand Nostalgia Type of Brand	Between Groups	1.057	3	0.352	4.448	0.004
	Within Groups	61.789	780	0.079		
	Total	62.846	783			
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Brand Attitude Type of Brand	Between Groups	0.226	3	0.075	5.811	0.001
	Within Groups	10.113	780	0.013		
	Total	10.339	783			
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Usage Occasion Type of Brand	Between Groups	0.380	3	0.127	3.388	0.018
	Within Groups	29.194	780	0.037		
	Total	29.575	783			

Table 4a. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Brand Attitude.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.736	[0.669, 0.804]		21.390	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.512	[0.470, 0.553]	0.653	24.105	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.426$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 4b. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Jim Beam Brand Attitude.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.742	[0.579, 0.905]		8.964	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.508	[0.407, 0.608]	0.582	9.959	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.426$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 4c. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Rebel Yell Brand Attitude.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.826	[0.712, 0.941]		14.215	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.458	[0.387, 0.528]	0.676	12.767	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.426$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 4d. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting High West Brand Attitude.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.821	[0.695, 0.947]		12.847	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.460	[0.382, 0.537]	0.642	11.676	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.426$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 4e. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Country Hills Brand Attitude.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.570	[0.432, 0.708]		8.141	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.612	[0.527, 0.698]	0.713	14.145	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.426$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 5a. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Overall Likelihood to Purchase.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.210	[0.132, 0.289]		5.273	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.684	[0.636, 0.732]	0.706	27.850	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 5b. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Jim Beam Likelihood to Purchase.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.249	[0.052, 0.445]		2.498	0.013
Brand Nostalgia	0.662	[0.541, 0.783]	0.613	10.811	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 5c. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Rebel Yell Likelihood to Purchase.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.194	[0.063, 0.325]		2.930	0.004
Brand Nostalgia	0.696	[0.615, 0.776]	0.775	17.071	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 5d. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting High West Likelihood to Purchase.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.300	[0.133, 0.467]		3.551	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.626	[0.523, 0.728]	0.654	12.048	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 5e. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Country Hills Likelihood to Purchase.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.109	[-0.027, 0.244]		1.584	0.115
Brand Nostalgia	0.747	[0.663, 0.830]	0.785	17.662	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.373$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 6a. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Overall Usage Occasion.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.408	[0.324, 0.493]		9.483	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.748	[0.696, 0.800]	0.711	28.251	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.354$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 6b. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Jim Beam Usage Occasion.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.447	[0.224, 0.671]		3.948	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.724	[0.586, 0.861]	0.598	10.380	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.354$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 6c. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Rebel Yell Usage Occasion.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.381	[0.231, 0.531]		5.007	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.766	[0.673, 0.858]	0.761	16.341	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.354$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 6d. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting High West Usage Occasion.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.461	[0.304, 0.619]		5.773	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.714	[0.617, 0.811]	0.722	14.539	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.354$ CI = confidence interval for B

Table 6e. Regression Analysis Summary for Brand Nostalgia Predicting Country Hills Usage Occasion.

Source	B	95% CI	β	t	p
(Constant)	0.349	[0.200, 0.498]		4.626	0.000
Brand Nostalgia	0.785	[0.693, 0.877]	0.771	16.852	0.000

Note: adjusted $R^2 = 0.354$ CI = confidence interval for B

Figure 1. Bottle Brands and Labels



Attitude Towards the Brand.

Viewing the image above: what is your attitude towards this brand?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Low Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	High Quality
Unsatisfactory	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Satisfactory
Common	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Distinctive
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Interesting
No Value for Money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Value for Money

Age

- 21 - 24
- 25 - 34
- 35 - 44
- 45 - 54
- 55 - 64
- 65 - 74
- 75 - 84
- 85 or older

Sex

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

Please mark your current marital status.

- Married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Never married
- Domestic relationship or common law marriage

Please check the response that fits closest to your current work status.

- Employed part time (i.e., less than 35 hours a week)
- Employed full time (i.e., 35 hours or more a week)
- Retired
- Unemployed
- Self-employed or independent contractor

Please mark your household income before taxes and other deductions.

- Less than \$20,000
- \$20,000 - \$39,999
- \$40,000 - \$59,999
- \$60,000 - \$79,999
- \$80,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 - \$119,999
- \$120,000 - \$139,999
- \$140,000 - \$159,999
- \$160,000 - \$179,000
- \$180,000 - \$199,999
- \$200,000 or more

Please check your highest level of educational attainment.

- Less than high school
- High school graduate
- Some college but no degree
- 2 year degree (e.g., AA, AS, AAS)
- 4 year degree (e.g., BA, BS)
- Graduate/Professional degree (e.g, MBA, JD, PhD, MA)