

Received: August 29, 2024
Revision received: March 3, 2025
Accepted: March 3, 2025

<https://doi.org/10.54155/jbs.42.1.13-25>

Historical Nostalgia, Personal Nostalgia, and the Kidult: Comparing Older and Younger Consumers

Timothy H. Reisenwitz^a

^a Langdale College of Business Administration, Valdosta State University, 1500 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, GA 31698
treisenw@valdosta.edu

Abstract

Nostalgia, a longing for the past, has been used successfully by marketers via nostalgia marketing or retro-marketing, including retro-branding, of goods and/or services. The nostalgia market has stereotypically been of interest to older consumers so it is surprising that a significant number of Generation Y (Millennials) and Generation Z consumers have taken an interest in nostalgia and retro brands. Moreover, an emerging market segment dominated by younger consumers is “kidults,” younger adults who prefer media or items from their childhood which helps them escape to a simpler, earlier time in their lives. These trends have impacted the two levels of nostalgia: historical and personal. This study attempted to empirically determine if younger consumers are engaged in nostalgia to a greater degree than older consumers. Scale items for historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, and kidult scales were developed. A hard copy questionnaire was distributed among older and younger consumers. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data. The study provided evidence that the stereotypical, traditional assumption that older consumers are more nostalgic does not necessarily apply in today’s marketplace. Theoretical and practical implications for marketers are offered based on the results.

Keywords

Historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, kidult, younger consumers, older consumers.

1. Introduction

Nostalgia, the sentimental longing for the past, has been popular in recent years (Muehling et al., 2014). Marketers have used this tactic to their advantage since an ad based on nostalgia may result in positive brand attitudes and purchase intentions. The term, nostalgia, has origins in the 17th century. Hofer’s (1688) dissertation introduced nostalgia as a theoretical construct and for cen-

turies it was considered a psychological problem related to homesickness causing melancholy, depression, and loneliness (Youn & Jin, 2017). Davis (1979) is credited with the seminal work redefining nostalgia as a consumer psychological construct. Davis (1979) defined nostalgia as a “positively toned evocation of a lived past in the context of some negative feeling toward the present or impending circumstance” (p. 18). His view on nostalgia is consistent with the consumer psychologist’s

perspective that things were better then than now. Holbrook (1993) define nostalgia as “a preference (general liking, positive attitude, or favorable affect) toward objects (people, places, or things) that were common (popular, fashionable, or widely circulated) when one was younger (in early adulthood, in adolescence, in childhood, or even before birth)” (p. 330). Although much of nostalgia is associated with an idealized recollection of the past, the construct is oftentimes discussed in conjunction with the term, “bittersweet,” (Kim & Yim, 2018; Merchant et al., 2013; Muehling & Pascal, 2011; Muehling et al., 2014; Youn & Jin, 2017), and “a basket of positive and negative emotions” (Merchant et al., 2013). Bittersweet emotions are a combination of happy and sad feelings, sometimes experienced simultaneously (Muehling & Pascal, 2011).

Nostalgia has been used in advertising that directly asks consumers to remember their past, as well as scenes that reminisce about brands and commercial jingles from the past. These messages cover a broad range of consumer products and services including soft drinks, alcohol, cereals, insurance, and banking (Merchant et al., 2013). Most academicians recognize two types of nostalgia: historical and personal.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to develop items to measure historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, and the kidult and use these measures to assess whether the interest in nostalgia is significantly greater among younger consumers (Generation Y and Generation Z) than older consumers (Matures, Baby Boomers, and Generation X). The surge of nostalgia by younger consumers has been reported in the non-academic literature but has yet to be empirically tested or confirmed. Traditionally, and intuitively, nostalgia, particularly personal nostalgia, was considered to be more prevalent among older age segments, since they have more to be nostalgic about. The study begins with a literature review with hypotheses development. It continues with the questionnaire administration, analysis, and interpretation of results. Finally, theoretical and practical contributions are discussed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical and personal nostalgia

Much has been written regarding nostalgia since Holbrook (1993) offered one of the first scales to measure nostalgia proneness. Unfortunately, his eight-item index has various shortcomings and does not measure nostalgia proneness, according to Hallegatte and Marticotte (2014): “it conflates the cause (nostalgia) with the consequence (preference); it does not consider nostalgia as an emotion; and it opposes the past to the present and future” (p. C-84).

Alternatively, at about the same time as the introduction of the unidimensional Holbrook (1993) Index, Stern (1992) and Havlena and Holak (1991) suggested that there are two types of nostalgia: historical and personal. Historical nostalgia is derived from a time not experienced by the individual, usually before he or she was born, i.e., “the way it was.” Historical nostalgia expresses the desire to experience a time in the distant past that is viewed as more desirable than the present. Personal nostalgia is generated from one’s own past life experiences, i.e., “the way I was” (Havlena & Holak, 1991; Stern, 1992). In contrast to historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia idealizes the personally remembered past, often a reconstructed fiction of what was experienced earlier in life, longing for what was considered the “home” of one’s childhood, i.e., homesickness.

Most subsequent nostalgia research has recognized these two types (Kim & Yim, 2018; Marchegiani & Phau, 2007a, 2007b; Marchegiani & Phau, 2010; Merchant et al., 2013; Muehling & Pascal, 2011; Muehling et al., 2014; Youn & Jin, 2017). These researchers concur that historical nostalgia takes place before one’s birth, i.e., a time that cannot be personally experienced. In contrast, personal nostalgia consists of positive reflections from one’s life. König and Larsen (2017) concur with previous research that people feel nostalgic for age 23 and may form lifetime product preferences at that age. This distinction is important to academicians and practitioners since, apparently, two nostalgia appeals are necessary.

Whether historical or personal, the resulting nos-

talistic emotion is thought to be great enough to positively affect brand attitudes and purchase intentions when implemented in a promotional campaign (Muehling et al., 2014). Nostalgia has also become a way for brands to return to earlier types of packaging and advertising. It is also a way to expand customer segments and engage in differentiation in a crowded product or service category. Through nostalgia, brands can achieve credibility, authenticity, durability, and quality (Kessous & Roux, 2013).

Historical nostalgia: Older and younger consumers

There is little current academic literature regarding consumers and historical or personal nostalgia. Moreover, most academic and non-academic sources regarding baby boomers are 20 years old, well before most members of Generation Z were even born. A fairly recent study (Oğuz, 2017) found that brand loyalty and retro-marketing perceptions of members of Generation X were higher than Generation Y and Generation Z. Another study of Generation X and Y consumers (Heyns et al., 2023) found that the only direct positive effect nostalgia could have toward brand loyalty toward Disney was among Generation Y consumers. Additionally, Madoglou et al. (2017) predictably found that “Older people seemed to be more prone to nostalgia and communicated their nostalgic experiences more often than younger individuals” (p.60). There was no specificity of historical and personal nostalgia in those studies as well as the study by Holotova et al. (2020). Their study surveyed generational cohorts to assess their feelings toward the purchase of retro local and global food brands. The authors stated that their findings could be helpful to marketers in creating successful retro-marketing campaigns.

In contrast, there is a substantial amount of literature in the non-academic literature regarding younger consumers and their interest in nostalgia, usually with an industry focus. In regard to historical nostalgia and younger consumers, these industries include fashion and soft drinks.

Members of Generation Z were not born or cannot remember the decade of the 1990s, yet have

a historical interest in the period. The Chanel suit collection from 1995 is enjoying a resurgence thanks to Generation Z. The 1990s are the focus of the revival; a time when fashion wasn't so serious (Cochrane, 2021). Generation Z is also credited with bringing back several fashion trends from the 1990s, including baggy jeans and the preppy aesthetic provided by brands like Ralph Lauren during the same period (Syme, 2023). Members of both Generation Y and Generation Z are consumers of fashion trends from the 1950s to 2000. Over 50% of Threadheads' brand clothing sales from these decades are attributed to Generation Y and Generation Z. Threadheads is an online clothing store featuring pop culture-powered tees, clothing, and accessories (<https://threadheads.com>). Interestingly, these younger consumers find it easier to look back to the past using the Internet, which has so many of these nostalgic products available. In soft drinks, Pepsi released a new logo based on the design used from 1987-1997 to address a surging nostalgia from Generation Z for the era (Syme, 2023).

Based on the previous discussion, it is hypothesized that younger consumers will hark back to times before their birth, i.e., historical nostalgia, more than older consumers:

Hypothesis 1. *Younger consumers have greater historical nostalgia than older consumers.*

Personal nostalgia and the kidult

Younger consumers are also expressing an interest in personal nostalgia toward bookstores, music, TV programs, video games, soft drinks, and clothing. Millennials and Gen Z consumers are nostalgic for the bookstore chains of the 1990s (Hoffower, 2022), as evidenced by the expansion of the number of independent bookstores and Barnes & Noble locations. Young adults seek comfort as a result of the pandemic and can find this comfort at the local bookstore. They also miss music videos and interviews with their favorite musicians on MTV and MuchMusic. MuchMusic is relaunching itself to provide the wave of 1990s music as younger consumers long for a simpler time (Niazi, 2021). Younger consumers are also missing the television programs and video

games they grew up with (Martinez, 2016). Millennials welcome the return of the television channel Nickelodeon broadcasting popular 1990s cartoons. Video games like “Halo” and movies such as “Toy Story 3” and “Finding Dory,” the sequel to the 2003 animated movie, “Finding Nemo,” are seeing renewed popularity. In the soft drink market, Coca-Cola has reintroduced Surge, which was discontinued in 2003. Surge was offered in a limited amount on Amazon.com but demand was so profound, especially among younger male consumers, that Coke now offers the drink at convenience stores and gas stations.

A growing and significant market that affects personal nostalgia in marketing is the emergence of the “kidult,” in which adults follow children’s values. The kidult is a term that refers to adults who engage with childhood interests, allowing them to reconnect with a simpler time in their lives. Driving this trend is a strong sense of personal nostalgia, which acts as a motivator for kidults (Wiederhold, 2024). Therefore, it can be considered as a special case of personal nostalgia. The term was first used by Martin in 1985. It was later defined as a successful, middle-aged individual of high social status who still enjoys childhood interests such as tales, cartoons, toys, etc. (Dvornyk, 2016). They are adult collectors who connect with their inner kid and are “young at heart,” experiencing “remembrance bumps” (Carrione, 2022). They comprise a growing group of adults who distance themselves from reality and stress, trying to find stability in past experiences (Carrione, 2022; Dvornyk, 2016). They want to escape to a simpler, earlier time in their lives (Pavely, 2020). Kidults purchase toys, board games, craft or building kits, and collectibles (“Amid a Nostalgia Wave, the Kidult Market is Growing,” 2022) that remind them of their childhood. The group contributes to about one-quarter of all annual toy sales (Carrione, 2022; Whitten, 2022). Somewhat surprisingly, over half of the kidult market consists of Millennials (Generation Y), who have more recently left their childhoods compared to previous generations. Millennials is the generational cohort that Kessous and Roux (2013) identify as the kidult group when describing their four consumer profiles and four cat-

egories of nostalgic brands. Furthermore, males and females are fairly equally represented in this group (Pavely, 2020).

Hypothesis 2. *Younger consumers have greater levels of personal nostalgia than older consumers.*

Hypothesis 3. *Younger consumers identify as kidults more than older consumers.*

Hypothesis 4. *Younger males identify as kidults as much as younger females.*

In research by Kim and Yim (2018), Study 1 and Study 2 found that nostalgia differs by age and gender. Although not identifying a focus on historical or personal nostalgia, an examination of their treatments for both studies focused on personal nostalgia. They found that older men feel more youthful than older women when exposed to nostalgia. Kim and Yim (2018) state that women are judged more critically based on age and therefore may be averse to nostalgia and its potential link to aging. Similarly, Schindler and Holbrook (2003) found that men show nostalgic attachment to styles popular during their youth (i.e., personal nostalgia) more than women. Moreover, the influence of nostalgia on conspicuous consumption and impulse buying was stronger for male consumers (Cho et al., 2025). In contrast, adult and older females experienced more autobiographical (personal) nostalgia in a study by Madoglou et al. (2017).

In a relatively early study (Batcho, 1995), although significant differences were found for nostalgia across age groups (median age of 20), gender was not significant in any of the analyses to assess nostalgia. Although not identified as personal nostalgia, personal nostalgia was inferred due to the items that Batcho (1995) employed. Similarly, in their more recent study, Kim and Yim (2018) found that younger adults experienced no gender differences.

Due to conflicting research results regarding personal nostalgia and gender in older age groups, the following hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis 5. *There are no significant differences in personal nostalgia between older males and older females.*

Since there were no differences in the findings for personal nostalgia in younger age groups, the following hypothesis is offered:

Hypothesis 6. *There are no significant differences in personal nostalgia between younger males and younger females.*

3. METHODS

A primary data survey research design was used in this study. A hard-copy questionnaire consisting of a cover page describing the study and compliance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) mandates was designed. The next page contained all of the demographic questions. The following pages included the psychographic multiple-item measures: historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, and the kidult.

A pretest was conducted with a convenience sample of 31 undergraduate business students at a medium-sized university. There were no concerns with the structure of the questionnaire so no changes were made as a result of the pretest. The sample was a variation of the convenience sampling method, which has been successful in previous research studies (Jones & Reynolds, 2006). Undergraduate students at a medium-sized university were given the exercise as part of their semester course grades to find older and younger respondents. It was necessary to use this method so that an almost equal number of older and younger respondents would comprise the final sample, facilitating comparisons between the two groups.

Based on the demographic data collected, summarized in Table 1, the typical older consumer (Matures, Baby Boomers, Generation X) in this study is male, earns over \$70,000 annually, is married, white (Caucasian), has completed high school, and works for a company or business. Similar in all demographics except marital status, the typical younger consumer (Generation Y, Generation Z) in this study is male, earns over \$70,000 annually, is single, white (Caucasian), has completed high school, and works for a company or business.

Measures

Multiple-item scales were designed for use in this study. Scales for historical and personal nostalgia were designed based on the literature and also scale development studies done by Marchegiani and Phau (2007b), who conducted scale generation, purification, validation (criterion or predictive, convergent, and discriminant validity), and confirmation. They identified five components for historical nostalgia and six components for personal nostalgia via confirmatory factor analysis. Since scale items were not provided in the Marchegiani and Phau (2007b) study, a seven-item, seven-point, strongly disagree to strongly agree, scale, was designed for both historical nostalgia and personal nostalgia based on their components. Additionally, a six-item seven-point, strongly disagree to strongly agree, scale was generated for the kidult. All scales were tested in this study for reliability and a confirmatory factor analysis (construct validity) was conducted to determine the final items for each of the three scales.

Reliability and Factor Analysis

Reliability coefficients were computed for each of the scales. Coefficient alphas were reported for the sample. All alpha values are at or above the 0.70 value recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Table 2 presents the reliability of the scales.

An exploratory factor analysis was run to identify whether the scale items build the expected constructs in support of construct validity. The suitability of the scale items for the factor analysis is determined by Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) Test and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The KMO Test checks the sample adequacy to conduct the factor analysis. A high value of KMO is expected, and a value below 0.5 is not acceptable. The KMO-value of the analysis is 0.843, as seen in Table 3. Bartlett's Test checks scale items correlation. A high correlation among variables implies that the variables are suitable for structure detection. A significance level < 0.05 indicates that factor analysis is useful within the data. The significance value of the analysis is < 0.001, as seen in Table 3. The rotated component matrix, as shown in Table 3, is useful to form

Table 1: Descriptive Information of the Sample*

Items		Older Consumers n=104		Younger Consumers n=106	
Gender	Male	51%	(54)	55%	(58)
	Female	43%	(45)	42%	(45)
Income	0-10k	3%	(3)	19%	(20)
	10,001-30k	16%	(17)	21%	(22)
	30,001-50k	19%	(20)	22%	(23)
	50,001-70k	17%	(18)	12%	(13)
	Above 70k	42%	(44)	25%	(27)
Marital Status	Married	54%	(57)	10%	(11)
	Single	17%	(18)	73%	(77)
	Living with another	7%	(7)	10%	(11)
	Widowed	10%	(11)	0%	(0)
	Separated	2%	(2)	1%	(1)
	Divorced	8%	(8)	3%	(3)
	Rather not say	1%	(1)	3%	(3)
Race	White (Caucasian)	59%	(62)	48%	(51)
	African American	27%	(28)	36%	(38)
	Hispanic American	8%	(8)	7%	(8)
	Pacific Islander	1%	(1)	0%	(0)
	Asian American	2%	(2)	5%	(5)
	Native American	2%	(2)	3%	(3)
	Other	1%	(1)	1%	(1)
Education Completed	GED	6%	(6)	5%	(5)
	High School	37%	(39)	46%	(49)
	Undergraduate	14%	(15)	25%	(27)
	Graduate	23%	(24)	13%	(14)
	Professional Degree	11%	(12)	6%	(6)
	Other	7%	(7)	4%	(4)
Occupation	Student	0%	(0)	41%	(44)
	Work for Company/Business	68%	(71)	51%	(54)
	Homemaker/Not Employed	16%	(17)	2%	(2)
	Self-Employed	9%	(9)	5%	(5)
	Other	0%	(0)	1%	(1)

*Sample (n)

Older Consumers (104): Matures, 1945 and prior (9); Baby Boomers, 1946-64 (36); Generation X, 1965-80 (59)

Younger Consumers (106): Generation Y, 1981-96 (42); Generation Z, 1997-2012 (64)

Table 2: Reliability Coefficients

Scale/Statements	<i>Coefficient Alpha</i>
Historical Nostalgia	0.86
I wish I was born in a previous era. I would like to experience how things were before I was born. Times were better before my birth. I have positive feelings about lifestyles before my birth. Generations before me had happier lives. I was born after the “good old days.” My life would be better if I could live during a time before I was born.	
Personal Nostalgia	0.89
*Things were better when I was younger. I miss the good times of my early years. *I have great memories of my younger days. My early years were happier times. Life was more enjoyable when I was younger. Sometimes I long for the earlier days of my life. I get sentimental thinking about my younger years.	
Kidult	0.84
I still enjoy doing the things I did during my childhood. I like to watch the cartoons I watched during my childhood. *I play with the toys that I had when I was a kid. Doing the things I did during my childhood keeps me young. I do things from my childhood to stay “young at heart.” I play the games I played when I was a kid.	

* = this item was removed as a result of the factor analysis

Table 3: Factor Analysis

(a) KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.843
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Square	2024.46
Df	190
Significance	<0.001

(b) Testing

	Testing				Communalities	
	1	2	3	4	Initial	Extraction
HN1	0.755	0.020	-0.061	-0.038	1.0	0.57
HN2	0.682	0.082	0.229	-0.128	1.0	0.54
HN3	0.782	-0.023	0.017	0.146	1.0	0.63
HN4	0.728	0.041	0.218	-0.063	1.0	0.58
HN5	0.700	0.159	0.091	0.136	1.0	0.54
HN6	0.695	0.193	-0.052	-0.182	1.0	0.56
HN7	0.805	0.111	0.000	0.113	1.0	0.67
PN1*	0.033	0.211	0.071	0.875	1.0	0.82
PN2	0.217	0.82	0.115	0.139	1.0	0.75
PN3	-0.088	0.63	0.228	0.088	1.0	0.46

constructs based on the factor loadings of the variables. Loadings close to 1 indicate that the component (factor) strongly influences the variable and the highest loadings under a component constitute a construct.

The factor analysis provided the following results. The seven factors representing historical nostalgia yielded one component. The factor analysis for the personal nostalgia scale yielded one component with two exceptions: 1) PN1, was a separate factor and was eliminated from further analysis, and 2) PN3 was removed since its extraction value was below 0.5. Furthermore, the kidult scale yielded one component with item KD3 deleted since its extraction value was below 0.5. These variables were removed so that the model will fit. Thus, three constructs were identified.

Reliability coefficients were again calculated for the revised personal nostalgia and kidult scales. The coefficient alpha was 0.89 for the five-item personal nostalgia scale and 0.84 for the five-item kidult scale. Both alpha values are above the 0.70 value recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein

(1994).

4. RESULTS

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant mean differences between groups as stated in the hypotheses. Table 4 presents the results. As shown in Table 4, Hypothesis 1 that younger consumers have greater historical nostalgia than older consumers, was supported. In contrast, although in the right direction, Hypothesis 2, younger consumers have greater personal nostalgia than older consumers, was not supported. The hypothesis that younger consumers identify as kidults more than older consumers (Hypothesis 3) was supported.

Regarding gender in the last three hypotheses, Hypothesis 4 was supported: Younger males identify as kidults as much as younger females. Hypothesis 5, that there are no significant differences in personal nostalgia between older males and older females, was supported. Finally, the last Hypothesis 6 was supported: There are no significant dif-

Table 4: ANOVA

Hypotheses	Group	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	Sig.
H1: Younger consumers have greater historical nostalgia than older consumers (supported).	Older	102	2.84	1.21	0.00*
	Younger	103	3.69	1.42	
H2: Younger consumers have greater personal nostalgia than older consumers (not supported).	Older	101	4.68	1.38	0.17
	Younger	105	4.86	1.38	
H3: Younger consumers identify as kidults more than older consumers (supported).	Older	102	3.07	1.37	0.00*
	Younger	106	3.80	1.53	
H4: Younger males identify as kidults as much as younger females (supported).	Males	58	3.71	1.47	0.34
	Females	45	3.99	1.56	
H5: There are no significant differences in personal nostalgia between older males and older females (supported).	Older Males	53	4.62	1.32	0.51
	Older Females	43	4.81	1.5	
H6: There are no significant differences in personal nostalgia between younger males and younger females (supported).	Younger Males	57	4.90	1.28	0.89
	Younger Females	45	4.86	1.43	

*p = 0.00

ferences in personal nostalgia between younger males and younger females.

5. DISCUSSION

The recent surge in nostalgia among younger consumers was supported by the hypothesis that younger consumers have greater historical nostalgia than older consumers as well as younger consumers identify as kidults more than older consumers. However, the hypothesis that younger consumers have greater personal nostalgia than older consumers was not supported, albeit the hypothesis was in the hypothesized direction. This result may be because older consumers have more personal experiences than younger consumers to be nostalgic about. Finally, the hypotheses regarding gender were supported except for the hypothesis stating that older males experience greater levels of personal nostalgia than older females.

6. CONCLUSION

Theoretical and practical implications

This study developed and utilized multiple-item scales to measure historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, and the kidult. The scales advanced the measurement of these constructs from a qualitative assessment to a quantitative measure or index, allowing for more accurate conclusions regarding the segment(s) under study. Furthermore, the scales are versatile in that they can be applied to a particular segment of consumers based on a variety of demographic and/or psychographic characteristics. In this study, the scales were implemented using the demographic of age via generational cohorts to assess the differences between older and younger consumers: Matures, Baby Boomers, and Generation X (older consumers) and Generation Y and Generation Z (younger consumers). The study provided evidence that the stereotypical, traditional assumption that older consumers are more nostalgic does not necessarily apply in today's marketplace.

From a practical perspective, this study has provided measures for the marketing practitioner to quantify the intensity of nostalgia in segments of

interest. The measures can be applied to demographics and/or psychographics. This study examined the demographic of age via groups of generational cohorts. The results of this study may aid in decision-making regarding which segments are better candidates for nostalgia marketing or retro-marketing. These decisions can affect multiple components of the marketing mix: Decisions in terms of the product, e.g., retro-branding, and decisions regarding the use of nostalgic elements in promotion.

Limitations and suggestions for future research

There are various limitations of the study as well as suggestions for future research. The study was the first to use newly-developed scales for historical nostalgia, personal nostalgia, and the kidult. The scales need to be included in future research for validation. Furthermore, other demographics and/or psychographics to better define the nostalgic consumer. Moreover, the sample was a variation of the convenience sample. Future research could address the limitations of convenience sampling by utilizing other sampling methods.

Furthermore, some industries that seem closely related to nostalgia may not be benefiting from the recent surge in the popularity of nostalgia. Future research may attempt to identify nostalgia-prone consumers, particularly in declining industries that may be receptive to nostalgia marketing campaigns, such as antiques and historic sites. Both of these industries have been faced with a decline in recent years. An underlying necessary yet not sufficient condition for consumers to identify with historical nostalgia communications is an interest in historical artifacts and history. The interest in antiques has dropped, illustrated in the general loss of the value of 18th and 19th-century furniture. Dealers are now offering more contemporary pieces as the interest in period pieces, and even 20th mid-century modern furniture, wanes (McKeough, 2018). Similarly, Carson (2008) observed that attendance at historic sites and house museums is in decline. For example, Colonial Williamsburg has experienced a decline in visitation for the past several decades. Similar declines

have been ongoing at historic Mount Vernon and the Jamestown and Yorktown sites. Other historic destinations, including Gettysburg, Ford's Theatre, and the National Air and Space Museum, have seen significant declines in visitors, despite an increase in the number of international tourists (Mahaskey & Canellos, 2019). Generally, historic destinations are experiencing similar challenges. Although no generational cohort is immune to representing a decline in attendance at these sites, the lower visitations are particularly significant

with younger consumers (Bortolot, 2019; van Balgooy, 2016). Furthermore, only 20.5% of Americans between 18 and 24 visited a historic site in 2012, a reduction of eight percentage points from 10 years prior (Tiedemann & Marsico, 2017). Similarly, college enrollment in history courses and the number of history majors are also in decline. Future research may attempt to address examples such as these that could benefit from nostalgia promotional campaigns.

References

- Amid a Nostalgia Wave, the Kidult Market is Growing. (2022). *Licensing International*. <https://licensinginternational.org/news/amid-a-nostalgia-wave-the-kidult-market-is-growing/>
- Batcho, K. I. (1995). Nostalgia: A Psychological Perspective. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 80(1), 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1995.80.1.131>
- Bortolot, L. (2019). A historic challenge: Colonial Williamsburg's exiting CEO faced deficits, declining visitors. *Virginia Business*. <https://viriniabusiness.com/a-historic-challenge/>
- Carrione, L. (2022). Growing 'kidult' trend takes toy industry by storm. *Fox Business*. <https://www.foxbusiness.com/retail/growing-kidult-trend-takes-toy-industry-by-storm>
- Carson, C. (2008). The End of History Museums: What's Plan B? *The Public Historian*, 30(4), 9–27. <https://doi.org/10.1525/tph.2008.30.4.9>
- Cho, H., Chiu, W., Kang, H.-K., & Lee, H.-W. (2025). Gender differences in the effects of nostalgia on conspicuous consumption and impulsive buying. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 26(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-04-2024-0081>
- Cochrane, L. (2021). Chanel suit finds new fans in Gen Z channelling 90s nostalgia. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/fashion/2021/jul/25/chanel-suit-finds-new-fans-in-gen-z-channelling-90s-nostalgia>
- Davis, F. (1979). *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia*. Free Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=3zt-AAAAMAAJ>
- Dvornyk, M. (2016). Postmodern rejuvenation of grown-ups: Who kidults are? *Psihologicni nauki: problemi i zbobutki*, 9, 56–71.
- Hallegatte, D., & Marticotte, F. (2014). Does Holbrook's nostalgia index measure nostalgia proneness?
- Havlena, W. J., & Holak, S. L. (1991). "The Good Old Days": Observations On Nostalgia and Its Role In Consumer Behavior. *Advances in consumer research*, 18(1).
- Heyns, G., D. Pentz, C., & Du Preez-Snyman, R. (2023). Evoked Nostalgia and Behavioural outcomes of South African Generation X and Y consumers: A case of Disney and Disney+. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 18(1), 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.31920/1750-4562/2023/v18n1a1>
- Hofer, J. (1688). *Medical dissertation on nostalgia*.
- Hoffower, H. (2022). Millennial and Gen Z nostalgia is bringing back book sales, indie bookstores, and Barnes & Noble. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/millennials-gen-z-nostalgia-reviving-chain-bookstores-barnes-noble-2022-4>
- Holbrook, M. B. (1993). Nostalgia and consumption preferences: Some emerging patterns of consumer tastes [Publisher: The University of Chicago Press]. *Journal of Consumer research*, 20(2), 245–256.

- Holotova, M., Kadekova, Z., & Kosciarova, I. (2020). RETRO MARKETING-A POWER OF NOSTALGIA WHICH WORKS AMONG THE AUDIENCE. *Communication Today*, 11(2).
- Jones, M., & Reynolds, K. (2006). The Role of Retailer Interest on Shopping Behavior. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 50278584606000583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2005.05.001>
- Kessous, A., & Roux, E. (2013). Nostalgia, autobiographical memories and brand communication: A semiotic analysis. *Marketing ZFP*, 35(1), 50–57. https://doi.org/10.15358/0344-1369_2013_1_50
- Kim, Y. K., & Yim, M. Y.-C. (2018). When nostalgia marketing backfires: Gender differences in the impact of nostalgia on youthfulness for older consumers. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 32(6), 815–822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3459>
- König, T. M., & Larsen, V. (2017). An intergenerational perspective on life satisfaction and its drivers: A comparison between 18–29-year-old and 50+ consumers in Germany. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 25(3), 258–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2017.1299788>
- Madoglou, A., Gkinopoulos, T., Xanthopoulos, P., & Kalamaras, D. (2017). Representations of autobiographical nostalgic memories: Generational effect, gender, nostalgia proneness and communication of nostalgic experiences. *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*, 7(1), 60–88.
- Mahaskey, M. S., & Canellos, P. (2019). Are Americans Falling Out of Love With Their Landmarks? *Politico Magazine*. <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2019/07/04/are-americans-falling-out-of-love-with-their-landmarks-227258/>
- Marchegiani, C., & Phau, I. (2007a). Advertising appeals to "the times of your life": Developing a scale to measure personal nostalgia. *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference 2007*, 1391–1399.
- Marchegiani, C., & Phau, I. (2007b). Remembering the way it was?: Development and validation of the historical nostalgia scale. *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference 2007*, 2000–2008.
- Marchegiani, C., & Phau, I. (2010). Away from "Unified Nostalgia": Conceptual Differences of Personal and Historical Nostalgia Appeals in Advertising. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 16(1-2), 80–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496490903572991>
- Martinez, L. (2016). OPINION: Nostalgia is Millennials' greatest weakness. *The Sanford Herald*. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1806280667/fulltext/EC8D515A16B48C0PQ/12?accountid=7065&sourcecetype=Wire%20Feeds>
- McKeough, T. (2018). How low will market for antiques actually go? *The New York Times*.
- Merchant, A., Latour, K., Ford, J. B., & Latour, M. S. (2013). How Strong is the Pull of the Past?: Measuring Personal Nostalgia Evoked by Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 53(2), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-53-2-150-165>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367400208>
- Muehling, D. D., Sprott, D. E., & Sultan, A. J. (2014). Exploring the Boundaries of Nostalgic Advertising Effects: A Consideration of Childhood Brand Exposure and Attachment on Consumers' Responses to Nostalgia-Themed Advertisements. *Journal of Advertising*, 43(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.815110>
- Niazi, A. (2021). How digital killed the video stars: MuchMusic re-launches on TikTok. *The Globe and Mail*. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/article-muchmusic-relaunches-tiktok-gen-z-millennials/>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). The assessment of reliability. In *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed., pp. 248–292). McGraw-Hill.

- Oğuz, G. V. (2017). INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF RETRO MARKETING ON BRAND LOYALTY OVER GENERATIONS X, Y & Z. *International Journal of Disciplines In Economics and Administrative Sciences Studies (IDEA studies)*, 3(3), 48–60. <https://doi.org/10.26728/ideas.13>
- Pavely, F. (2020). Not just child's play: The rise of the 'kidult' market for licensing. *Licensing Source Book Europe*, (Spring 2020), 86–87. <https://www.licensingsource.net/indepth/not-just-childs-play-the-rise-of-the-kidult-market-for-licensing/>
- Schindler, R. M., & Holbrook, M. B. (2003). Nostalgia for early experience as a determinant of consumer preferences. *Psychology & Marketing*, 20(4), 275–302. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10074>
- Stern, B. B. (1992). Historical and Personal Nostalgia in Advertising Text: The *Fin de siecle* Effect. *Journal of Advertising*, 21(4), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1992.10673382>
- Syme, P. (2023). Pepsi's new logo takes inspiration from its '90s design, tapping into Gen Z nostalgia for the era. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/pepsi-new-logo-inspired-90s-design-gen-z-nostalgia-2023-3#:~:text=Pepsi%20unveiled%20a%20new%20logo%20on%20Tuesday%2C%20which%20appears%20to,with%20the%20wording%20placed%20inside>
- Tiedemann, J., & Marsico, K. (2017). Americans' Declining Interest In History Is Hitting Museums Like Colonial Williamsburg Hard. *The Federalist*. <https://www.goacta.org/news-item/americans-declining-interest-in-history-is-hitting-museums-like-colonial-wi/>
- van Balgooy, M. (2016, February). Visits to Historic Sites are a Humanities Indicator, says AAAS. <https://engagingplaces.net/2016/02/25/visits-to-historic-sites-are-a-humanities-indicator-says-aaas/>
- Whitten, S. (2022). Adults are buying toys for themselves, and it's the biggest source of growth for the industry. *CNBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/business/business-news/adults-are-buying-toys-s-biggest-source-growth-industry-rcna62354>
- Wiederhold, B. K. (2024). Nostalgia as Self-Care: Embracing the Kidult Culture. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 27(4), 238–239. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2024.29308.editorial>
- Youn, S., & Jin, S. V. (2017). Reconnecting with the past in social media: The moderating role of social influence in nostalgia marketing on Pinterest. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 16(6), 565–576. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1655>