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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the effects of psychological capital and demographic variables of consumers on retro (nostalgic) consumption. In this respect, in the first part of the study, the literature on psychological capital and retro marketing was conducted. In this part of the study, the data collected from consumers by the survey method were reanalyzed using the SPSS 21 package program. 390 consumers were reached in Erzincan and face-to-face survey method was used. According to the results of the study, psychological resilience, self-efficacy and optimism dimensions of psychological capital sub-dimensions affect retro consumption. As the psychological resilience, self-efficacy and optimism of the consumers increase, the tendency of retro consumption increases. In addition, various demographic variables create some differences in psychological capital and retro consumption.
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INTRODUCTION

Today, consumers demand applications and products that stimulate past habits synthesized by technology and scientific developments. Retro marketing is intended to ensure that demand is restored to those products whose products are forgotten (Şahin, 2013: 93). Businesses use the retro style in the field of marketing communication both locally and globally. Referencing history when it comes to local marketing campaigns; it underlines local authenticity, history and tradition. In the case of global brands, retro marketing is particularly used to emphasize exclusive brand traits, history and eternal values. The objectives of these retro marketing are to focus on improving brand value and strengthening brand image (Greboszand Pointed, 2015: 121-122).

It is necessary to explain the term nostalgia in order to understand the contents of retro brands and to determine the effects of brand management (Brown et al., 2003: 19). Nostalgia is used to express the longing for the past and the desire to return to the past and relive that period (Gülay, 2015: 844). Reasons for using past tenses in brand communication methods, although existing nostalgic memories are not the same as one by one, nostalgic memories eliminate negative situations, change semantic content and give information about the past with nostalgic interpretations (Kessous,2014:50).

For researchers in the field of marketing, this term has been studied since the 1990s and is important for shaping consumer choice methods (Toledo and Lopes, 2016: 35). Considering the positive aspects of generalized nostalgia, it can be thought that consumers will react positively to brand nostalgia. In this context, this is especially the case if minor changes are made to keep the brand up-to-date, especially when customers continue to use the mark regularly (Shields and Johnson, 2016: 714).

Retro products have superior functions and harmonize the present with the past (Brown, 1999: 365). Interest in the term nostalgia is increasing in the field of marketing, especially in relation to the behavior of consumers, along with the attitude, intention to buy, and advertising for a brand (Toledo and Lopes, 2016: 36). Longing for the past (Davis, 1979: 23) is embodied in individuals’ efforts to re-uncover some traces of the past in their present lives. The trend of nostalgia and postmodernism manifests itself in the field of service and marketing with product development and promotion methods and efforts. Retro Marketing, which has emerged as a brand new marketing term, was first introduced by Stephen Brown. Brown defined retro marketing as a re-start or revival of past products or services (Gallagher, 2004: 163). Retro brand and product are modern in functionality and usability, but old in appearance and feel (Ogechukwu, 2014: 3334).

Retro marketing-related research is based on four themes. They accept antinomy (brand paradox), aura (brand essence), arcadia (idealized brand society) and allegory (brand history) as the 4A of retro branding. Antinomy; describes the contradiction of individuals’ desire to return to less stressful, less complex and slower days with rapidly developing the scientific and technological process. Aura belongs to the posture that is perceived with authenticity. Authenticity, which is used in terms of uniqueness, is one of the most important components of brand identity. With Arcadis; utopian aspects of past societies and the world. The idea that the past is a special and magical place is one of the most important parts of attractiveness in retro marketing. It is reconstructed
with advanced technology as idealized as possible. Allegory; symbolic stories or added metaphors. Successful examples of didactic messages are more common in advertisements (Brown et al., 2003a: 135-140).

The nostalgic appeal is also evaluated in brand message strategies to differentiate or achieve a successful position. Nostalgic production and message strategy aim to awaken the desire to lead to the past. The past tense, perceived superior to the present, is embodied in the memories based on the predicted items that consumers have missed in the past, or on historical elements that have no chance of reuse (Shindler and Holbrook, 2003:275).

Brands are increasingly using the retro concept to reach consumers. However, the idea of using the past is not a new trend (Clemente-Ricolf and Enguer-Gosilez, 2018: 380). Retro brands’ styles should be combined with the latest technology to provide a competitive advantage (Merlo and Perugini, 2015: 95). Today, too many companies in the consumer goods market rely on nostalgia to increase product sales, and an increase in the relaunch of nostalgic products is observed in the market (Shields and Johnson, 2016: 359). Given the perceived need for individuals to maintain their personality in historical transition periods, retro marketing is the commercial answer to this need, as it focuses on customer nostalgia and the emotional ties that customers establish over time with classic products and brands (Brown, 2013: 522). In addition to the types of capital (economic, cultural, intellectual, human, social, emotional) that exist in our world where competition is intense, psychological capital is defined as positive psychological development of the individual (Luthans and Youssef, 2007). The majority of the characteristics of a person's psychological capital are expressed by the person's point of view or self-confidence (Larson and Luthans, 2006). It is possible to say that psychological capital has the ability of the individual to successfully carry economic, human and social capital to the organization for the purpose of productivity (Polatç, 2011).

In other words, psychological capital expresses who we are and what we can become through positive development (Luthans et al., 2006;32). Rather than expressing a fixed state and having certain characteristics, people's psychological states are the features that can change according to the situation, differentiate and develop with experience and education (Çetin and Basım, 2012). According to Luthans, there are four main factors that make up psychological capital: Self-efficacy, Optimism, Hope, Resilience (Luthans et al., 2010). These four components of positive psychological capital are generally accepted as the criteria of the value of positive organizational behavior since individuals can allow and manage competitive advantage (Luthans et al., 2005: 252). As a result of the management and competitive advantage of these values, positive psychological capital is explained with four components in general (Luthans and Youssef, 2004:149).

Self-efficacy:
Self-efficacy is not an observable skill. It is only the belief that individuals can achieve in certain circumstances through the skills they possess (Maddux, 2002: 278-279). In other words, one's belief in his / her self-motivation, cognitive resources and ability to successfully perform the given job (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998). At the same time, self-efficacy cannot be a personality trait, as it varies according to the circumstances (Hefferon and Boniwell, 2014: 105). Self-efficacy in terms of measurability and development ability is easier
than other positive psychological capital elements (Luthans, 2002: 70). In addition, self-efficacy is the one that meets positive organizational behavior characteristics in the best way since it is evident in all positive psychological capital elements that are open to development, research-based and its effect on performance has been proved (Luthans et al., 2008: 222; Luthans, 2002: 70). Strong self-efficacy belief in individuals triggers success in many ways. Persons with high levels of self-efficacy do not consider the tasks that are difficult to accomplish as a body demonstration, but as a danger (Bandura, 1993: 144).

Hope:
The concept of hope is defined as the desire combined with expectations that what is commonly desired today can be achieved (Snyder et al., 1995). Hope; not only purposeful but also methods used to achieve the purpose (Çetin et al., 2013: 31). Hope is more than just a feeling, it is an effective, powerful and diffuse cognitive process (Hellandand Winston, 2005: 42). Hope is the energy source of the efforts made towards achievable targets. The higher the level of hope of the people, the higher the targets they set and tend to realize these higher targets by sub-targets, step by step (Hefferonand Boniwell, 2014: 108-109). Individuals with a high level of hope are not limited to striving to achieve their goals, but also set more goals (Snyder, 2002: 252).

Optimism:
Optimism is an explanation style that evaluates positive events on the basis of individual, permanent and general causes, and negative events on the axis of involuntary, temporary and situational reasons (Seligman, 1998: 49). Optimism is the behavior of individuals to explain events that lead to their own well-being and happiness (Tiger, 1971: 18). If we think that one end of a line is very optimistic and the other end is very pessimistic, the points in this line show the level of optimism. Thus, while some individuals have a certain level of optimism, there may be a level of pessimism in the same person (Kubzanskyet al., 2004: 954). Optimistic individuals do not lose their motivation in the face of failure (Seligman, 1998: 49), and they are people who do not restrict their behavior to the environment, behave comfortably, enjoy living (Yılmaz, 2019, s.171) and warm-blooded. Individuals with high levels of optimism always try to keep themselves psychologically positive in order to achieve ambitious success and physiological health (Seligman ve Csíkszentmihalyi, 2000, s. 9). Therefore, optimism, perseverance and solution focus, academic, political, sportive, military and professional success; It is explained by a healthy lifestyle that comes with positive mood free from traumas. Pessimism is expressed by the concepts of failure, passivity, depression and illness (Peterson, 2000: 44).

Resilience:
Endurance is the ability to overcome traumas, diseases and difficulties as quickly as possible. (Wilkes, 1979: 1241). Endurance is a positive adaptation to risky and troublesome processes (Mastenand Reed, 2002: 74). Psychological resilience is not ethically good or bad, but the ability and capacity to remain resistant under conditions of great stress and change (Coutu, 2002: 49). In its broadest sense, resilience as an element of positive psychological capital; conflict, risk, failure, as well as negative situations such as progress, change and increase the responsibility in the face of positive events in the individual's collapse and is able to face events in every changing situation (Luthans, 2002a: 702). According to the data obtained as a result of scientific studies conducted at organizational level, the resilience level of individuals who grow up in failure and difficulties is
higher. Resilient individuals not only return to their original state after facing difficult conditions, but they also come to better levels, and the challenges they face add value and meaning to their lives. (Luthans and Youssef, 2004: 154).

As a matter of fact, the studies conducted frequently in recent years reveal that psychological capital should be considered as an important resource in providing a sustainable competitive advantage for individuals and organizations (Toor and Ofori, 2010). Psychological capital is a holistic state of mind (Erkuş and Findikli, 2012). In addition to psychological capital, another type of capital to be considered is intellectual capital. Intellectual capital is the human capital made up of information contained in individuals; it consists of relational capital, which consists of qualifications such as customer relationship, customer loyalty and trust, and the structural capital existing in the organizations themselves (Yılmaz and Kumkale, 2019: 202-203). Within the framework of general definitions, it can be said that psychological capital focuses on the changeable and developable aspects of the individual rather than fixed and difficult to change personality traits (Erkuş & Findikli, 2012).

Having psychological capital means having enough effort to successfully perform difficult tasks and having confidence (self-sufficiency) to take responsibility; to develop a positive attitude (optimism) to succeed now or in the future, to strive for goals and, when necessary, to find new ways to achieve the goal (hope), to recover in the face of problems and difficulties (to recover) to achieve success (psychological resilience) that it consists (Özer et al., 2013). Defining the four basic dimensions of psychological capital, Luthans and Youssef (2004) stated that this concept is yet a new concept and is open to development. In this context, cognitive dimensions such as creativity and wisdom; the emotional dimensions of humor, flow, well-being; emphasizing that the study of social dimensions such as emotional intelligence, forgiveness, gratitude, and high-level dimensions such as spiritualism, courage, and authenticity will develop the concept in future studies. (Luthans et al., 2007)

**METHOD**

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between consumer’s psychological capital on retro-consumer disposition behavior. In addition to this, the relationship between demographic variables and psychological capital and retro consumption tendency is revealed. The model of this study is as follows:

![Figure 1: Research Model](image-url)
While psychological capital and demographic variables are independent variables, retro consumption tendency is dependent variable.

The hypotheses determined in terms of addressing the purpose of the research are as follows:

H1: Psychological endurance has a statistically significant effect on the trend of retro consumption.

H2: Hope has a statistically significant effect on the trend of retro consumption.

H3: Self-efficacy has a statistically significant effect on the trend of retro consumption.

H4: Optimism has a statistically significant effect on the trend of retro consumption.

An easy sampling method was used in the study. The main population of the study consists of consumers living in the provinces and districts of Erzincan. The questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The questionnaire consists of two parts. In the first part, there are questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second part, psychological capital and retro consumption tendency scales are given. 5-point Likert-type scale was used to determine the participants' level of participation in the questionnaire (1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree).

The psychological capital scale developed by Luthans et al. (2007) was used to determine the psychological capital levels of the consumers. The scale measures the four dimensions of the concept of psychological capital with 24 expressions. In the scale, the first 6 expressions express psychological resilience, 6 expressions express hope, 6 expressions express self-efficacy and 6 expressions express optimism. In order to check the consistency of the answers, the inverse expression was used inversely. The answers to these statements were included in the mean by reversing before the analysis.

When creating a questionnaire; Retbrook's (1993) study was used to measure retro (nostalgia) tendency. There are 15 questions in the scale.

FINDINGS

In the findings of the study, firstly the frequency analysis of the demographic variables of the consumers was performed. Then correlation and regression analyses were performed. The data obtained have normal distribution. The t-test and the one-way ANOVA test were used to determine whether the dimensions of psychological capital and retro-consumption tendency differed statistically according to demographic variables.

For the analysis and interpretation of the data set, SPSS software was used. Firstly, reliability analysis of the scales was performed and the results are given below.

| Scales                          | Matter | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Psychological Capital Scale    | 24     | .876            |
| Psychological Resilience       | 6      | .766            |
| Hope                           | 6      | .798            |
| Self-sufficiency               | 6      | .786            |
| Optimism                       | 6      | .832            |
| Retro Consumption Tendency Scale | 15    | .893            |

Table 1: Reliability Analysis of Scales Used in the Study
The Cronbach’s alpha value of the psychological capital scale is 0.876. With sub-dimensions; Cronbach’s alpha value of psychological resilience scale is 0.766, Cronbach’s alpha value of hope dimension is 0.798, The Cronbach’s alpha value of the self-efficacy dimension is 0.786 and the Cronbach’s alpha value of the optimism dimension is 0.832. The Cronbach’s alpha value of the retro-consumption trend scale is 0.893. It is possible to say that the scales are reliable with the output of the scale values in this way.

Table 2: Socio-demographic variables of consumers

| Gender         | Frekans | Percent (%) |
|----------------|---------|-------------|
| Female         | 207     | 53,1        |
| Male           | 183     | 46,9        |
| Marital status |         |             |
| Single         | 149     | 38,2        |
| The married    | 241     | 61,8        |
| Age            |         |             |
| 18-24          | 78      | 20,0        |
| 25-34          | 105     | 26,9        |
| 35-44          | 79      | 20,3        |
| 45-54          | 53      | 13,6        |
| 55 and above   | 75      | 19,2        |
| Income rate    |         |             |
| 2020 and under | 390     | 59,0        |
| 2021-5000      | 93      | 23,8        |
| 5001 and above | 67      | 17,2        |
| Education level|         |             |
| Primary education | 39    | 10,0        |
| High school    | 161     | 41,3        |
| Associate Degree | 113   | 29,0        |
| License        | 66      | 16,9        |
| Master / Doctorate | 11    | 2,8         |
| Total          | 390     | 100,0       |

According to Table 2, 53.1% of consumers are women and 46.9% are men, it is possible to say that there is a homogeneous distribution of gender. In terms of marital status, 38.2% are single and 61.8% are married. Age distributions of consumers; 20.0% in the 18-24 age range, 26.9% in the 25-34 age range, 20.3% in the 35-44 age range, 13.6% in the 45-54 age range and 19 %, 2 are 55 years and older. Income distribution of consumers; 59,0% of the mean military wage or less, 23.8% earn minimum wage and 5000 TL income and 17.2% earn 5001 TL and above. More than half of the consumers participating in our research earn minimum wage or less. The educational levels of the participants were as follows; 10.0% are primary school graduates, 41.3% are high school graduates, 29.0% are associate degree graduates, 16.9% are undergraduate graduates and 2.8% are graduate or doctorate graduates.

In Table 3, the correlation between the independent variable psychological capital and the sub-dimensions of psychological resilience, hope, self-efficacy and optimism with retro (nostalgic) consumption tendency is given.
Table 3. Results of Correlation Analysis of Psychological Capital Sub-dimensions and Retro (Nostalgic) Consumption Tendency

| Psychological Resilience | Hope | Self-efficacy | Optimism | Retro C. Tendency |
|--------------------------|------|---------------|----------|------------------|
| Correlation              | 1    |               |          |                  |
| Sig. (p)                 |      |               |          |                  |
| N                        | 390  | 390           | 390      | 390              |
| Hope                     |      |               |          |                  |
| Correlation              | 0.683** | 1            |          |                  |
| Sig. (p)                 | 0.000 |               |          |                  |
| N                        | 390  | 390           | 390      | 390              |
| Self-efficacy            |      |               |          |                  |
| Correlation              | 0.286** | 0.277** | 1        |                  |
| Sig. (p)                 | 0.000 | 0.000         |          |                  |
| N                        | 390  | 390           | 390      | 390              |
| Optimism                 |      |               |          |                  |
| Correlation              | 0.130** | 0.147** | 0.669** | 1                |
| Sig. (p)                 | 0.000 | 0.000         | 0.000    |                  |
| N                        | 390  | 390           | 390      | 390              |
| Retro Consumption Tendency |      |               |          |                  |
| Correlation              | 0.303** | 0.249** | 0.589** | 0.604** | 1        |
| Sig. (p)                 | 0.000 | 0.000         | 0.000    | 0.000   |
| N                        | 390  | 390           | 390      | 390              |

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level, n=390

H1, H3 and H4 are accepted, and H2 is rejected.

When the correlations between variables are examined, there is a strong positive relationship between retro consumption tendency and psychological capital sub-dimensions. \( r = 0.303 ** \) between the tendency of retro consumption and psychological resilience, between hope \( r = 0.249 ** \), between self-efficacy \( r = 0.589 ** \), between optimism \( r = 0.604 ** \) and there are strong relationships.

Table 4: Results of Regression Analysis of Sub-dimensions of Psychological Capital and Retro (Nostalgic) Consumption Tendency

| Model            | Retro (Nostalgic) Consumption Tendency |
|------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                  | B          | Standard error | \( \beta \) | t   | p     |
| Psych. Resilience| 0.429      | 0.126          | 0.178       | 3.406 | 0.001 |
| Hope             | -0.018     | 0.129          | -0.007      | -0.142 | 0.887 |
| Self-efficacy    | 0.646      | 0.125          | 0.274       | 5.178 | 0.000 |
| Optimism         | 0.946      | 0.121          | 0.399       | 7.839 | 0.000 |

\( R = 0.674 \)
\( R^2 = 0.454 \)
Durbin-Watson = 1.482
\( F = 80.051 \)
\( p = 0.000 \)
According to the results, multiple regression model related to psychological capital sub-dimensions and retro (nostalgic) consumption tendency is significant (F = 80.051; p < 0.000) and 45.4% of the retro consumption tendency according to the coefficient of determination (R² = 0.454) by independent variables can be explained. When Table 4 is examined, psychological capital sub-dimensions; there is a significant positive relationship between psychological resilience, self-efficacy and optimism and the tendency for retro consumption. However, there was no significant relationship between hope sub-dimension and retro-consumption tendency.

In order to determine the differences between demographic variables and psychological capital sub-dimensions and retro-consumption tendency, t-test and variance analyzes are as follows:

**Table 5.** T-Test Results of Gender, Psychological Capital Sub-dimensions and Retro Consumption Tendency

| Variable              | Gender   | N   | X       | t    | Sig. (p) |
|-----------------------|----------|-----|---------|------|----------|
| Psychological Resilience | Female   | 207 | 19,9952 | 2,566| 0.011    |
|                       | Male     | 183 | 18,7213 |      |          |
| Hope                  | Female   | 207 | 20,8116 | 1,700| 0.090    |
|                       | Male     | 183 | 20,0000 |      |          |
| Self-efficacy         | Female   | 207 | 20,1691 | 3,224| 0.001    |
|                       | Male     | 183 | 18,5519 |      |          |
| Optimism              | Female   | 207 | 20,9758 | 2,700| 0.007    |
|                       | Male     | 183 | 19,6175 |      |          |
| Retro C. Tendency     | Female   | 207 | 54,5894 | 4,319| 0.000    |
|                       | Male     | 183 | 49,5574 |      |          |

According to Table 5; there was a significant difference between all variables except gender and hope subscale (p < 0.05). When we look at the averages in order to understand which group is caused by this difference; female consumers have more tendency to psychological resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and retro consumption than male consumers.

**Table 6.** T-Test Results Related to Marital Status of Consumers and Sub-Dimensions of Psychological Capital and Retro Consumption Tendency

| Variable          | Marital Status | N    | X       | T   | Sig. (p) |
|-------------------|----------------|------|---------|-----|----------|
| Psychological Resilience | Single       | 149  | 18,6779 | -2,212 | 0.028    |
|                    | Themarried    | 241  | 19,8423 |      |          |
| Hope               | Single       | 149  | 19,8725 | -1,771 | 0.078    |
|                    | Themarried   | 241  | 20,7759 |      |          |
| Self-efficacy      | Single       | 149  | 18,3691 | -3,294 | 0.001    |
|                    | Themarried   | 241  | 20,0539 |      |          |
| Optimism           | Single       | 149  | 19,6510 | -2,086 | 0.038    |
|                    | Themarried   | 241  | 20,7635 |      |          |
| Retro C. Tendency  | Single       | 149  | 49,2685 | -3.989 | 0.000    |
|                    | Themarried   | 241  | 54,0581 |      |          |
In Table 6, t-test results regarding the marital status of consumers and psychological capital sub-dimensions and retro consumption tendency are given. When these results are examined; There was a significant relationship between marital status and psychological resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and tendency of retro consumption (p < 0.05). Married consumers have higher psychological endurance, self-efficacy, optimism and retro-consumption tendencies than single consumers.

Homogeneity testing should be performed before performing Anova analysis. The homogeneity test for variables and age is as follows:

**Table 7: Homogeneity Test for Age and Variables**

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | LeveneStatistic | df1 | df2 | Sig.(p) |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Psyc. Resilience                 | 1,226            | 4   | 385 | .924    |
| Hope                             | 1,462            | 4   | 385 | .764    |
| Self-efficacy                    | 1,473            | 4   | 385 | .092    |
| Optimism                         | 1,990            | 4   | 385 | .095    |
| Retro ConsumptionTendency        | 1,265            | 4   | 385 | .283    |

Since the P values are greater than 0.05, Anova Test is suitable.

**Table 8. Anova Results on the Ages of Consumers, Sub-Dimensions of Psychological Capital and Retro Consumption Tendency**

| Variable                  | Age       | Average (X) | F value | Sig. (p) |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Psychological Resilience  | 18-24     | 19,6667     | 0,653   | 0,625    |
|                           | 25-34     | 18,9429     |         |          |
|                           | 35-44     | 19,7848     |         |          |
|                           | 45-54     | 19,8679     |         |          |
|                           | 55 and over | 19,0133    |         |          |
| Hope                      | 18-24     | 21,0385     | 0,469   | 0,759    |
|                           | 25-34     | 20,1333     |         |          |
|                           | 35-44     | 20,3797     |         |          |
|                           | 45-54     | 20,1698     |         |          |
|                           | 55 and over | 20,4533    |         |          |
| Self-efficacy             | 18-24     | 18,6026     | 0,776   | 0,541    |
|                           | 25-34     | 19,5905     |         |          |
|                           | 35-44     | 19,6582     |         |          |
|                           | 45-54     | 19,9811     |         |          |
|                           | 55 and over | 19,3333    |         |          |
| Optimism                  | 18-24     | 19,6538     | 1,813   | 0,126    |
|                           | 25-34     | 21,0952     |         |          |
|                           | 35-44     | 20,7975     |         |          |
|                           | 45-54     | 20,4528     |         |          |
|                           | 55 and over | 19,4267    |         |          |
| Retro Consumption Tendency | 18-24     | 48,8077     | 6,419   | 0,000    |
|                           | 25-34     | 50,7524     |         |          |
|                           | 35-44     | 52,2405     |         |          |
|                           | 45-54     | 52,4906     |         |          |
|                           | 55 and over | 57,6533    |         |          |
When Table 8 is examined; there is a significant difference between the age of consumers and the trend of retro consumption only (p <0.05). The tukey test results should be examined in order to understand from which group this difference arises.

Table 9: Tukey Test Result Between Age and Retro Consumption Tendency

| Age       | N   | TukeyHSD<sup>a,b</sup> | Subset for alpha = 0.05 |
|-----------|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 18-24     | 78  | 48,8077                 | 1                       |
| 25-34     | 105 | 50,7524                 | 2                       |
| 35-44     | 79  | 52,2405                 |                         |
| 45-54     | 53  | 52,4906                 |                         |
| 54 and over | 75  | 57,6533                 |                         |

According to Table 9, the significant difference arises from consumers aged 54 and over. Retro-consumption tendencies of those aged 54 and over are higher than other age groups. According to Tukey test results, it can be said that the tendency of retro consumption increases with age.

Homogeneity results should be checked before Anova analysis between variables.

Table 10: Homogeneity Test on Education and Variables

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Psychological Resilience        | 1,897            | 4   | 385 | .110 |
| Hope                            | .325             | 4   | 385 | .861 |
| Self-efficacy                   | .294             | 4   | 385 | .882 |
| Optimism                        | 1,992            | 4   | 385 | .095 |
| Retro ConsumptionTendency       | 2,506            | 4   | 385 | .062 |

The data according to Table 10 are homogeneous and the Anova test is appropriate.

Table 11. Anova Results on Educational Levels of Consumers and Sub-Dimensions of Psychological Capital and Retro Consumption Tendency

| Variable                  | Education | Average (X) | F value | Sig. (p) |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Psychological Resilience  | Primary e.| 20,8462     | 2,458   | 0,045    |
|                           | High school | 19,5342   |         |          |
|                           | A. Degree | 19,3274     |         |          |
|                           | License   | 18,8939     |         |          |
|                           | Master / Dr. | 16,0000 |         |          |
| Hope                      | Primary e.| 20,9744     | 1,017   | 0,398    |
|                           | High school | 20,6273   |         |          |
|                           | A. Degree | 20,3982     |         |          |
|                           | License   | 20,0909     |         |          |
According to Table 11, psychological resilience and self-efficacy subscale shows a significant difference with education. Tukey test results should be examined in order to understand which group is caused by this difference.

**Table 12: Education-Psychological Resilience Tukey Test Results**

|                      | Master / Dr.. | 18,0000 |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|
| **Self-efficacy**    | Primary e.    | 21,0769 |
|                      | High school   | 19,7205 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 19,2389 |
|                      | License       | 18,1212 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 18,4545 |
| **Optimism**         | Primary e.    | 21,0769 |
|                      | High school   | 20,7888 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 20,1832 |
|                      | License       | 18,9242 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 20,1818 |
| **Retro Consumption Tendency** | Primary e. | 54,5897 |
|                      | High school   | 53,2360 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 52,0708 |
|                      | License       | 49,3030 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 48,2727 |

Significant differences in education and psychological resilience stem from the group with primary education.

While the psychological resilience of those who have primary education is highest, the psychological resilience of consumers who have undergraduate, graduate and PhD education is at the lowest level. In this case, psychological resilience decreases as education increases.

**Table 13: Education-Psychological Resilience Tukey Test Results**

|                      | Master / Dr.. | 18,0000 |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|
| **Self-Efficacy**    | Primary e.    | 21,0769 |
|                      | High school   | 19,7205 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 19,2389 |
|                      | License       | 18,1212 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 18,4545 |
| **Optimism**         | Primary e.    | 21,0769 |
|                      | High school   | 20,7888 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 20,1832 |
|                      | License       | 18,9242 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 20,1818 |
| **Retro Consumption Tendency** | Primary e. | 54,5897 |
|                      | High school   | 53,2360 |
|                      | A. Degree     | 52,0708 |
|                      | License       | 49,3030 |
|                      | Master / Dr.  | 48,2727 |
As in the self-efficacy sub-dimension, psychological self-efficacy sub-dimension is higher than the ones who have primary education, bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral education.

Homogeneity results should be examined before Anova analysis between income and variables.

**Table 14: Homogeneity Test on Income and Variables**

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Psychological Resilience         | 0.748            | 2   | 387 | 0.474|
| Hope                             | 0.403            | 2   | 387 | 0.669|
| Self-efficacy                    | 1.547            | 2   | 387 | 0.214|
| Optimism                         | 2.126            | 2   | 387 | 0.121|
| Retro Consumption Tendency       | 0.599            | 2   | 387 | 0.550|

Since the p values are greater than 0.05, the data are homogeneous and the Anova test can be performed.

**Table 15. Anova Results on Revenues of Consumers and Sub-Dimensions of Psychological Capital and Retro Consumption Tendency**

| Variable                      | Revenue  | Average (X) | F value | Sig. (p) |
|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Psychological Resilience      | 2020 tl and less | 19,3913 | 0.001 | 0.999 |
|                               | 2021-5000 tl | 19,3978 |        |         |
|                               | 5000 tl and over | 19,4179 |        |         |
| Hope                          | 2020 tl and less | 20,4609 | 0.017 | 0.983 |
|                               | 2021-5000 tl | 20,3548 |        |         |
|                               | 5000 tl and over | 20,4328 |        |         |
| Self-efficacy                 | 2020 tl and less | 19,2652 | 2.026 | 0.133 |
|                               | 2021-5000 tl | 20,2473 |        |         |
|                               | 5000 tl and over | 20,4320 |        |         |
| Optimism                      | 2020 tl and less | 20,0913 | 0.776 | 0.465 |
|                               | 2021-5000 tl | 20,8172 |        |         |
|                               | 5000 tl and over | 20,5224 |        |         |
| Retro Consumption Tendency    | 2020 tl and less | 50,8783 | 6.694 | 0.001 |
|                               | 2021-5000 tl | 56,0323 |        |         |
|                               | 5000 tl and over | 51,5821 |        |         |

According to Table 15, there is a significant difference between the income of consumers and the trend of retro consumption.

The tukey test results should be checked to see which group is the difference.
Table 16: Income-Retro Consumption Tendency Tukey Test Results

| TukeyHSD\(^{a,b}\) | Retro Consumption Tendency | Subset\(\alpha = 0.05\) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Income              | N                           | 1   | 2    |
| 2020 tl and less    | 230                         | 50,8783 |
| 5001 tl and over    | 67                          | 51,5821 |
| 2021-5000           | 93                          | 56,0323 |
| Sig.                | .903                        | 1,000 |

When Tukey test results are examined, consumers with a income level between 2021-5000 tl have a higher tendency for retro consumption. The group with the lowest retro consumption tendencies is the consumer with minimum wage and lower income.

CONCLUSION

Today, the economic values of different countries can be compared with the economic value of the initiatives behind the emergence of this success due to the details of competing firms, governments, educational institutions and of course has become the focus of interest. Competitors began to replicate this success, governments began to develop policies for this purpose, and revised the curricula of educational institutions, while the scientific world focused this new situation on economic, political, socio-cultural and psychological aspects.

According to the results of the research; there is a strong relationship between psychological resilience, self-efficacy and optimism and the retro consumption tendency. Only a significant relationship was not found between hope sub-dimension and retro-consumption tendency. As the psychological resilience, self-efficacy and optimism of the consumers increase, retro (nostalgic) consumption tendencies increase.

According to other results of the research:

- Female consumers have higher psychological resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and retro-consumption tendencies than male consumers.

- Married consumers have higher psychological resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and retro-consumption tendencies than single consumers.

- Retro-consumption tendencies of 54-year-olds and older are higher than other age groups. The age group with the lowest tendency for retro consumption is the 18-24 age group. Retro-consumption tendency increases with age.
Psychological resilience and self-efficacy of the consumers with primary education is highest, while the psychological resilience of the consumers who have undergraduate, graduate and Phd education is the lowest. In this case, psychological resilience and self-efficacy decreases as education increases.

Consumers that income level between 2021-5000 tl, retro consumption trends are more. The group with the lowest retro consumption tendencies is the consumer with minimum wage and lower income.

Retro consumption and retro marketing are becoming more and more important. Businesses can take advantage of nostalgic elements to increase the profitability of their customers' longing for the past. It may be suggested that businesses include nostalgia in advertisements, brands and logos.

Since the study was carried out only in Erzincan, it could be seen as a limitation of this research. It can be performed in different provinces or regions in order to generalize the results. It may also be suggested to other researchers to compare the relationship between retro consumption and different consumer behaviors.
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