

The Dynamics of Well-Being in Daily Life: A Multilevel Perspective

David B. Newman

Department of Psychology

Social Psychology

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Southern California

Faculty of the USC Graduate School

August 15, 2019

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Chapter I: Nostalgia and Well-Being in Daily Life: An Ecological Validity Perspective... 10	
Transition.....	68
Chapter II: Global Reports of Well-Being Overestimate Aggregated Daily States.....	69
General Discussion.....	87
References.....	89
Appendix.....	105
Tables.....	106

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my co-advisors, Norbert Schwarz and Arthur Stone, for their guidance and mentorship throughout my studies as a doctoral student. I have learned a great deal from each of them through our conversations, our coauthored papers, and through lab meeting discussions. I am very grateful for the influence they have had on my academic career thus far. I would also like to thank Daphna Oyserman, Donna Spruijt-Metz, and Cheryl Wakslak for serving on my dissertation committee and for their helpful comments and edits on an earlier draft of my paper on nostalgia.

## Introduction

Social and personality psychologists rely heavily on experiments in controlled settings to understand thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in daily life. Although informative in providing insight into causal mechanisms, carefully controlled experiments leave open how well the results bear on phenomena as they occur in daily life. The use of methods that describe phenomena in the real world can provide useful and important information and appeals for greater use of these methods have certainly been warranted (Rozin, 2009). Purely descriptive information is limited though in the extent to which phenomena can be explained. An alternative to emphasizing a single method is to use a variety of techniques to understand thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in daily life.

One class of methods that is well-suited to study daily life processes is known as ecological momentary assessment (EMA; Stone & Shiffman, 1994). In these studies, participants are asked about their behaviors, thoughts, and feelings in real time. They involve a selection of time points that attempt to either capture a representative sample of time points or a strategic sample of instances of a particular behavior or experience. Participants complete multiple reports over time which helps depict the ebb and flow of experiences in a dynamic manner.

The use of EMA and daily diary techniques can considerably extend the research in social and personality psychology in several ways (Newman & Stone, 2019). First, EMA methods enable researchers to examine within-person processes, a level of analysis that is distinct from between-person analyses, the level at which many, if not most, theories are tested. Second, EMA methods ask participants to reflect on the current moment or to recall a short amount of time (e.g., the last few hours). This limits recall biases and heuristics that are present in single-assessment global reports. Distinguishing the present moment from longer recall

periods can yield novel insights about phenomena as they occur in daily life. Third, EMA methods typically select a random (and somewhat representative) sample of time points from the larger population of time points of people's current lives, which increases the ecological validity of these findings. This can often lead to novel conclusions that contrast with findings from experimental paradigms that study specific contexts. I expand on each of these three characteristics of EMA methods, followed by an overview of the two chapters that include studies that utilize these techniques to examine well-being in daily life.

### **Distinguishing between- and within-person relationships**

Between-person analyses primarily focus on relationships between variables measured as individual differences. Within-person analyses, in contrast, primarily focus on relationships between repeated measures of situations, feelings, states, and behaviors. These levels of analysis are mathematically independent (Nezlek, 2001) and can represent distinct psychological processes (Affleck, Zautra, Tennen, & Armeli, 1999). Failing to disentangle these levels of analysis can lead to misleading conclusions. For example, consider the relationship between typing speed and typing mistakes. A between-person analysis would reveal that people who type quickly make fewer mistakes than those who type more slowly (a negative relationship). Presumably, those who type quickly have had lots of practice over the years and have acquired a level of expertise, whereas those who type slowly are likely novices who might make frequent mistakes. In contrast, a within-person analysis would reveal that for any particular person, the number of typing mistakes will increase as typing speed increases (a positive relationship; Hamaker, 2012). Making a general conclusion about potential effects of typing speed on typing mistakes from a between-person level of analysis would lead to an erroneous conclusion, namely

that typing speed decreases typos. This type of error is known as an ecological fallacy (Robinson, 1950).

Several other examples of contrasting relationships at between- and within-person levels of analysis have been documented in health and clinical psychology. For example, between-persons, those who exercise regularly have a lower risk of having a heart attack (a negative relationship). In contrast, within-persons, the average person is at a higher risk of having a heart attack when they exercise compared to times when they are not exercising (a positive relationship; Curran & Bauer, 2011).

A couple of interesting between- vs. within-person distinctions have been made recently in the fields of social and personality psychology. At a between-person level of analysis, those who report higher levels of searching for meaning in life report lower levels of presence of meaning in life (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006; Steger, Kashdan, Sullivan, & Lorentz, 2008). In contrast, within-individuals, people report greater levels of presence of meaning in daily life on days when they search for meaning in their lives (Newman, Nezlek, & Thrash, 2018a). Asking people at one time to think about how much they search for meaning in their lives likely prompts thoughts about what the overarching meaning is to their lives, which can be a difficult task. Searching for meaning in daily life, however, is much more manageable and can lead to the feeling that life is quite meaningful on that particular day and on the following day. As another example, Newman and colleagues found that people who report engaging in prayers of supplication, thanksgiving, confession, and adoration all report greater well-being than those who do not pray as frequently (Newman, Nezlek, & Thrash, 2018b, in preparation). This pattern replicates a more general finding that religious people report greater well-being than non-religious people (Diener, Tay, & Myers, 2011; Steger & Frazier, 2005). Moving beyond

between-person analyses, Newman et al. showed that, within-persons, people reported greater well-being on days when they engaged in prayers of thanksgiving and adoration but lower well-being on days when they engaged in prayers of supplication and confession. These within-person relationships demonstrate how the daily events of the day can dictate the types of prayer people engage in and how they feel on those days, a process that differs substantially from the between-person relationships. These studies illustrate the dangers of generalizing a pattern of findings from one level of analysis to another.

### **Global evaluations vs. daily reports**

In addition to providing information about within-person relationships, EMA methods restrict the reflection period to a short amount of time, such as the present moment or past couple of hours. This differs considerably from global evaluations in which participants reflect on their lives, which is a prominent method of self-report in cross-sectional studies that attempt to assess personality traits or individual differences. When people are asked to think about their lives in general, they obviously cannot replay their entire lives and sum up or create an average level of the construct. Instead, they try to remember and confirm instances of the variable of interest in their lives. This results in a biased reconstruction of their life that overemphasizes peak and recent experiences (Robinson & Clore, 2002; Schwarz, 2012).

Global evaluations also differ from concurrent, momentary reports in terms of their psychological distance. Global evaluations require the participant to reflect on a long period of time, whereas momentary reports require a much shorter reflection. As temporal distance increases, judgments become less concrete and more abstract (Trope & Liberman, 2010). This has important implications for particular well-being judgments that are more abstract in nature, such as meaning in life. People tend to find more meaning in life as psychological distance

increases (e.g., as people think about their life in the future as opposed to the present; Waytz, Hershfield, & Tamir, 2015).

### **Daily life vs. experiments**

In addition to providing a contrast to global evaluations, EMA methods can also offer a unique perspective that differs from results from experimental methods. It is important to remember, as Joe McGrath noted, that all methods are seriously flawed (McGrath, 1982). That is, they each have their own strengths and weaknesses. Experiments excel at demonstrating causality by ruling out third variable confounds through random assignment. They also offer precision in understanding exact processes and mechanisms that underlie various effects. One limitation of experiments though, is that they often lack ecological validity. That is, it is often difficult to determine whether the variable manipulated in the lab is the same of the variable that occurs in the real world. In some cases, manipulating the variable alters the very construct that experimenters intended to study. For example, lack of control has been shown to increase an illusory pattern perception (Whitson & Galinsky, 2008). In these experiments, participants in the lack-of-control condition receive random feedback after clicking on dots on a computer screen. In the real world, however, lack of control takes a different form (e.g., “will my boss fire me?” “Will the military require my family to move?”). This type of lack of control looks quite different from the uncertainty that undergraduate participants face in the lab.

EMA methods attenuate this issue by sampling random and representative moments from one’s life. The sampling design allows researchers to more easily generalize findings to the real world. It also depicts a more accurate representation of people’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, which is often more mundane and less extreme than the situations created in the lab. Measuring states as they occur in daily life can sometimes lead to conclusions that differ from

conclusions drawn from experiments. Of course, EMA methods have their own set of limitations that differ from the limitations of experiments. Because the primary goal of EMA methods is to measure variables as they occur naturally, these variables cannot be easily manipulated in real time. Therefore, EMA methods are limited in the extent to which they can address causal processes. The best approach, therefore, is to use a variety of methods to offset limitations of each individual method (McGrath, 1982). In some cases, findings across methods converge, whereas in other cases, they lead to opposing conclusions.

### **Overview of dissertation**

The dissertation is composed of two chapters that include sets of studies that utilize EMA and daily diary methods to understand well-being in daily life. The first chapter examines what nostalgia looks like in daily life and how it relates to well-being. The chapter addresses between- and within-person relationships between nostalgia and well-being. The finding that nostalgia is negatively related to well-being in daily life contrasts with many experiments that find that nostalgia increases well-being. This illustrates the importance of relying on several different methodologies to obtain a more complete and accurate depiction of nostalgia's effect on well-being. The studies in the second chapter compare aggregated daily states of well-being with global evaluations of well-being. Global evaluations of well-being were consistently higher than aggregated daily states. These findings demonstrate how well-being judgments may differ depending on the reflection period, and this has important implications for well-being research.

## Chapter I: Nostalgia and Well-Being in Daily Life: An Ecological Validity Perspective

Newman, D. B., Sachs, M. E., Stone, A. A., & Schwarz, N. (in press). Nostalgia and well-being in daily life: An ecological validity perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000236>

### Abstract

Nostalgia is a mixed emotion. Recent empirical research, however, has highlighted positive effects of nostalgia, suggesting it is a predominantly positive emotion. When measured as an individual difference, nostalgia-prone individuals report greater meaning in life and approach temperament. When manipulated in an experimental paradigm, nostalgia increases meaning in life, self-esteem, optimism, and positive affect. These positive effects may result from the specific experimental procedures used and little is known about daily experiences that covary with nostalgia. To address this gap, we aimed to measure nostalgia in ecologically valid contexts. We created and validated the Personal Inventory of Nostalgic Experiences (PINE) scale (Studies 1a - 1d) to assess both trait and state-based nostalgic experiences. When measured as an individual difference, the nomological net was generally negative (Study 2). When measured in daily life (Studies 3 – 4), nostalgia as a state variable was negatively related to well-being. Lagged analyses showed that state nostalgia had mixed effects on well-being at a later moment that day and negative effects on well-being on the following day. To reconcile the discrepancies between these studies and the positive effects of nostalgia from previous research, we showed that experimentally induced nostalgic recollections were rated more positively and less negatively than daily experiences of nostalgia (Study 5). These studies show that nostalgia is a mixed emotion; although it may be predominantly positive when nostalgic memories are generated on request, it seems predominantly negative when nostalgia is experienced in the course of everyday life.

*Keywords:* nostalgia, well-being, ecological validity, ecological momentary assessment,  
diary study

Nostalgia is often classified as a mixed emotion because it is composed of positive and negative aspects. The Oxford English dictionary defines nostalgia as “A sentimental longing or wistful affection for a period in the past.” Similar to other emotions, nostalgia presumably varies within individuals. Someone may feel nostalgic at a particular moment in time but not the next. The intensity of nostalgic feelings may also vary considerably from moment to moment or from day to day. Moreover, these fluctuating states of nostalgia likely occur concurrently with a variety of situations, contexts, and internal states. Currently very little is known about the daily experiences that occur in real time when people feel nostalgic. The goal of the present set of studies was to examine the daily experiences, feelings, thoughts, and states of well-being that accompany feelings of nostalgia.

### **Review of Empirical Findings on Nostalgia**

Recent empirical findings from psychology suggest that nostalgia is associated with numerous psychological benefits. For example, nostalgia-prone individuals (those who report higher levels of intensity and frequency of nostalgia) report greater meaning in life (Cheung et al., 2013; Routledge et al., 2011) and approach motivation (Stephan et al., 2014), a dimension of personality that, in contrast to avoidance motivation, is associated with positive emotionality (Elliot & Thrash, 2010). In experimental settings, nostalgia increases meaning in life, optimism, self-esteem, social connectedness, and positive affect (Cheung et al., 2013; Routledge et al., 2011; Wildschut, Sedikides, Arndt, & Routledge, 2006). In a recent review of the literature, Sedikides and colleagues concluded that “...nostalgia is considered an emotion, and a predominantly positive one at that” (Sedikides et al., 2015, p. 6).

Recent theories hold that feelings of nostalgia are associated with positive outcomes because of two different mechanisms. One mechanism is a regulatory, restorative, or palliative

function in which nostalgia buffers certain negative effects. When negative events occur, they can influence an individual in a negative manner by decreasing well-being. Negative events can also trigger feelings of nostalgia, and these nostalgic experiences attenuate the associated negative effects. For example, the negative effects of experimentally induced self-threat (Vess, Arndt, Routledge, Sedikides, & Wildschut, 2012) and perceived meaninglessness (Routledge et al., 2011) have been attenuated by recalling nostalgic experiences. In correlational studies, the negative effects of loneliness have been buffered by nostalgia (Zhou, Sedikides, Wildschut, & Gao, 2008). Presumably, recalling nostalgic experiences increases one's sense of social connectedness, which is assumed to restore one's well-being following a negative experience.

A second mechanism of nostalgia is one in which nostalgia serves self-oriented, existential, and social functions, which subsequently lead directly to positive outcomes. In terms of its self-orienting function, participants in one study reported higher self-esteem after listening to a nostalgic song (Cheung et al., 2013). People also reported higher optimism about their future after smelling scents that made them feel nostalgic (Cheung et al., 2013). Regarding the existential function, after pondering a past nostalgic event, people reported lower levels of searching for meaning in life (Routledge et al., 2011). Finally, several studies support a social function of nostalgia. For example, after participants were instructed to think about the most nostalgic experience in their own lives, they reported lower attachment anxiety and avoidance (Wildschut et al., 2006 study 6), a higher degree of social support (Zhou et al., 2008), and an increased level of trust towards an outgroup member (Turner, Wildschut, & Sedikides, 2012). Recalling a nostalgic memory has even increased prosocial behavior, such as helping a stranger pick up dropped pencils (Stephan et al., 2014) and donating to charity (Zhou, Wildschut,

Sedikides, Shi, & Feng, 2012). In sum, various mechanisms suggest that nostalgic recollections can lead to positive outcomes (for a review, see Sedikides et al., 2015).

### **Ecological Validity Considerations**

Although such experimental studies are informative in providing information about psychological processes involved in nostalgia and its outcomes, they tell us little about the emergence and consequences of nostalgia in everyday life (Brunswik, 1956; Shiffman & Stone, 1998). In the absence of such information, one cannot even determine to what extent the experimental settings created by researchers mimic circumstances that elicit feelings of nostalgia in natural contexts. It also remains unknown what types of situations, feelings, and states of well-being are likely to co-occur with nostalgia in daily life. To our knowledge, only one study has captured nostalgia as it has occurred in daily life (Zhou, Wildschut, Sedikides, Chen, & Vingerhoets, 2012, Study 1). In this study, 19 Chinese participants recorded how nostalgic they felt each evening over the course of 30 days. Participants were more likely to feel nostalgic on cold days than on warm days. No other situational factors or internal feelings were assessed in this study, however. Clearly, there is a dearth of information about the daily experiences that could covary with daily states of nostalgia.

Our aim was to bridge this gap in the literature by examining and measuring nostalgia in daily life through the use of daily diary (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003) and ecological momentary assessment (EMA) techniques (Stone & Shiffman, 1994). Diary and EMA studies are designed to capture behavior, thoughts, and feelings as they occur in real time in daily life (Shiffman, Stone, & Hufford, 2008). One advantage of this methodology is that recall biases are limited; daily or momentary reports are much more accurate in capturing affective experience than global recalls (National Research Council, 2013, pp. 29–30; Robinson & Clore, 2002;

Schwarz, 2012). Such techniques allow the researcher to measure “life as it is lived” (Bolger et al., 2003), suggesting that EMA techniques can greatly enhance our understanding of nostalgia in real-world settings.

Another advantage of daily diary and EMA techniques is that they can capture ordinary feelings and experiences, whereas experimental manipulations often privilege unusual experiences in the interest of strong manipulations. Indeed, the most common experimental manipulation of nostalgia is the Event Reflection Task, which asks participants to “...think of a past event that makes you feel *most* nostalgic” (italics added for emphasis). Such instructions explicitly ask for an event that is likely to differ from one’s most common nostalgia experiences, which are not the “most” nostalgic ones. In other studies (Iyer & Jetten, 2011, Study 3; Wildschut et al., 2006, Study 6), participants were asked to recall a nostalgic event that had personal meaning (e.g., “please think of a nostalgic event in your life—a nostalgic event that has personal meaning for you”). Asking for a “meaningful” event increases the odds that the recalled event affects well-being related measures, which may or may not be the case for other episodes of nostalgia. In short, commonly used experimental instructions in nostalgia research compound the concerns usually associated with recall-based reports (for reviews, see Schwarz, 2012; Schwarz, Kahneman, & Xu, 2009), including the higher memorability of extreme and personally meaningful events and the disproportionate impact of peaks and ends (Fredrickson & Kahneman, 1993; Morewedge, Gilbert, & Wilson, 2005). Moreover, negative affect associated with past events has often been found to fade quicker than positive affect (e.g., Ritchie et al., 2006; Walker, Vogl, & Thompson, 1997), adding a risk of differential affect reconstruction when people report on distant episodes. People also remember central aspects of nostalgia (e.g., fond memories, personal meaning, happiness), which tend to be relatively positive, more easily than

peripheral aspects of nostalgia (e.g., mixed feelings, regret, loneliness, pain/anxiety), which tend to be relatively negative (Hepper et al., 2012), again enhancing the risk of biased reconstruction.

All of these concerns should be attenuated when participants report how nostalgic they feel in real time. Concurrent or temporally close reports can provide a more representative sample of nostalgic experiences, including experiences of lower intensity. They also bypass the difficulties associated with selecting and reconstructing a past experience. In addition, any negative affect that may be associated with nostalgia is less likely to be missed in real-time reporting. By the same token, however, real-time assessments of nostalgia are unlikely to capture rare episodes of particularly intense nostalgia, unless the sample of persons and/or time points is very large. Hence, real-time studies may miss benefits that are uniquely associated with peak nostalgia experiences.

Based on these considerations we hypothesized that the relationship between nostalgia and well-being captured in everyday experiences would not be as positive as suggested by much of the experimental work (Sedikides & Wildschut, 2018). We further predicted that the nomological net of nostalgia would be mixed, i.e., nostalgia would relate to some positive and some negative attributes. This pattern of findings would be consistent with common definitions of nostalgia that contain positive and negative aspects. The Greek origin of the word nostalgia even contains positive and negative aspects (*nostos* = “return home”, *algos* = “pain”).

### **Measurement of Nostalgia**

In order to test this hypothesis and evaluate the experience of nostalgia in daily life, we needed to create a measure that could capture nostalgia in ecologically valid settings. Some existing scales measure nostalgia in very specific settings, such as in the context of marketing (Pascal, Sprott, & Muehling, 2002), and in response to advertisements (Marchegiani & Phau,

2013). The Nostalgia Inventory (Batcho, 1995) lists specific aspects of one's past that one misses, such as family, places, toys, and music. This restricts the concept of nostalgia to aspects of one's past that one misses and excludes other aspects, such as the extent to which one yearns for and desires to return to or relive a past experience or situation.

The most widely used measure of nostalgia, the Southampton Nostalgia Scale (SNS; Barrett et al., 2010; Routledge, Arndt, Sedikides, & Wildschut, 2008), is also not ideal for our purposes. The most recent version of the scale contains seven items designed to assess nostalgia proneness as an individual difference (Barrett et al., 2010). Each item contains the word "nostalgia" which creates a narrow construct. As McCrae (2015) noted, trait variance becomes confounded with specific item variance when an instrument is dominated by almost identical questions, a technique that Cattell (1973) once called a "bloated specific". Additionally, one item of the SNS asks participants to recall how often they bring to mind nostalgic experiences with responses ranging from "At least once a day" to "Once or twice a year." This question assumes that nostalgia is a dichotomous variable (e.g., one either feels nostalgic or not) rather than a continuous variable (e.g., one can feel nostalgic to varying degrees). Finally, two of the SNS items ask participants how valuable and significant nostalgic feelings are to them, which selectively directs attention to positive aspects of nostalgia. In sum, published scales assessing nostalgia have either measured the construct in highly specific contexts, have asked participants questions that rely on extensive recall, and have included aspects that do not pertain to the experience per se.

### **Overview of present studies**

As a first step, we created and validated a brief trait nostalgia scale (Studies 1a – 1d). Next, we examined the between-person relationships between nostalgia, personality, and well-

being measured as traits or individual differences to assess the nomological net of nostalgia (Study 2). To ascertain the usefulness of this new scale, we additionally compared the strengths of the relationships between our new scale and other constructs with the relationships between the SNS scale and other constructs.

Following scale construction, we conducted a daily diary study (Study 3) to address our primary research aim of understanding how nostalgia relates to other daily experiences, feelings, and thoughts in a naturalistic setting. The intensive repeated measures nature of a diary study also allowed us to examine within-person relationships, a level of analysis that is statistically orthogonal to between-person relationships (Nezlek, 2001). Separating within-person and between-person variance in nostalgia considerably extends the research agenda, given that theories concerning the relationship between nostalgia and well-being have been tested almost exclusively with between-person designs. In Study 4, we conducted an EMA study in which participants reported their momentary nostalgic feelings and well-being at randomly selected time points throughout the day, thus eliminating the need to recall any past experiences. The findings from these naturalistic studies diverged from experimental findings by showing that nostalgia is a mixed emotion, although more strongly associated with negative feelings than positive feelings. Study 5 addressed this divergence between experimental and real-time findings by comparing recalled nostalgic experiences with daily nostalgic experiences. This comparison allowed us to determine whether experimentally induced nostalgic recollections are more positive than everyday nostalgic experiences, a difference that may drive the associations observed in Studies 3 and 4.

## Studies 1a – 1d: Scale Construction

The purpose of the first set of studies was to develop a short nostalgia scale. Although our primary goal was to create a scale that could assess nostalgia at the daily level, we additionally aimed to test the psychometric properties of the scale as an individual difference measure. We initially asked participants to think of their life in general to assess a trait-like individual difference measure of nostalgia. The creation of a trait measure of nostalgia would serve as a foundation for developing daily items to be administered in daily diary studies.

### Study 1a

#### Method

The cognitive interview portion of Study 1a was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern California under the ID UP-15-00625. The latter part of Study 1a, Study 1b, Study 1c, Study 2, and Study 3 were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern California under the ID UP-15-00479.

To generate items for a measure of nostalgia, we initially drew from four primary sources. First, we considered words written by students about a recent nostalgic experience (Wildschut et al., 2006). Second, we read definitions from several dictionaries, such as Oxford, Merriam-Webster, and Collins English. Third, we considered the items from scales that have been used to measure nostalgia in specific contexts, such as the personal nostalgic response to advertisements (Marchegiani & Phau, 2013), the Evoked Nostalgia Scale to assess nostalgia in marketing contexts (Pascal et al., 2002), and the Batcho Nostalgia Scale (Batcho, 1995) designed specifically to assess the extent to which people miss aspects of their past. Fourth, to assess nostalgia in an ecologically valid context, we called 33 undergraduate students ( $M_{\text{age}} = 20.09$ ,  $SD = 1.4$ ; 51.52% female) in the evening between 9:00pm – 11:30pm and asked them to recount the

events of their day. After reconstructing their day, we asked participants how nostalgic they felt today on a 10-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 10 = *very much*). After the participants provided a numeric rating, we asked them what words came to mind when they heard the word ‘nostalgia’ or what they thought of when they thought of the word ‘nostalgia’. The answers to these questions are listed in Supplemental Table 1.

From these sources, we created a list of 15 items with the goal of capturing a wide variety of language used to define nostalgia. We placed a particular emphasis on the responses recorded by participants at the end of their day because these descriptions were recorded in an ecologically valid setting (see Supplemental Table 2). We then administered the 15-items to 470 undergraduate students from a large private university in the US. Participants were asked, “Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements describe you in general.” Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*). As recommended by Meade and Craig (2012), we included an instructed response item to capture insufficient effort responses: “Please select the choice ‘Very much’ for this question.” Twenty-six participants failed to answer this question correctly and their data were removed; final analyses included data from 444 participants ( $M_{age} = 20.21$ ,  $SD = 2.82$ ; 77.5% female).

## **Results**

We factor analyzed responses to the 15 items with the R package *semTools* and the function *factanal*. First, we examined the eigenvalues (7.62, 1.28, .93, .69, .60...). A single factor solution seemed most reasonable, but we also examined a two-factor model using a maximum likelihood estimation with direct oblimin rotation (as recommended by Costello & Osbourne, 2005). The items did not load onto the two respective factors in a meaningful manner, so we

opted for a single factor model. The factor loadings are presented next to items in Supplemental Table 2.

## Study 1b

### Method

Some of the 15 items were redundant. Because our goal was to create a brief scale, we kept the first 6 items because they had high factor loadings and still contained varied descriptions of nostalgia. We distributed the shortened scale to 298 undergraduate students from the same university as Study 1a ( $M_{\text{age}} = 19.48$ ,  $SD = 1.69$ , 71.5% female) in a similar manner.

### Results

We ran a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) in R. All 6 items were treated as indicators of a latent construct of nostalgia. The variance of the latent construct was fixed at 1 so that we could estimate each factor loading. The data were not multivariate normal as indicated by Mardia's tests of skewness,  $\hat{\gamma}_{1,p} = 3.82$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , and kurtosis,  $\hat{\gamma}_{2,p} = 65.12$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , so we used a maximum likelihood estimator with robust standard errors (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). The standardized loadings of each indicator were as follows: .74, .81, .70, .81, .76, .83. The model fit was not optimal,  $\chi^2(9) = 89.58$ ,  $p < .001$ ; RMSEA = .228, 90% CI [.186, .272]; CFI = .874; SRMR = .065. Therefore, we tested alternative models by dropping items that we felt were redundant with the others. After dropping items 2 and 4, we found good model fit with items 1, 3, 5, and 6 as indicators of a latent construct. Standardized factor loadings were .83, .81, .83, .65 and the model fit was considerably better,  $\chi^2(2) = .85$ ,  $p = .66$ ; RMSEA = .000, 90% CI [.000, .121]; CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .008. These four items were as follows: "How nostalgic do you feel?", "To what extent do you feel

sentimental for the past?”, “How much do you feel a wistful affection for the past?”, and “To what extent do you feel a longing to return to a former time in your life?”

### Study 1c

#### Method

Although the 4-item model showed good model fit, we may have capitalized on chance given that the shortened 4-item model was generated after we tested model fit with the initial 6-items. To rule out this possibility, we administered the shortened 4-item scale to 440 undergraduate students ( $M_{age} = 20.13$ ,  $SD = 1.93$ ; 69.8% female) during the next semester in a similar manner as before.

#### Results

We ran a CFA with the four items as indicators of a single latent construct as described previously. The data were not multivariate normal as indicated by Mardia’s tests of skewness,  $\hat{\gamma}_{1,p} = 1.62$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , and kurtosis,  $\hat{\gamma}_{2,p} = 32.61$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Therefore, we used a maximum likelihood estimator with robust standard errors (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). The standardized factor loadings were all above .70: .82, .84, .85, and .72. Model fit indicators were good:  $\chi^2(2) = .57$ ,  $p = .75$ , RMSEA = .000, 90% CI [.000, .092], CFI = 1.000, SRMR = .005. Revelle’s omega coefficient to test reliability was also sufficiently high (.89) as was Cronbach’s alpha (.87). We note that Cronbach’s alpha has several documented limitations (Bentler, 2017; McNeish, 2017), but we report it throughout nevertheless due to its widespread use. In sum, the four-item measure of nostalgia demonstrated excellent psychometric properties. The four items are highlighted with an asterisk in Supplemental Table 2 and can additionally be found in the Appendix.

## Study 1d

### Method

Study 1d was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern California under the ID UP-16-00003. Next, we tested the reliability of the trait measure by assessing nostalgia as an individual difference at two time points separated by 10 weeks. This enabled us to examine measurement invariance and the correlation between latent constructs at two time points.

198 undergraduate students signed up for the study and completed the first measure of nostalgia in exchange for research credit for a course. The first questionnaire was distributed at the beginning of the semester and the follow-up questionnaire was distributed 10 weeks later. Twelve participants did not complete the second questionnaire. Final analyses included 186 participants ( $M_{\text{age}} = 20.28$ ;  $SD = 2.57$ ; 77.4% female). Participants who completed both questionnaires did not differ significantly from participants who only completed the first questionnaire in terms of their age,  $t(16.79) = 1.76$ ,  $p = .31$ , ratio of males to females (odds ratio = 1.14,  $p = .74$ ), or mean levels of nostalgia,  $t(12.13) = 1.65$ ,  $p = .13$ .

Similar to the previous studies, participants were asked to think about their life in general as they completed the four-item nostalgia scale.

### Results

Means, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis, and inter-item correlations for the trait version of the scale are presented in Supplemental Table 3. Revelle's omega measure of reliability was .91 ( $\alpha = .88$ ) at Time 1 and .89 ( $\alpha = .88$ ) at Time 2.

We tested measurement invariance across time points using a confirmatory factor analysis approach as outlined by Vandenberg and Lance (2000). The four nostalgia items

distributed at Time 1 were treated as indicators of a latent construct at Time 1, and the four nostalgia items at Time 2 were similarly treated as indicators of a latent construct at Time 2. Errors terms of each nostalgia item at Time 1 were allowed to freely covary with each respective nostalgia item at Time 2 (e.g., item1 at Time1 with item1 at Time2). Variances of each latent construct were fixed to 1 and the latent constructs were allowed to freely covary.

First, we found that the data were not multivariate normal as indicated by Mardia's tests of skewness,  $\hat{\gamma}_{1,p} = 6.80, p < 0.001$ , and kurtosis,  $\hat{\gamma}_{2,p} = 90.77, p < 0.001$ , so we used a maximum likelihood estimator with robust standard errors (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). The model fit was good:  $\chi^2(2) = 18.62, p = .23$ ; RMSEA = .040, 90% CI [.000, .091]; CFI = .995; SRMR = .025. The standardized factor loadings at time 1 were .85, .87, .82, and .70; at Time 2, the standardized factor loadings were .84, .84, .85, and .69. The standardized covariation between the latent nostalgia constructs at Time 1 and Time 2 was .64,  $z = 11.26, p < .001$ . Although this correlation was not as high as some correlations in test-retest reliability studies involving individual differences, it is similar to studies that have assessed positive and negative affect at multiple time points just four weeks apart (e.g., Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996).

More importantly, we tested measurement invariance to determine whether the latent constructs of nostalgia at both time points were represented by the four nostalgia items in similar manners. The four tests of measurement invariance increase in the extent to which they restrict the models to be similar to both time points. Configural or pattern invariance tests whether the number and pattern of factor loadings remains constant. Weak or metric invariance restricts the respective factor loadings at each time to be equal and tests whether the factor variances and covariances are equal across time points. Strong or scalar invariance restricts the intercepts to be equal at each time point and tests whether the means of each item are consistent. Finally, strict or

error invariance restricts the uniquenesses or error terms of each indicator to be equal. Typically, the former two tests of measurement invariance are considered adequate and the latter two tests are considered too strict (Little, 2013). As presented in Supplemental Table 4, we found measurement invariance at each level of restriction. That is, not only were the factor patterns and factor loadings similar at each time point, but the factor means and error structures were also consistent over time. This suggests that the four items reliably measure the underlying construct in a similar manner over time.

## **Discussion**

Thus far we have established that the four-item measure of nostalgia concisely summarizes aspects of nostalgia using a variety of terms. The items show good internal consistency, and they hang together in a similar manner over time. We now name this scale the Personal Inventory of Nostalgic Experiences (PINE; see Appendix for the list of items).

### **Study 2: Individual Differences in Nostalgia**

In this study, we examined the nomological net of nostalgia at a trait level of analysis. We relied on two of the major theories of personality, namely approach and avoidance temperament (Elliot & Thrash, 2002) and the Big Five personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Because nostalgia entails thinking about the past, we considered individual differences in time perspectives captured with the Time Perspective Inventory (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). We also included several well-being measures, such as satisfaction with life, meaning in life, affect, self-esteem, and depression because one of our primary aims was to understand the relationship between nostalgia and well-being. Finally, we examined the relationships between nostalgia and various other measures that often predict or relate to well-being, such as optimism, searching for meaning in life, regret, empathy, and inspiration. These variables have been measured in

previous research on nostalgia, often as a dependent variable. Our goal was to examine these relationships at a trait level.

We also expected the PINE Scale to be positively related to the Southampton Nostalgia Scale while not being redundant as to suggest the items measure the same latent construct. Given that the Southampton Nostalgia Scale was correlated with various measures of well-being, a further goal of this study was to compare the strengths of the relationships between well-being and the PINE scale with those of the Southampton Nostalgia Scale.

## **Method**

**Participants and procedure.** Undergraduate students completed online questionnaires in exchange for course research credit. Participants were instructed to reflect on their life in general as they responded to the questions. Seven samples of participants completed questionnaires online via the survey provider Qualtrics. Some of the measures were asked in multiple questionnaires, and we aggregated the samples to increase power in our calculations. Moreover, some participants completed multiple questionnaires. For these participants, we included their first questionnaire and excluded any additional questionnaires that contained a duplicate measure. The total aggregated sample included 596 ( $M_{\text{age}} = 20.06$ ,  $SD = 2.2$ ; 72.80% female) unique participants.

### **Materials.**

**Nostalgia.** Nostalgia was assessed in each sample with the 4-item PINE measure with a 7-point response scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*). In three of the samples, participants also completed the Southampton Nostalgia Scale, which contains 7 items. For example, “How valuable is nostalgia for you?” (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*). When participants completed both scales in the same questionnaire, the order in which they completed scales was randomized

and a few scales were included in between the separate nostalgia scales to distribute any potential context effects.

***Personality traits and individual differences.*** Approach/avoidance temperament and the Big Five were used to assess personality. We used a 12-item scale to measure approach and avoidance temperament (Elliot & Thrash, 2010). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 4 = *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). In two samples ( $N = 171$ ), we used a 44-item scale to assess the Big Five (John & Srivastava, 1999), and in one sample ( $N = 108$ ) we used the newer 60-item Big Five 2 scale (Soto & John, 2017). Correlations between nostalgia and the five personality traits did not differ meaningfully between the two measures of the Big Five, so we combined the samples together for the analyses.

The Time Perspective Inventory (TPI; Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999) includes five factors to describe individual differences in how participants think about time: past positive (e.g., “It gives me great pleasure to think about my past”), past negative (e.g., “I think about the bad things that have happened to me in the past”), present fatalistic (e.g., “Since whatever will be will be, it doesn’t really matter what I do”), present hedonic (e.g., “I believe that getting together with one’s friends to party is one of life’s important pleasures”), and future (e.g., “I believe that a person’s day should be planned ahead each morning”). Responses were recorded on a 5-point scale (1 = *Very uncharacteristic*, 5 = *Very characteristic*).

***Well-being and related constructs.*** Given the focus of the paper, we included several well-being indicators and other constructs relevant to well-being (inspiration, empathy, searching for meaning in life, regret, and depression). Satisfaction with life was assessed with the 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) with responses on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*).

Affect was measured using a circumplex model that distinguishes valence (positive and negative) and arousal (activated and deactivated) (e.g., Feldman Barrett & Russell, 1998). Items were taken from a list of adjectives that have been used reliably in daily diary research (e.g., Brandstätter, 2007; Nezlek, 2005) and were worded to reflect one's life in general. Positive activated affect (PA) was assessed with the words enthusiastic, delighted, happy, glad, and excited; positive deactivated affect (PD) with the words calm, peaceful, relaxed, contented, and at ease; negative activated affect (NA) with stressed, angry, annoyed, tense, and nervous; negative deactivated affect (ND) with depressed, disappointed, miserable, gloomy, and sad. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *do not feel this way at all*, 4 = *feel this way moderately*, 7 = *feel this way very strongly*).

The two dimensions of meaning in life (presence and search) were assessed with the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006). Example items include "My life has a clear sense of purpose" and "I am searching for meaning in my life" for presence and search, respectively. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Absolutely Untrue*, 7 = *Absolutely True*).

Self-esteem was assessed with the 10-item Rosenberg scale (Rosenberg, 1965) with responses recorded on a 4-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 4 = *Strongly Agree*).

Regret was measured with a 5-item scale that has been used in the context of decision making (Schwartz et al., 2002). An example item is "When I think about how I'm doing in life, I often assess opportunities I have passed up," and responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Completely disagree*, 7 = *Completely agree*).

Empathy was assessed with the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983). The scale is composed of four subscales: perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress.

Given our interest in the broad concept, we created an aggregate score across all subscales. Participants responded on a 5-point scale (1= *Does not describe me well*, 5 = *Describes me very well*).

Depression was measured using the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977), which instructs participants to recall how often they have felt a particular way during the past week. The scale contains 20-items (e.g., “I thought my life had been a failure”). Responses were recorded on a 4-point scale (0 = *Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)*..., 3 = *Most or all of the time (5-7 days)*).

Inspiration was measured with four items (e.g., “I feel inspired”). After each item, frequency and intensity were recorded with the questions “How often does this happen?” and “How deeply or strongly (in general)?” on 7-point response scales (1 = *Never*, 7 = *Very often*; 1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very deeply or strongly*, respectively) (Thrash & Elliot, 2003). As recommended by Thrash and Elliot (2003), we aggregated these items for a total score of inspiration and present correlations with nostalgia and all three inspiration scores (frequency, intensity, aggregate).

Means for each construct were calculated and used for the correlations with the exception of depression in which the sum was used. Reliabilities were calculated using Revelle’s omega. The number of participants who completed each measure, the means or sums, and standard deviations for each measure are included in Table 1.

## **Results and Discussion**

First, we examined the Pearson’s correlations between nostalgia and personality traits, individual differences, and well-being measures. The results and descriptive statistics of the measures are presented in Table 1. Individuals who reported high levels of nostalgia reported

high avoidance temperament but there was no significant relationship with approach temperament. In terms of the Big 5, nostalgia was only significantly (positively) related to neuroticism.

In terms of the time perspective inventory, nostalgia was positively related to past positive, past negative, present fatalistic, and present hedonic, but was not related to future. This suggests that individuals who are prone to nostalgia think about the past in both positive and negative ways, which is consistent with the notion that nostalgia is a mixed emotion. In a multiple regression model, we included both past positive and past negative as standardized predictors simultaneously and found that nostalgia was still significantly related to past positive,  $\beta = .43, t = 9.97, p < .001$ , and past negative,  $\beta = .43, t = 9.95, p < .001$ .

Regarding well-being and related constructs, nostalgia was negatively (marginally) related to satisfaction with life, meaning in life (presence), and self-esteem; nostalgia was positively related to negative activated affect, negative deactivated affect, meaning in life (search), empathy, inspiration intensity (although not frequency), regret, and depression; and nostalgia was not significantly related to positive activated or positive deactivated affect. In sum, individuals who were prone to nostalgia reported low levels of well-being, but they also reported higher levels of empathy and inspiration intensity.

Next, we wanted to contrast these correlations with the relationships between nostalgia measured with the Southampton Nostalgia Scale and other variables. A subsample of participants completed the PINE and SNS measures. Before examining these comparisons, we first conducted separate confirmatory factor analyses to examine model fit of the PINE and SNS measures. The data were not multivariate normal for either scale as indicated by Mardia's tests of skewness (PINE:  $\gamma^{\wedge}_{1,p} = .69, p < 0.001$ ; SNS:  $\gamma^{\wedge}_{1,p} = 7.71, p < 0.001$ ) and kurtosis (PINE:  $\gamma^{\wedge}_{2,p} =$

30.22,  $p < 0.001$ ; SNS:  $\gamma^2_{2,p} = 82.75$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), so we used a maximum likelihood estimator with robust standard errors (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). Fit indices for the PINE scale showed excellent model fit,  $\chi^2(2) = 2.47$ ,  $p = .29$ ; RMSEA = .026, 90% CI [.000, .112]; CFI = 1.000; SRMR = .007. In contrast, the SNS showed unacceptable model fit,  $\chi^2(14) = 107.60$ ,  $p < .001$ ; RMSEA = .212, 90% CI [.175, .250]; CFI = .898; SRMR = .061.

Finally, we compared the strengths of the relationships between these two nostalgia scales and a subset of the available individual difference measures. The correlations were compared using William's test because the pairs of dependent correlations shared one variable (Steiger, 1980; Williams, 1959). The PINE and SNS measures were positively related,  $r(228) = .66$ ,  $p < .001$ . As can be seen in Table 2, there were a few differences between the correlations involving the PINE scale and the correlations involving the SNS. For example, approach temperament was not significantly related the PINE scale but it was significantly related to SNS, and these correlations were significantly different. In terms of the Big 5, the pattern of relations was similar for agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. However, extraversion was slightly positively related to SNS but was slightly negatively related to the PINE scale. Although neither correlation was significant, the difference between these correlations was significant. Similarly, openness to experience was positively related to SNS but was not related to the PINE scale.

Individuals who reported high levels of SNS also reported higher levels of inspiration, satisfaction with life, meaning in life (both presence and search), and lower levels of depression in comparison to individuals who reported high levels of nostalgia on the PINE scale. In an attempt to understand why the SNS was more positively related to well-being than the PINE, we considered the approach-oriented wording of several of the SNS items (e.g., "How important is it

for you to bring to mind nostalgic experiences?”, “Generally speaking, how often do you bring to mind nostalgic experiences?”). Pursuing and seeking nostalgic experiences is different from simply feeling nostalgic, which could explain why the SNS was positively related to approach motivation and the PINE was not. After controlling for approach motivation in multiple regression analyses with standardized coefficients, we found that the relationships between SNS and satisfaction with life,  $\beta = .06, t = .91, p = .37$ , presence of meaning in life,  $\beta = .00, t = .07, p = .95$ , and depression,  $\beta = .27, t = 2.86, p < .01$ , were more similar to the relationships between PINE and those respective well-being measures,  $\beta = .01, t = .11, p = .92$ ;  $\beta = -.06, t = .91, p = .37$ ;  $\beta = .31, t = 3.53, p < .001$ , respectively.

In sum, these findings show that, between-individuals, the nomological net of nostalgia as measured with the PINE scale is more negative than previously suggested by the results from trait correlations involving the SNS (Routledge et al., 2011; Stephan et al., 2014).

### **Study 3: Daily States of Nostalgia**

After establishing good psychometric properties of the PINE scale and after examining the between-person nomological net of nostalgia, we sought to measure nostalgia as it occurred in daily life in an ecologically valid context. To do so, participants completed end-of-the-day reports about their daily experiences, state of well-being, thoughts, and how nostalgic they felt that day. This type of study can advance our understanding of nostalgia by showing what types of events and experiences are likely to occur on days when one feels nostalgic. It also allows for the examination of within-person relationships between nostalgia, well-being, and daily events. This level of analysis is mathematically independent from the between-person relationships examined in Study 2 and from between-subject experiments involving nostalgia. Within-person

relationships also address processes that are psychologically distinct from between-person relationships (Affleck, Zautra, Tennen, & Armeli, 1999).

## **Method**

**Participants and procedure.** A subset of the participants from Study 2 (232 undergraduate students;  $M_{\text{age}} = 19.94$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ , 82.3% female) signed up for the study in exchange for research credit. Prior to completing daily reports, they either watched an instructional video online or participated in an online video call with one of the coauthors to learn about the procedure. They were instructed to complete a daily questionnaire administered via email with a Qualtrics link just before going to bed in the evening. Over the course of 14 days, an email was sent at 9:00pm each evening and a reminder email was sent to participants at 7:00am the following morning if they forgot to complete the questionnaire the night before. Emails completed as late as 10:00am were accepted, consistent with previous diary studies (e.g., Oishi, Diener, Choi, Kim-Prieto, & Choi, 2007).

The diary studies were conducted in three separate semesters with different participants. Because the procedures were nearly identical and because the measures used in each sample were very similar, we aggregated participants across all three samples. Doing so minimizes the potential of capitalizing on sampling variability. Separate analyses were also calculated and differences across samples were not meaningful, so we present the aggregated analyses.

We collected 3,011 daily reports and excluded 287 entries that were either duplicate entries, completed after 10:00am the following day, or completed in less than 2 or 3 minutes (depending on the sample and number of questions asked). We additionally excluded data from participants who failed to correctly answer an instructed response item, (e.g., “Please select ‘A moderate amount’ for this question”) as recommended by Meade and Craig (2012), or whose

total number of valid completed entries was less than 5. This resulted in 2,724 entries (90.47%) for analysis, a percentage consistent with many diary studies (Nezlek, 2012, pp. 45–49).

Participants completed an average of 11.74 of the 14 possible daily questionnaires ( $SD = 2.14$ ) and the minimum number of completed reports was 5.

### **Measures**

**Daily events.** Participants first answered 26 questions about events and experiences that are common in everyday life among undergraduate students. The list of events is a compilation from the Daily Event Schedule (Butler, Hokanson, & Flynn, 1994), the Objective/Subjective Event Checklist (Seidlitz & Diener, 1993), and other items from a diary study by Gable, Reis, and Elliot (2000). Events were grouped into categories of positive social (e.g., “Had especially good interactions with friend(s) or acquaintances”), positive achievement (e.g., “Completed work on an interesting project or assignment”), negative social (e.g., “Was excluded or left out by my group of friends”), and negative achievement (e.g., “Fell behind in coursework or duties”). Additionally, we created five items concerning events that would likely covary with nostalgic experiences: “Met up with a friend or acquaintance you hadn’t seen in a long time,” “Sent email, text, facebook message, or communicated in some way with an old friend or acquaintance,” “Heard a song that I had not heard in a long time,” “Watched a movie or part of a movie (e.g., youtube clip) that reminded me of my past,” and “Saw an old photo of myself or friends (on instagram, facebook, text, etc.)”. These five nostalgic events were administered in the third sample only. The first two items were included in the first and second samples. For each daily event, participants responded on a 5-point scale (0 = *did not occur*, 1 = *occurred and not important*, 2 = *occurred and somewhat important*, 3 = *occurred and pretty important*, 4 =

*occurred and extremely important*). The average score was calculated which provides a measure that captures whether an event occurred and how important the event was to the participant.

Helping behavior was measured with 10 items that assessed the extent to which they helped strangers with everyday activities (e.g., “Today, I gave directions to a stranger or acquaintance”). These items were originally adapted from the Self-Report Altruism Scale (Philippe Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Cynthia Fekken, 1981) and later consolidated and reworded for a daily diary study (Morelli, Rameson, & Lieberman, 2014). Responses were recorded on the same response scale as the daily events (0 = *did not occur...*, 4 = *occurred and extremely important*).

To measure the extent to which participants engaged in social media, we created several items that were adapted from previous daily diary studies (Walters & Horton, 2015; Wenninger, Krasnova, & Buxmann, 2014). These items were meant to assess active (e.g., sending messages to a friend) and passive (e.g., viewing images of friends) participation. In the first two samples, items were worded specifically for Facebook use, whereas the items in the third sample were edited to more broadly include many forms of social media, such as Instagram. Edited items occur after the backslash. Participants were asked, “Of the time you spent on Facebook/social media today, to what extent did you engage in the following activities?” The items were: “Passively scrolling through my news feed/Passively scrolling through the feed,” “Commenting on friends’ posts, status updates, pictures, etc./Commenting on posts or photos,” “Messaging friends/Direct messaging friends,” “Updating my status/Updating my status/profile,” “Uploading pictures or videos/Publishing posts or photos,” “Searching through specific people’s profiles or pictures/Looking at specific people’s accounts,” and “Playing games.” Responses were recorded

on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *A great deal*). The results across the studies did not differ meaningfully, so we combined the items for a composite score.

***Nostalgia.*** To measure daily states of nostalgia, we asked participants to indicate the extent to which the PINE statements described them today. Items were worded in the past tense (“How nostalgic did you feel today?”, “To what extent did you feel sentimental for the past?”, “How much did you feel a wistful affection for the past?”, “To what extent did you feel a longing to return to a former time in your life?”). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*).

***Temporal thoughts.*** To assess convergent and discriminant validity at the daily level, we included three items to assess the extent to which participants thought about the past, present, and future each day: “Today, how often did you think about things that had occurred in the past?”, “How often were you focused today on what was happening in the moment?”, and “Today, how often did you think about things that are to come in your future?” These single items have been adapted from a longer trait version (Shipp, Edwards, & Lambert, 2009) and have been used reliably at the daily level (Rush & Grouzet, 2012). Responses were recorded on a 9-point scale (1 = *Never*, 9 = *Constantly*).

***Well-being.*** Similar to affect in Study 2, daily affective states were measured using a circumplex model. Participants were asked to indicate how strongly they felt each adjective today on a 7-point scale (1 = *did not feel this way at all*, 4 = *felt this way moderately*, 7 = *felt this way very strongly*). The same adjectives from Study 2 were used in the diary studies. In addition to the 20 adjectives used to measure the affect circumplex, loneliness was assessed with the items *alone* and *lonely*, similar to the methods and items used to assess daily states of loneliness in previous research (e.g., Doane & Adam, 2010; Jonason, Webster, & Lindsey, 2008).

Daily states of satisfaction with life were assessed with a single item: “How satisfied were you with your life today?” Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

Daily states of meaning in life were distinguished by the extent to which one found meaning in life (presence) and the extent to which one searched for meaning in life (search) on that day. Presence was assessed with the items, “How meaningful did you feel your life was today?” and “How much did you feel your life had purpose today?”; search was assessed with the items, “How much were you searching for meaning in your life today?” and “How much were you looking to find your life’s purpose today?”, similar to previous diary studies that have assessed these constructs (e.g., Newman, Nezlek, & Thrash, 2018; Steger & Kashdan, 2013). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

Daily states of inspiration were measured with three items that have been adapted from a trait measure to be administered at the daily level (Thrash & Elliot, 2003; Thrash, Elliot, Maruskin, & Cassidy, 2010). These items were, “Something I encountered or experienced inspired me today,” “Today I felt inspired,” and “Today I was inspired to do something”. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very strongly*).

Regret was captured with three items that were adapted from a trait measure (Schwartz et al., 2002). Similar to Newman, Schug, Yuki, Yamada, and Nezlek (2018), the items were reworded at the daily level: “Whenever I made a choice today, I was curious about what would have happened if I had chosen differently,” “Today, when I thought about how I’m doing in life, I often thought about the opportunities I had passed up,” and “Whenever I made a choice today, I tried to get information about how the other alternatives would have turned out.” Responses were

recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 4 = *Neither agree nor disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*).

Daily states of self-esteem were measured with four items that were adapted from Rosenberg's (1965) 10-item trait measure to reflect the daily state (Nezlek, 2005). These items were "Today, I felt like a failure," "Today, I felt that I had many good qualities," "Today, I thought I was no good at all," and "Today, on the whole, I was satisfied with myself." Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *very uncharacteristic of me today*, 7 = *very characteristic of me today*).

Rumination and reflection were assessed with three items for each construct that were adapted from the trait measures developed by Trapnell and Campbell (1999). The rumination items were "How much today did you ruminate or dwell on things that happened to you?", "How much today did you play back over in my mind how you acted in a past situation?", and "How much today did you spend time rethinking things that are over and done with?"; the reflection items were "How much today did you think about your attitudes and feelings?", "How much today did you think about the nature and meaning of things?", and "How much today did you think introspectively or self-reflectively, i.e., about yourself and what you are like?". Because the reliability for reflection was not as high as we had hoped (.46), we removed the second item following the advice of Nezlek (2012) and practice of Newman and Nezlek (2019).

Optimism was measured with three items that were adapted and reworded from the Life Orientation Test-Revised (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). These items were "I usually expected the best today", "Today, I was optimistic about my future", and "Overall, I expected more good things to happen to me today than bad." Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *very uncharacteristic of me today*, 7 = *very characteristic of me today*).

## Results

**Overview.** These data were multilevel in nature such that  $i$  days were nested within  $j$  persons. Because of this nested structure, we could not assume independence among observations, so we used multilevel modeling to differentiate between- and within-person variation. We used the program HLM 7.01 (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2011) for all analyses and reported unstandardized coefficients. We began by presenting descriptive statistics of each variable by providing estimates of the means, the amount of variance between- and within-individuals, and the reliability of each variable. Next, we analyzed the within-person relationships between nostalgia and daily events to understand when people were likely to feel nostalgic. We also provided convergent and discriminant validity by examining the extent to which nostalgia covaries with daily thoughts about the past, present, and future. After these models, we examined within-person relationships between nostalgia and well-being and variables relevant to well-being, such as regret, inspiration, and rumination. We built models with and without controls for negative events. Finally, we examined lagged analyses as one potential method of testing causal pathways involving nostalgia.

**Descriptive statistics.** To provide estimates of the means and variances, we created unconditional or null models, which means that each variable was entered as the outcome or dependent variable in separate models without any predictors. The intercept was allowed to vary randomly and the coefficient value takes into account the number of observations provided by each participant. The unconditional model also provides estimates of within- and between-person variation. These results are presented in Table 3. Nostalgia's mean was 2.69 on a 1-7 scale, and a closer examination of the distribution suggested the variable was positively skewed. On 30.6% of the days, participants reported feeling not nostalgic at all. Roughly half of the variance of

nostalgia occurred within-individuals, similar to measures of affect and loneliness. The means of all of the constructs were sufficiently far away from the endpoints of the scales so ceiling effects were not an issue.

To calculate the reliability of each variable, we followed recommendations by Nezlek (2017). Three level models were created in which items were nested within days, and days were nested within persons. The intercepts of these null models provide ratios of true variance over total variance without confounding within- and between-person variation. These statistics are presented in Table 3. Notably, the reliability of the four items measuring daily states of nostalgia was reasonably high (.90).

To offer additional support of the construct validity of the trait PINE scale, we examined the correlation between the daily average nostalgia score and the trait nostalgia score. The correlation was calculated by taking the square root of the percent the between-person variance from the nostalgia null model was reduced when the PINE scale was entered as a predictor at level 2. This percentage of reduced variance is conceptually equivalent to  $r^2$ . The square root,  $r$ , was .72, indicating reasonable validity.

**Relationships between daily events/temporal thoughts and nostalgia.** To understand when people were likely to experience nostalgia, we created two-level models in which days were nested within persons. Nostalgia was the outcome measure and daily events were entered group-mean centered (i.e., centered around each individual's mean) at Level 1 to control for any individual differences in these measures (Enders & Tofighi, 2007). Error terms were trimmed if the random effects were not significant, defined loosely as  $p = .15$  (as recommended by Nezlek, 2012, pp. 65–68). We also added a time variable, which was group-mean centered at level 1, to

account for a possible linear trend in the data. Doing so controls for such trends without formally modeling autocorrelated error (Nezlek, 2012, pg. 114-117)<sup>1</sup>. The model was as follows:

Day level: 
$$y_{ij} \text{ (nostalgia)} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} \text{ (positive social events)} + \beta_{2j} \text{ (negative social events)} + \beta_{3j} \text{ (positive achievement events)} + \beta_{4j} \text{ (negative achievement events)} + \beta_{5j} \text{ (time)} + r_{ij}$$

Person level:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j}$$

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j}$$

$$\beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + u_{2j}$$

$$\beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30} + u_{3j}$$

$$\beta_{4j} = \gamma_{40} + u_{4j}$$

$$\beta_{5j} = \gamma_{50} + u_{5j}$$

Daily states of nostalgia were positively related to negative social events,  $\gamma_{20} = .30, t = 3.58, p < .001$ , and negative achievement events,  $\gamma_{40} = .21, t = 3.79, p < .001$ , and were not significantly related to positive social events,  $\gamma_{10} = .05, t = 1.13, p = .26$ , or positive achievement events,  $\gamma_{30} = -.00, t < 1, p = .93$ . To interpret these unstandardized coefficients, as negative social events increase by 1 point on the raw scale (0 = *did not occur*, 4 = *occurred and extremely important*) for the average individual, nostalgia increases by .30 on the raw scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*) holding all other daily events constant. That is, participants on average were likely to feel nostalgic when negative events occurred. The strengths of the relationships between

---

<sup>1</sup> Time coefficients indicated a slight negative autocorrelation (ranging from  $b = -.00, t = .10, p = .92$ , to  $b = -.03, t = 4.91, p < .001$ ), but inclusion of the time coefficient did not meaningfully change the fixed effects of primary interest (the largest change of a fixed effect was from  $b = .53, t = 7.16, p < .001$ , to  $b = .57, t = 7.96, p < .001$ ).

nostalgia and social and achievement events were not significantly different, positive:  $\chi^2(1) = .62, p > .5$ ; negative:  $\chi^2(1) = .62, p > .5$ , so we aggregated across social and achievement events to create composite positive and negative event scores. We additionally constrained the coefficients to be equal with a chi-squared based test of fixed effects. Consistent with the notion that the “bad is stronger than the good” (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001), the relationship between nostalgia and negative events,  $\gamma_{20} = .53, t = 7.16, p < .001$ , was stronger than the relationship between nostalgia and positive events,  $\gamma_{10} = .08, t = 1.25, p = .21; \chi^2(1) = 18.57, p < .001$ .

Next, we entered the nostalgic events variable as a sole predictor group-mean centered and found a positive relationship with nostalgia,  $\gamma_{10} = .29, t = 7.27, p < .001$ . Likewise, we found significant positive relationships between nostalgia and helping behavior,  $\gamma_{10} = .27, t = 3.01, p < .01$ , between nostalgia and active social media use,  $\gamma_{10} = .21, t = 4.30, p < .001$ , and between nostalgia and passive social media use,  $\gamma_{10} = .15, t = 5.00, p < .001$ . This means that people were likely to feel nostalgic when they met friends/acquaintances they hadn’t seen in a long time, heard a song they hadn’t heard in a while, helped others, and engaged in social media either actively or passively.

Finally, to examine convergent and discriminant validity, we assumed participants would be more likely to think about the past than the present or future when they felt nostalgic. To test this, we created a model in which nostalgia was the outcome measure and past (“Today, how often did you think about things that had occurred in the past?”), present (“How often were you focused today on what was happening in the moment?”), and future (“Today, how often did you think about things that are to come in your future?”) were entered simultaneously group-mean centered at Level 1:

Day level:  $y_{ij}$  (nostalgia) =  $\beta_{0j}$  +  $\beta_{1j}$  (past) +  $\beta_{2j}$  (present) +  $\beta_{3j}$  (future) +  $\beta_{4j}$  (time) +

$r_{ij}$

Person level:  $\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j}$

$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j}$

$\beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + u_{2j}$

$\beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30} + u_{3j}$

$\beta_{4j} = \gamma_{40} + u_{4j}$

As predicted, people were likely to feel nostalgic when thinking about the past,  $\gamma_{10} = .41$ ,  $t = 24.90$ ,  $p < .001$ , rather than the present,  $\gamma_{20} = .01$ ,  $t < 1$ ,  $p = .38$ , or future,  $\gamma_{30} = .01$ ,  $t < 1$ ,  $p = .38$ .

**Relationships between nostalgia and well-being and related constructs.** In the next set of models, we examined the relationships between daily states of nostalgia and various well-being measures and other relevant measures that have been linked to nostalgia in previous studies. Nostalgia was entered as a group-mean centered predictor at level 1 and each well-being variable was entered as the outcome measure in separate analyses.

Day level:  $y_{ij}$  (well-being) =  $\beta_{0j}$  +  $\beta_{1j}$  (nostalgia) +  $\beta_{2j}$  (time) +  $r_{ij}$

Person level:  $\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j}$

$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j}$

$\beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + u_{2j}$

As can be seen in Table 4, on days when people felt nostalgic, they also reported greater negative affect (both activated and deactivated), loneliness, regret, rumination, reflection, searching for meaning, and inspiration. On these days, they also reported less satisfaction with life and self-

esteem. Nostalgia was not significantly related to positive activated affect, positive deactivated affect, presence of meaning in life, or optimism.

Given that people felt nostalgic when negative events occurred, it is possible that the negative relationships between nostalgia and well-being could be caused by negative events which would presumably lower well-being. To test this possibility, we created models in which we statistically adjusted for negative events by adding this measure as a predictor along with nostalgia at level 1. The results of these analyses remained largely the same although the relationships between nostalgia and well-being were slightly attenuated (See Table 4). These analyses showed that the negative relationships between nostalgia and well-being cannot simply be attributed to the negative effects associated with negative events.

**Lagged analyses.** To provide some insight into the direction of the effects between nostalgia, daily events, and well-being, we examined one-day lagged relationships between these measures (for a discussion of the logic of such analyses, see Nezlek, 2012, pg. 111-114). We used temporal precedence as a proxy for causality (West & Hepworth, 1991) while still acknowledging the caveat that third variables could potentially explain the relationships. To test the lagged effect to nostalgia, yesterday's nostalgia and yesterday's daily events/well-being were used to predict today's nostalgia. To test the lagged effect from nostalgia, today's daily events/well-being were the outcome measure:

Lag to nostalgia:  $y_{ij}$  (nostalgia day  $n$ ) =  $\beta_{0j}$  +  $\beta_{1j}$  (nostalgia day  $n - 1$ ) +  $\beta_{2j}$  (daily event/well-being day  $n - 1$ ) +  $r_{ij}$

Lag from nostalgia:  $y_{ij}$  (daily event/well-being day  $n$ ) =  $\beta_{0j}$  +  $\beta_{1j}$  (nostalgia day  $n - 1$ ) +  $\beta_{2j}$  (daily event/well-being day  $n - 1$ ) +  $r_{ij}$

In the first set of models, yesterday's loneliness,  $\gamma_{20} = .05, t = 2.00, p < .05$ , was positively related to today's nostalgia, and yesterday's active social media use,  $\gamma_{20} = -.11, t = 2.15, p < .05$ , was negatively related to today's nostalgia. Reverse lagged effects involving these variables were not significant (all  $t_s < 1.13, p_s > .25$ ). This suggests that loneliness leads people to feel more nostalgic on the following day, and active social media use leads people to feel less nostalgic the following day. In the second set of models, yesterday's nostalgia was positively related to today's negative events,  $\gamma_{10} = .02, t = 2.34, p = .02$ ;  $\gamma_{10} = .02, t = 2.60, p = .01$  (both social and achievement, respectively), thinking about the past,  $\gamma_{10} = .14, t = 2.67, p < .01$ , and rumination,  $\gamma_{10} = .17, t = 2.46, p < .05$ , and was negatively related to PD,  $\gamma_{10} = -.05, t = 2.02, p < .05$ . Reverse lagged effects were not significant (all  $t_s < 1.46, p_s > .14$ )<sup>2</sup>. This suggests that nostalgia could lead people to experience negative events, to think about the past more, to ruminate, and to feel less peaceful and calm on the following day. Finally, there were significant positive lagged relationships from ND to nostalgia,  $\gamma_{20} = .06, t = 2.07, p < .05$ , and from nostalgia to ND,  $\gamma_{10} = .05, t = 2.20, p = .03$ . This means that yesterday's nostalgia is likely to make one feel sad and depressed on the following day, and yesterday's sadness and depression are likely to lead one to feel more nostalgic on the following day. All other lagged relationships were not significant (all  $t_s < 1.55, p_s > .12$ ). In sum, nostalgia tends to have mostly negative effects on one's well-being the following day.

---

<sup>2</sup> Because loneliness was positively related to tomorrow's nostalgia, we controlled for loneliness in the other lagged analyses. Substantive conclusions remained the same, namely that nostalgia was still significantly related to tomorrow's negative social and achievement events, thinking about the past, rumination, and PD.

## **Discussion**

These results show that nostalgic feelings varied considerably from day to day. People were more likely to feel nostalgic when negative events occurred than when positive events occurred. They were also likely to feel nostalgic on days when they helped others, were reminded of old friendships or music, felt inspired, and engaged in social media use. Despite a few positive or mixed effects, the predominant finding was that people reported lower levels of well-being on days when they felt nostalgic, and these effects remained even after statistically adjusting for negative events. Lagged relationships also indicated that experiencing nostalgia on one day was negatively related to one's well-being on the following day.

### **Study 4: Momentary States of Nostalgia**

Study 3 showed that everyday nostalgia relates negatively to well-being, in contrast to the positive effects of nostalgia observed in experimental laboratory studies. This observed discrepancy could be due to differences in the measurement of nostalgia and/or differences in the extent to which nostalgia has been measured or manipulated in ecologically valid contexts. Alternatively, this discrepancy could be due to differences in the questionnaire reporting period. In the experimental studies, nostalgia was manipulated and the dependent variable was measured either immediately or within a few minutes of the manipulation. In contrast, participants in Study 3 were asked to reflect on their entire day. It is possible that nostalgia has immediate positive benefits but that these effects dissipate relatively quickly. If so, the benefits of nostalgia may not be captured by end-of-day diaries because they may dissipate before participants complete their diaries.

To address the latter possibility, we conducted an ecological momentary assessment study in which participants completed reports of how nostalgic they felt at randomly selected

moments during the day, thus shrinking the temporal distance between experience and report. Random selection of time points throughout the day aims to capture a representative sample of the larger population of time points in participants' current lives (Shiffman et al., 2008). If nostalgia has an immediate positive effect, people should report high levels of well-being at moments when they feel nostalgic. Alternatively, if the positive effects of nostalgia are limited to extreme and memorable episodes, positive within-person relationships between momentary nostalgia and momentary well-being should not be observed in EMA data, which privilege the more modest experiences of daily life.

## **Method**

Study 4 was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern California under the ID UP-17-00143.

**Participants and procedure.** 79 undergraduate students signed up for the study in exchange for research credits. Participants initially completed a questionnaire containing a few brief personality measures (nostalgia, meaning in life questionnaire, neuroticism) and some demographics. The questionnaire also contained instructions about the procedure of the study and how to download the Personal Analytics Companion (PACO) app on their mobile phone (Evans, 2016).

Notifications were sent to the participant via the PACO app at 8 random times during the day from 9:00am until 10:00pm. Each notification occurred at least 45 minutes after the previous notification. After receiving the notification, participants could open their app and complete a short questionnaire. Consistent with the practice of a recent EMA study (Hofmann, Wisneski, Brandt, & Skitka, 2014), the notifications were accepted up until two hours after the notification

was sent. Participants received notifications each day for 7 days so that both weekday and weekend days could be represented.

Seven participants decided to drop out of the study after signing up or after completing just a few responses due to scheduling issues or for unknown reasons. Two other participants completed less than 40% of the notifications. Data were analyzed from 70 participants ( $M_{\text{age}} = 20.53$ ,  $SD = 1.63$ , 75.71% female) who completed 2,922 momentary reports. On average, participants completed 41.74 (75.3%) responses ( $SD = 7.79$ , minimum percentage was 44.64%).

**Measures.** At each notification, participants answered three questions about where they were, what they were doing and who they were with. Next, they completed 8 items about their emotional states, and individual items about how nostalgic they felt, how meaningful they found their lives at the moment, and how optimistic they felt about their life at the moment.

The goal in asking the three questions about the activity of the participant was to capture a broad sense of what activities covary with momentary states of nostalgia. Given that this was the first study to assess nostalgia in the moment, we thought such questions would be informative. We realize that these questions are not comprehensive in capturing all possible situations, as is the goal of questionnaires such as the DIAMONDS (Rauthmann et al., 2014), Riverside Situational Q-Sort (e.g., Sherman, Nave, & Funder, 2010), or CAPTION (Parrigon, Woo, Tay, & Wang, 2017). Because such questionnaires require many items, we opted instead for a brief set of three items to capture the activity of the participant.

The first question asked, “Where are you right now?” with the following options: Home/dorm/apartment, At a friend’s place, School, Traveling, and Other. The second question asked, “What are you doing right now?” with the options: Working/studying, Eating, Exercising, Traveling, and Other leisure. The third question asked, “Who are you with?” with the following

options: Friends, Coworkers/classmates, Family, Strangers, and Alone. For each question, the response options were not mutually exclusive; that is, participants were allowed to select multiple options.

Following the questions about the participants' activity, questions regarding well-being were included to capture some of the corresponding well-being related measures that have been used in laboratory settings, such as positive affect (Wildschut et al., 2006), meaning in life (Routledge et al., 2011), and optimism (Cheung et al., 2013). Therefore, we included single items to measure meaning in life ("How meaningful do you find your life right now?") and optimism ("How optimistic do you feel about your life right now?"). In terms of emotions, rather than focusing exclusively on positive affect, we additionally included negative affect items. Similar to the daily diary studies, we relied on an affective circumplex model and used two items for each quadrant by selecting items that had high factor loadings from the previous studies. Positive activated affect was assessed with excited and enthusiastic; positive deactivated affect was assessed with calm and relaxed; negative activated affect was assessed with tense and stressed; negative deactivated affect was assessed with depressed and sad. Participants were asked, "How [emotion adjective] do you feel right now?" The single item for nostalgia was, "How nostalgic do you feel right now?" Participants answered each item by responding on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

## **Results**

**Overview.** To account for the nested data structure, we used multilevel modeling. In most of the models, we nested moments within days, and days were nested within persons to account for between-person variation, within-person between-day variation, and within-person within-day variation. In the preliminary models, we examined the reliabilities of the affect items.

We also ran basic descriptive statistics and unconditional models to understand how much variation of each construct occurred at each level of analysis. In the first primary set of models, we examined the relationships between nostalgia and momentary activities in an exploratory manner to understand which types of activities were most likely to covary with momentary states of nostalgia. In the second primary set of analyses, we examined the within-person relationships between momentary states of nostalgia and momentary states of affect, meaning in life, and optimism. Finally, we examined lagged analyses to determine what type of short-term effects nostalgia had on affect, meaning in life, and optimism.

**Descriptive statistics.** Reliability analyses for the affect measures were conducted by nesting items within moments, and moments within persons. A response variable at the item level was the dependent variable in unconditional models. Similar to the reliability analyses from the diary studies, the reliability estimate of the intercept provides an estimate of the true variance over total variance, a classic definition of reliability. This method of calculating reliability does not confound between- and within-person variation as Cronbach's alpha would (Nezlek, 2017). The reliabilities of the affect measures were .75 or higher. All other measures were assessed with a single item and their reliability estimate could not be calculated.

To provide estimates of how much variation of each construct occurred at each level of analysis, unconditional models were run in which moments were nested within days, and days were nested within individuals. See Table 5 for the descriptive statistics. More than half of the variation for nostalgia, meaning in life, and optimism occurred between individuals. Of the within-person variation, more than half occurred within-day as opposed to between-day. For PA, PD, and NA, more variation occurred within-individuals within-day than either within-individuals between-day or between-individuals. About half of the variation for ND occurred

between-individuals and about a third of the variation occurred within-individuals within-day. These results suggest that sufficient within-individual within-day variation occurred to examine within-person relationships between momentary states of nostalgia and well-being related constructs.

The distribution of nostalgia was positively skewed. Participants reported feeling not all nostalgic 51.67% of the total moments.

**Relationships between nostalgia and momentary events.** To understand when participants felt nostalgic, we created models involving the type of activity, the location of the participant, and the type of people the participant was with. Because these variables were not mutually exclusive, we created dummy codes for each answer to specify whether the person was or was not engaged in a particular activity. Each dummy code was entered uncentered into the model at level 1, and the level 1 intercept was dropped. This meant that the coefficient for each dummy code represented the mean levels of nostalgia for each activity. These coefficients were then constrained with a chi-squared based test of fixed effects to determine whether these coefficients differed significantly. A variable representing the occasion of measurement was entered group-mean centered to control for mean level changes in the outcome within each day<sup>3</sup>.

Momentary level:  $y_{ijk} \text{ (nostalgia)} = \pi_{1jk} \text{ (activity present dummy code)} + \pi_{2jk} \text{ (activity absent dummy code)} + \pi_{3jk} \text{ (time)} + e_{ijk}$

Day level: activity present:  $\pi_{1jk} = \beta_{10k} + r_{1jk}$

---

<sup>3</sup> Time occasion coefficients included positive and negative values (ranging from  $b = -.0004$ ,  $t = 4.35$ ,  $p < .001$ , to  $b = .0006$ ,  $t = 4.40$ ,  $p < .001$ ), but inclusion of the time occasion coefficient did not meaningfully change the fixed effects of primary interest (the largest change of a fixed effect was from  $\chi^2(1) = 17.33$ ,  $p < .001$ , to  $\chi^2(1) = 21.15$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

$$\text{activity absent: } \pi_{2jk} = \beta_{20k} + r_{2jk}$$

$$\text{time: } \pi_{3jk} = \beta_{30k} + r_{3jk}$$

Person-level: activity present:  $\beta_{10k} = \gamma_{100} + u_{10k}$

$$\text{activity absent: } \beta_{20k} = \gamma_{200} + u_{20k}$$

$$\text{time: } \beta_{30k} = \gamma_{300} + u_{30k}$$

Participants were more likely to feel nostalgic when they were eating ( $\gamma = 2.35$ ), with friends ( $\gamma = 2.30$ ), and with family ( $\gamma = 2.64$ ) than when they were not eating ( $\gamma = 2.23$ ), not with friends ( $\gamma = 2.22$ ), and not with family ( $\gamma = 2.21$ ),  $\chi^2(1) = 4.50, p < .05$ ;  $\chi^2(1) = 2.89, p = .08$ ;  $\chi^2(1) = 7.94, p < .01$ , respectively. They were less likely to feel nostalgic when they were at school ( $\gamma = 2.13$ ), working/studying ( $\gamma = 2.16$ ), or with coworkers/classmates ( $\gamma = 2.04$ ) than when they were not at school ( $\gamma = 2.28$ ), not working/studying ( $\gamma = 2.29$ ), and not with coworkers/classmates ( $\gamma = 2.29$ ),  $\chi^2(1) = 14.75, p < .001$ ,  $\chi^2(1) = 6.78, p < .01$ ;  $\chi^2(1) = 21.15, p < .001$ , respectively. All other contrasts were not significant ( $ps > .25$ ).

**Relationships between momentary nostalgia and well-being.** Next, we examined the within-person relationships between momentary states of nostalgia and meaning in life, optimism, and affect. Nostalgia was entered group-mean centered as a level 1 predictor to account for any individual differences in nostalgia, and each of the other variables were entered separately as outcome measures. A time variable representing the occasion of measurement was also entered group-mean centered to control for mean level changes in the outcome within each day.

Momentary level:  $y_{ijk}$  (well-being) =  $\pi_{0jk}$  +  $\pi_{1jk}$  (nostalgia) +  $\pi_{2jk}$  (time) +  $e_{ijk}$

Day level: intercept:  $\pi_{0jk} = \beta_{00k} + r_{0jk}$

nostalgia:  $\pi_{1jk} = \beta_{10k} + r_{1jk}$

time:  $\pi_{2jk} = \beta_{20k} + r_{2jk}$

Person-level: intercept:  $\beta_{00k} = \gamma_{000} + u_{00k}$

nostalgia:  $\beta_{10k} = \gamma_{100} + u_{10k}$

time:  $\beta_{20k} = \gamma_{200} + u_{20k}$

As can be seen in Table 5, nostalgia was positively related to ND but was not significantly related to any of the other affect variables, meaning in life, or optimism. That is, when participants felt nostalgic, they were also likely to feel depressed and sad.

Although non-significant results do not mean that no effect exists, it is possible to compare the strengths of the relationships between 1) nostalgia and ND and 2) nostalgia and other well-being variables. Doing so would provide more conclusive evidence that the main relationship worth paying attention to is the relationship between nostalgia and ND. Stated in other words, a demonstration that certain relationships are significant while others are not significant provides some useful information. Demonstrating that the significant relationship with ND is significantly stronger than the relationships with other variables strengthens the argument that nostalgia is more likely to covary with momentary negative states than positive ones.

To compare the strengths of these relationships, we “stacked the data” by creating an item level file in which a response variable alternated between ND and one of the other well-being variables. A similar technique was described by Bauer, Preacher, and Gil (2006) to compare direct and indirect effects simultaneously in multilevel mediation analyses. In our

models, items were nested within moments, moments were nested within days, and days were nested within persons in a four-level model. Dummy codes at level 1 for ND and the other respective well-being variable were entered uncentered, and the level 1 intercept was dropped. Nostalgia was entered group-mean centered at level 2, and the coefficient between nostalgia and ND was constrained to the coefficient between nostalgia and the other well-being construct. The strength of the relationship between nostalgia and ND was stronger than the relationships between nostalgia and meaning in life,  $\chi^2(1) = 7.44, p < .01$ ; optimism,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.43, p < .05$ ; PA,  $\chi^2(1) = 8.77, p < .01$ ; and PD,  $\chi^2(1) = 13.69, p < .001$ . In sum, the positive relationships between nostalgia and meaning in life, optimism, and PA were not only small and nonsignificant, they were significantly weaker than the relationship between nostalgia and ND.

**Lagged analyses.** Finally, to examine any short-term effects that nostalgia may have on well-being, we ran lagged analyses. In such models, the amount of time between measurements are assumed to be roughly equal, an assumption that is easily met in daily diary studies but not in EMA studies that intentionally schedule notifications at random times. Therefore, we created subsets of the data that included responses recorded within certain similar amounts of time. These subsets included responses within 90 minutes, 120 minutes, and 180 minutes of a previous response, as well as responses between 0-59 minutes, between 60-119, and between 120-179 minutes of a previous response. Doing so obviously lowered the number of observations which lowers statistical power and representativeness of the time points. Therefore, following the recommendations of Bolger, Stadler, and Laurenceau (2012), we conducted power analyses using MPlus V8 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017) by running simulations based on the parameters obtained from the same-moment within-person relationships presented above. Assuming an estimated within-person correlation of  $r = .30$  (a medium effect size by standard conventions),

only the time windows of 0-120 and 0-180 following a previous response yielded power estimates close to or above the recommended value of .80 (.77 and .81, respectively). Hence, these time frames were used in the analyses.

The lagged analysis models were created similarly to the ones in Study 3. In the models with responses that occurred within 120 minutes of the previous response ( $n = 1,467$ ), there were no significant relationships between nostalgia and meaning in life, optimism, or any affect measure (all  $t_s < 1.47$ ,  $p_s > .14$ ). In the models with responses that occurred within 180 minutes of the previous response ( $n = 1,965$ ), nostalgia at time  $n - 1$  was positively related to PA at time  $n$ ,  $\gamma = .10$ ,  $t = 2.58$ ,  $p = .01$ , and was negatively related (marginally) to PD at time  $n$ ,  $\gamma = -.08$ ,  $t = 1.85$ ,  $p = .065$ . All other lagged relationships were not significant (all  $t_s < 1.43$ ,  $p_s > .15$ ). Potential third variable critiques aside, this suggests that nostalgia could increase feelings of excitement and enthusiasm up until roughly three hours later, but it also decreases feelings of calm and relaxation during this same time window.

## **Discussion**

Nostalgia varied considerably from moment to moment during the course of the day. People reported feeling nostalgic when they were eating, with friends, and with family, and they reported feeling less nostalgic when they were at school, working/studying, or with coworkers/classmates. Critical to our main hypothesis, people were likely to feel depressed and sad when they felt nostalgic. Momentary nostalgia did not covary significantly with positive affect, meaning in life, or optimism. Lagged relationships were mostly non-significant with the exception that people were likely to feel greater PA and lower PD up to three hours later. In contrast to experimental studies that showed momentary positive effects of recall-induced

nostalgia on well-being, nostalgia was negatively related to concurrent well-being when measured in ecologically valid contexts during the course of the day.

### **Study 5: Comparing Recalled and Daily Nostalgic Events**

The results from our diary and ecological momentary assessment studies showed that nostalgia was negatively related to well-being, whereas many experimental studies showed that nostalgia has a positive effect on well-being. To address this discrepancy, we ran a study in which participants wrote about their most nostalgic experience (similar to the Event Reflection Task) and their everyday experiences that made them feel nostalgic in daily life. As discussed in the introduction, people are likely to view their most nostalgic experiences more positively than everyday experiences of nostalgia. By definition, the “most” nostalgic experiences are likely to be more extreme, more meaningful, and more memorable. They are also more distant in time and their representation is therefore likely to be more stylized and stripped of tangential details than representations of very recent events (Trope & Liberman, 2010). Moreover, negative affect associated with past events fades faster than positive affect (Ritchie et al., 2006; Walker, Vogl, & Thompson, 1997), increasing the likelihood that any mixed feelings that may have been experienced concurrently are lost in later reconstructions. Each of these differences predicts that studies based on recalling one’s most nostalgic experience should arrive at a more positive picture of nostalgia’s relationship with well-being than studies based on more recent and mundane experiences of nostalgia in everyday life.

To test this hypothesis, we asked the same participants to complete the Event Reflection Task of Sedikides and colleagues (Sedikides et al., 2015; Wildschut et al., 2006) and a one-week daily diary study, in counterbalanced order. This allows us to assess how ratings of positivity, negativity, meaning in life, and self-esteem differ between the “most” nostalgic experience that

participants' recall when asked to do so and the ordinary experiences of nostalgia that they record in a daily diary. In addition to analyses of participants' own ratings, we conducted content analyses to determine whether the topics described in the texts differed across recalled experiences and daily experiences.

## **Method**

**Participants and procedure.** This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern California under the ID UP-18-00183 and preregistered at [aspredicted.org](https://aspredicted.org) under ID #9565 (<https://aspredicted.org/4ic4c.pdf>). Participants were 81 ( $M_{age} = 20.31$ ,  $SD = 1.73$ ; 81.5% female; 43.2%) undergraduate students from the same university as the preceding studies and received course research credit. All participants completed the Event Reflection Task (Sedikides et al., 2015; Wildschut et al., 2006) and a one-week daily diary study. They were randomly assigned to complete either the Event Reflection Task first ( $n = 43$ ) or the diary study first ( $n = 38$ ). Two days before the first daily questionnaire was administered, all participants received an email with a Qualtrics link that included either the Event Reflection Task and a few demographic questions or demographic questions only. The one-week diary study procedure was identical to the procedure in Study 3. Two days after the final diary questionnaire was distributed, all participants received another email with a link to a questionnaire that contained either the Event Reflection Task and a few demographic questions or the demographic questions only. All participants completed the Event Reflection Task only once.

Data cleaning was conducted in a similar manner as Study 3. Responses that were completed after 10:00am, duplicate responses, and responses that failed to correctly answer an instructed response item were eliminated from final analyses. Participants who completed less

than three valid daily questionnaires were also eliminated. Of the initial 535 daily questionnaires, 484 were retained for final analyses (90.47%); 81 of the initial 90 (90.0%) participants remained as well. They completed an average of 5.98 of the 7 possible daily questionnaires ( $SD = 1.11$ , median = 6, minimum = 3).

**Measures.** The Event Reflection Task materials were copied from Sedikides et al. (2015; initially created by Wildschut et al., 2006). Participants were shown a definition of nostalgia and were then asked to think of a past event that makes them feel most nostalgic. They were asked to write four keywords relevant to this nostalgic event and were then asked to describe the experience and how it made them feel in a text box. On the following screen, they were asked, “How positive was this experience for you?” and “How negative was this experience for you?” on 7-point scales (1 = *Not at all positive*, 7 = *Very positive*; 1 = *Not at all negative*, 7 = *Very negative*, respectively). Next, meaning in life, self-esteem, and nostalgia were measured as states with items that were slightly reworded from the daily items from Study 3. For example, meaning in life items were, “How meaningful do you feel your life is right now?” and “How much do you feel your life has purpose right now?” A few demographic questions followed.

The daily questionnaires included questions about daily events, affect, nostalgia, meaning in life, self-esteem, satisfaction with life, and the past, present, and future that were same as Study 3. Participants who reported some level of nostalgia (by endorsing a value greater than “not at all” for any of the four items) were asked to think about the experience that made them feel nostalgic today. They were asked to write down four keywords relevant to this nostalgic event, and on the next page they were asked to describe the experience and how it made them feel today. These instructions were the same as those from the Event Reflection Task but reworded to make sense for the daily nature of the questionnaire. If the participant reported

feeling not at all nostalgic for all four items, they were asked to think about an ordinary experience today. Similarly, they were asked to write down four keywords relevant to the ordinary event, and on the next page they were asked to describe the experience and how it made them feel today. Similar to the Event Reflection Task questionnaire, participants were asked how positive and negative this experience was to them with the exact same wording and response scale.

## **Results**

**Event reflection task and diary comparisons.** Of interest is whether the same person reports differential subjective experiences after thinking about a past event that made them feel “most nostalgic” (the wording of the ERT instructions) than after describing a recent everyday event for which they indicated nostalgic feelings. To address this issue, we first compared the mean ratings, within-individuals, of nostalgia, positivity, negativity, meaning in life, and self-esteem between the Event Reflection Task and daily reports. Because daily reports were nested within individuals, we used multilevel modeling. Each daily score was subtracted from that specific individual’s respective ERT score to create a new difference score variable. This difference score variable was entered as the outcome variable in an unconditional model (i.e., no predictors at levels 1 or 2). The intercept coefficient provides an estimate of the difference between the ERT score and the average daily scores while taking the nested data structure into account.

Average ERT and daily scores aggregated across conditions (completing the ERT portion before vs. after completing the diary portion) are presented on the left side of Table 6 and statistical comparisons of the means obtained from the intercept coefficients are presented on the right side of Table 6. Average daily reports come from unconditional models. Interaction effects

were tested by adding a dummy-coded predictor uncentered at level 2 to determine whether the condition (order of completing ERT and diaries) influenced the difference between ERT and daily scores. Interaction coefficients were not significant with the exception of the effect for nostalgia between ERT and daily nostalgia,  $b = .94$ ,  $t = 2.81$ ,  $p < .01$ , and marginally for self-esteem between ERT nostalgia and ordinary reports,  $b = -.52$ ,  $t = 1.81$ ,  $p = .08$ . Main effects within each group were significant and in the same direction, so we collapsed across conditions.

Consistent with our hypothesis, participants reported higher nostalgia, positivity, and meaning in life and lower negativity during the ERT than during daily nostalgic reports. Self-esteem levels did not differ significantly, however. Daily positivity, negativity, meaning in life, and self-esteem scores were not significantly different between daily nostalgia and daily ordinary experiences. In short, daily nostalgic experiences were no more or less positive than ordinary daily experiences but were less positive and more negative than recalled nostalgic experiences under ERT instructions.

**Content coding.** To shed more light on these differences, research assistants who were blind to the purpose of the study provided content coding of each written text. Drawing on a previous content analysis by Hepper and colleagues (Hepper et al., 2012; 2014), we used 35 categories of nostalgia that represent associations people have with nostalgia. Two research assistants reported whether each of the 35 categories was present in the text (1 = present, 0 = absent). To simplify the analyses, we organized the 35 categories into 3 groups according to factor analyses performed by Hepper et al. (2014): longing for the past (e.g., longing/yearning, fond memories), positive affect (e.g., happiness, comfort/warmth), and negative affect (e.g., sadness/depressed, pain/anxiety). A score of .40, for example, indicates that 40% of the categories in that particular group were present in those written texts. ICCs of coders' ERT

ratings were reasonably high (.71, .45, and .72, for longing for the past, positive affect, and negative affect, respectively), as were the reliabilities of the coders' daily ratings (.64, .51, and .66 for longing for the past, positive affect, and negative affect, respectively), so we aggregated across coders' ratings.

Consistent with the subjective reports, participants' descriptions of ERT nostalgic experiences contained higher percentages of material categorized as longing for the past and positive affect than their descriptions of daily nostalgic experiences (see bottom of Table 6). There were no significant differences in negative affect.

## **Discussion**

Given the discrepancies between the findings of previous experimental studies and our diary (Study 3) and EMA (Study 4) studies, Study 5 assessed how the event that people recall when asked to describe the “most” nostalgic experience they can remember compares to the, presumably more ordinary, events people recall in daily diaries. Not surprisingly, the daily nostalgic events differed from the most nostalgic experiences people could remember: what the same participants recorded in their daily diaries was less positive and more negative than what they recalled about the most nostalgic experience they could remember. This suggests that the positive effects of nostalgia on well-being observed in experiments (Sedikides et al., 2015) can be attributed in part to the highly positive nature of the recalled nostalgic experiences. In daily life, nostalgia seems more mundane, less intense, and less beneficial.

### **General Discussion**

The purpose of these five studies was to measure nostalgia in ecologically valid contexts to understand how nostalgia relates to daily experiences, feelings, and thoughts. To accomplish this, we first created and validated a trait-version of the Personal Inventory of Nostalgic

Experiences scale. When assessed as a trait measure (i.e., between-persons), nostalgia-prone people generally reported lower well-being than people who were less nostalgia-prone. We found that nostalgia was positively related to negative affect, regret, and depression; nostalgia was negatively related to satisfaction with life, presence of meaning in life, and self-esteem. Nostalgia-prone individuals also reported relatively high levels of avoidance motivation, neuroticism, thinking about the past in a negative manner, and thinking about the present in a fatalistic manner. Not all relationships were negative, however; nostalgia was positively related to thinking of the past in positive ways, thinking of the present in hedonic ways, and empathy. Thus, although most associations involving nostalgia and well-being were negative, we found some support for the notion that nostalgia is a mixed emotion as suggested by previous findings (e.g., Sedikides et al., 2015).

When assessed repeatedly in daily life, there was considerable within-person variation in nostalgic states, similar to other measures of affect. At a within-person level of analysis, people were more likely to feel nostalgic on days that included negative social and achievement events than on days that included positive social and achievement events. Nostalgia was also negatively related to daily and momentary states of well-being, and these relationships were not explained by the occurrence of daily negative events. Lagged analyses also showed that nostalgia was either negatively related, not significantly related, or both positively and negatively related to well-being at a later moment in time or on the following day.

Although most within-person analyses showed that nostalgia was negatively related to well-being and daily events, it is important to note a few positive or neutral relationships. People were more likely to feel nostalgic on days when they helped others, felt inspired, were engaged in social media, heard songs they had not heard in a long time or communicated in some manner

with an old friend/acquaintance, and searched for meaning in life. At a momentary level, people were more likely to feel nostalgic when they were eating and with friends and family. In combination, the results from between- and within-person levels of analysis indicate that nostalgia is a mixed emotion, albeit one that is more strongly and consistently associated with negative than with positive affect.

This conclusion, based on assessments of everyday nostalgic experiences in ecologically valid contexts, is opposite to the conclusions drawn from experimental studies that induced nostalgia through recall tasks (Sedikides et al., 2015; Sedikides & Wildschut, 2018). One likely reason for this discrepancy is that the experimental studies encouraged the recall of extreme nostalgic experiences, which are more positive and less negative than the ordinary experiences of nostalgia in everyday life, as indicated by the within-person comparisons of Study 5. Similarly, studies that used preselected stimuli to induce nostalgia have relied mostly on positive stimuli (e.g., Barrett et al., 2010; Routledge et al., 2011), which may highlight the positive aspects of nostalgia. Hence, the conclusion that nostalgia is predominantly positive, and related to positive well-being outcomes (Sedikides et al., 2015), may be limited to positive instances of nostalgia, which these procedures selectively privilege. The observation does not hold up with more representative samples of everyday nostalgic experiences captured with EMA (Study 4) or daily diaries (Studies 3 and 5): daily experiences that trigger nostalgic feelings are less positive than the experimental literature suggests and relate negatively (or less positively) to well-being.

In combination, this suggests that the affect and well-being outcomes associated with nostalgia may depend on the nostalgia eliciting event: positively colored nostalgic experiences are beneficial, but many, if not most, moments of nostalgia in everyday life have a more negative flavor. If so, deliberately engaging in the recollection of extremely nostalgic moments may be

beneficial, paralleling the results of experiments that prompt such deliberative recollections (e.g., Routledge et al., 2011; Wildschut et al., 2006). Reliving nostalgic moments may enhance well-being and buffer against adverse effects of negative experiences as suggested by experimental findings (e.g., Zhou et al., 2008). On the other hand, involuntarily experiencing nostalgia that is elicited by situational cues may be predominantly negative, as indicated by the EMA (Study 4) and diary (Studies 3 and 5) findings.

The proposed distinction between the deliberate and involuntary experience of nostalgia also received some support when nostalgia was measured as an individual difference (Study 2). The SNS contains several items that reflect an active, nostalgia seeking experience (e.g., “Generally speaking, how often do you bring to mind nostalgic experiences?”), whereas the PINE does not. Paralleling the differences between experimental studies and EMA and diary studies, the SNS is positively associated with well-being, whereas the PINE is negatively associated with well-being. In addition, the SNS was also positively associated with approach motivation, whereas the PINE was not significantly related to approach motivation. These observations are consistent with the notion that actively pursuing nostalgia may have positive effects on well-being, whereas involuntarily experiencing nostalgia due to contextual influences may have negative effects on well-being. Future research may fruitfully test these conjectures.

Taking a step back, it is worth remembering Joe McGrath’s (1982, p. 70) admonition that “all research strategies and methods are seriously flawed.” Reliance on multiple methodologies can attenuate the problem by providing multiple complementary perspectives. Experiments excel at addressing what can occur (e.g., “Can nostalgia increase meaning in life?”) and at testing a hypothesized underlying process. In contrast, diary and EMA techniques excel at addressing what typically does occur in real life (e.g., “Do people believe their lives are meaningful when

they feel nostalgic?”), but provide limited insight into causality. Both types of questions are important and diverging observations enrich our understanding of a phenomenon, raising new questions for further testing.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

No set of studies comes without limitations. As is usually the case in nostalgia research, participants were undergraduate students in the United States, which limits generalizations across age groups but facilitates comparison with the large bulk of studies conducted with undergraduate students in the United States and the United Kingdom.

Nevertheless, in future research on nostalgia, several age-related topics would be worth considering. Do older adults feel nostalgic as often and as intensely as younger adults? Is the relationship between nostalgia and well-being consistent across age groups or does it vary? What types of daily experiences elicit feelings of nostalgia among people of various ages? Recent findings indicate that older adults are more likely to experience mixed emotions more broadly (Schneider & Stone, 2015), which might suggest that older adults would also feel nostalgic more often than younger adults. Furthermore, older adults tend to experience and recall positive emotions and experiences more than negative emotions and experiences (Mather & Carstensen, 2005). This suggests that when older adults feel nostalgic, their recollections might be more positive than typical nostalgic recollections. Future research is needed to test such possibilities.

Relatedly, the time points that we randomly sampled were presumably representative of this particular period of our participants' lives, namely during the college years in young adulthood. One could envision a sampling design in which time periods (e.g., young adulthood, early parenthood, retirement, etc.) were randomly sampled from the larger population of time periods of people's lives. Although practically challenging, such a longitudinal design would

allow researchers to learn more about which periods of life people might be likely to experience nostalgia, such as the transition from high school to college or from the end of a career to retirement.

A similar limitation is that participants were only sampled from the US which restrains generalizability across cultures. Although people in many countries conceptualize nostalgia in similar ways (Hepper et al., 2014), the types of daily experiences associated with daily states of nostalgia may vary across cultures. The implementation of EMA studies on nostalgia in different countries or cultures could shed light on this topic.

The same-day (Study 3) and same-moment (Study 4) within-person relationships between nostalgia and daily events and well-being cannot provide causal evidence for the direction of the effects. For example, negative social events, such as being made fun of by others, might lead people to feel depressed, which could lead them to seek nostalgic memories or feelings. Although we ran one-day lagged analyses in the diary study, some effects of nostalgia might not last until the following day. Alternatively, certain daily experiences or even repeated experiences might only affect well-being and/or nostalgia several days or weeks later. Longitudinal studies or other EMA techniques with different reporting schedules would be needed to test such possibilities.

An additional avenue for future research concerns the relationship between nostalgia and daily events that have not been considered in previous research, such as negative achievement-oriented events, such as failing an exam. Several studies have examined the positive social connectedness aspect of nostalgia (Hepper, Ritchie, Sedikides, & Wildschut, 2012; Reid, Green, Wildschut, & Sedikides, 2015; Wildschut et al., 2006), but have not considered how nostalgia may be related to other (and predominantly negative) aspects of daily life. These negative daily

experiences could be used in experimental manipulations to determine the consequences of nostalgic feelings that are elicited from negative stimuli.

## **Conclusion**

In sum, we find that nostalgia is a mixed emotion that varies both between and within individuals. Nostalgia-prone individuals tend to report lower well-being and are characterized by several negative traits, such as neuroticism and avoidance motivation, although they also report greater empathy. In daily life, people are more likely to feel nostalgic on days when negative social and achievement events occur than when positive events occur, although they are also more likely to help others and feel inspired when they feel nostalgic. Daily and momentary nostalgic states are consistently related to increased negative affect and are not related to concurrent positive affect. Taken together, these findings diverge from experiments in which participants are asked to recall their “most” nostalgic experience, which typically increases well-being. Daily states of nostalgia are more negative, less positive and intense, and less beneficial for well-being than recalled extreme nostalgic experiences. Our findings indicate that nostalgia should be considered a mixed emotion that is more likely to covary with negative states than positive ones.

## **Transition**

These studies have shown that the measurement of nostalgia in daily life can lead to conclusions that differ from the conclusions drawn from experimental methods. In particular, the Event Reflection Task requires participants to think of their most nostalgic experience, which is not representative of the range of typical stimuli in daily life that elicit feelings of nostalgia.

The next chapter examines a similar comparison between daily life methods and other methods that rely on extensive recall, which carries the risk of recall biases. In many studies, participants are asked at one time to reflect on their life in general and to report on their personality, attitudes, behaviors, or well-being. These types of judgments rely on various heuristics and can be influenced by numerous factors. The following studies attempt to compare how global evaluations of well-being compare to reports of well-being measured in daily life in ecologically valid contexts.

## **Chapter II: Global Reports of Well-Being Overestimate Aggregated Daily States**

Newman, D. B., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (in preparation). Global reports of well-being overestimate aggregated daily states

### **Abstract**

When evaluating their lives, people can either reflect broadly on their life at one time or they can provide repeated assessments during their daily lives. Global evaluations are reconstructions that are influenced by peak, recent, and frequently occurring states, whereas daily reports reflect naturally occurring variations in daily life. The present research compared the averages of individual global evaluations and corresponding aggregated daily states from an ordinary two-week period and used a range of well-being measures (life satisfaction, meaning in life, and affect) and other relevant constructs (searching for meaning in life and nostalgia). Across all measures, global reports were significantly higher than aggregated daily states. That is, when people evaluate their lives at one time, they conclude that life is more extreme; life is more satisfying and more meaningful, and positive and negative emotions are more intensely experienced compared to their own reports in daily life.

*Keywords:* well-being, daily diary, ecological validity, global evaluations

What offers a better depiction of a person's life: a global evaluation or their day-to-day experience? Global evaluations require people to bring to mind relevant aspects of their lives and privilege memorable experiences, such as a wedding or an exotic vacation. Single assessments or recollections of life in general necessarily omit ordinary and mundane experiences, such as sitting in front of the computer. Assessments in daily life likely capture a more realistic picture of how someone's life is going but may miss some of the peak memorable experiences. Understanding the distinction between global evaluations of one's life and contextualized reports of states has been an important topic in social and personality psychology. More specifically, well-being can be assessed in similar manners, and the latter has been advocated by the philosopher Jeremy Bentham and more recently by Kahneman (1999), who referred to the sum of all momentary states of positive and negative feelings as objective happiness.

These distinct methods of assessing well-being have various strengths and weaknesses. The goal of the present research was to compare the averages of specific global reports with their corresponding aggregated daily states of well-being. Doing so provides insight into the cognitive processes involved in each form of judgment and yields provocative implications for well-being/social and personality psychology, namely that these different methods do not capture the same construct.

### **Processes involved in global reports and aggregated states**

Global reports of well-being, often assessed with either single-item measures (e.g., "All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?"; World Values Survey) or multiple-item scales (e.g., Satisfaction with Life Scale), allow people to consider longer periods of time that might include peak experiences or major life events, such as marriage or career accomplishments. Clearly people are not able to replay their entire life as they make

these judgments. Rather, people are influenced by chronically accessible information and temporarily accessible information (Schimmack, Diener, & Oishi, 2002; Schwarz & Strack, 1999). Chronically accessible information refers to any type of information that is brought to mind repeatedly over time. Temporarily accessible information can take the form of one's present mood (Schwarz & Clore, 1983), thoughts about your current romantic situation (Schwarz, Strack, & Mai, 1991), or thoughts about the current state of the country (Deaton & Stone, 2016). These sources of information can have profound effects on subsequent judgments of global well-being reports.

This means that global evaluations reflect a process in which people perform a confirmatory search for instances of the target judgment. The longer the reflection period, the more extreme instances people will be able to find. This essentially produces a peak effect. Additionally, the currently accessible information, such as how one's life is currently going right now, will influence this judgment. The net effect results in a judgment that is highly influenced by the peak experiences that come to mind, tempered by the current situation, which is rarely as extreme as the peak experience.

Studies that have asked people to recall a recent past experience support this process model. For example, in one study, participants completed momentary reports of their satisfaction and positive and negative affect at randomly selected times during a spring break vacation (Wirtz, Kruger, Napa Scollon, & Diener, 2003). Recalled reports of each specific measure of well-being was higher than the corresponding momentary average. Similarly, global reports of how one typically feels while driving luxury cars are typically higher and not strongly related to episodic reports of a recent driving experience (Schwarz & Xu, 2011). In other studies, participants have been asked to recall their well-being, pain, fatigue or other health relevant

variables from the preceding few days or weeks (Stone et al., 1998; Stone, Broderick, & Schwartz, 2010). When the momentary average is compared with the recall, the recall is typically higher than the momentary average (Broderick et al., 2008; Stone et al., 2010; Stone, Broderick, Shiffman, & Schwartz, 2004). For example, participants completed momentary reports of pain and fatigue at randomly selected times during the day, and they also completed end-of-day reports of their pain and fatigue. End-of-day reports were significantly higher than the average of momentary reports, although these effects were somewhat small (Stone et al., 2010).

In addition to using global reports to characterize individuals, researchers can measure individual differences by aggregating daily or momentary states. This method has been advocated among researchers in various areas, including social interactions, romantic intimacy, personality, and health behaviors (e.g., Affleck, Zautra, Tennen, & Armeli, 1999; Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003; Fleeson, 2001, Tennen, Suls, & Affleck, 1991) and could theoretically be applied to individual differences in well-being. Doing so would eliminate or drastically reduce any recall bias inherent in global reports. It would also incorporate the situation more appropriately than global evaluations. Assuming the sample of time points constitutes a fairly representative sample for this period of the individual's life, an aggregation of these states may provide a more "accurate" characterization of the individual.

Although perhaps more "accurate" in describing the attributes of an individual, momentary or daily reports likely capture more mundane and less memorable experiences than global reports. Hence, they may not accurately represent the way people think about themselves and they may not predict future intentions as well as global reports (e.g., Wirtz et al., 2003).

## The present research

Previous research in this area has addressed different questions than the questions posed by the current study. Much of the prior work has focused on the correlation of aggregated daily or momentary states and global evaluations or recalls. Although momentary states measured throughout the course of the day are different from end-of-day daily reports of states, researchers have attempted to characterize individuals based on the aggregation of both types of measurement. For example, Hudson, Anusic, Lucas, and Donnellan (2017) and Anusic, Lucas, and Donnellan (2016) reported relatively weak correlations ( $r$ s ranged from .33 to .54) between global reports of affect and affect assessed with the Day Reconstruction Method (DRM). Correlations between global reports of affect and daily averages of affect in other studies have been a bit higher though ( $r$ s ranged from .59 to .65; Newman, Nezlek, & Thrash, 2018). In other health domains, the correlation between the recall and momentary average of pain and fatigue has ranged from .81 to .90 (Stone et al., 2010).

The present research extends prior findings in several important ways. First, whereas previous research has compared aggregated daily or momentary states with recall of that experience, the present study compares aggregated daily states with global ratings. Second, the present research expands the range of measures that has typically been considered among studies that measure well-being. Well-being can be reasonably conceptualized as containing three aspects: evaluative (e.g., how satisfied people are with their lives), experiential (e.g., how people feel when living their lives), and eudaimonic (e.g., how meaningful or purposeful their lives seem; see Kahneman, 1999; Schwarz & Strack, 1999; Steptoe, Deaton, & Stone, 2015, for a discussion). In addition to measuring evaluative and experiential well-being (measures that have dominated the well-being literature), we measured a sense of meaning and purpose in life.

Moreover, we sought to examine two relevant constructs that have less normal distributions in daily life, nostalgia and searching for meaning in life. The measurement of these additional constructs allowed us to generalize our findings more broadly. Third, the present study counterbalanced the order in which participants completed the global reports and the daily reports, which allows for the possible examination of any order effect and provides insight into how global judgments are formed. Given that people are influenced by peak experiences, recent episodes, and frequently occurring events and states, global reports should be more highly correlated with peak, recent, and average states among participants who complete the daily diary reports before the global evaluations. When daily states are brought to mind through repeated administration, they should influence a subsequent judgment (e.g., Schwarz et al., 1991). The present study allowed for this examination.

## **Method**

**Participants and procedure.** We conducted an initial study and replicated the findings with a larger sample. The two studies had very similar procedures and measures across two semesters. Because the results were nearly identical across semesters and for the sake of brevity, we describe the method and results together.

Participants were undergraduate students who received course research credit. They were instructed to think about their life as a whole as they completed a questionnaire at one time. They also received daily questionnaires for two weeks and were instructed to think about their day as they completed the daily questionnaires. Daily questionnaires were emailed to students at 9:00pm each evening. Reminder emails were distributed the following morning at 7:00am to those who did not complete the questionnaire in the evening. Responses were accepted until 10:00am. Daily questionnaires were eliminated if they were completed after 10:00am, if they

were duplicate entries, if the participant failed to correctly answer an instructed response item as recommended by (Meade & Craig, 2012), or if the participant completed less than five valid entries<sup>4</sup>. Of the initial 3,153 daily questionnaires, we used 2,984 (5.36% eliminated) daily questionnaires in our final analyses, which included 244 participants ( $M_{\text{age}} = 20.21$ ;  $SD = 2.09$ ; 74.2% female). On average, participants completed 12.23 daily reports ( $SD = 2.12$ ; minimum = 5, median = 13). The participants were also randomly assigned to either complete the global evaluations before or after the two-week diary portion of the study. The global evaluations questionnaire was administered two days before or two days after the two-week daily diary period.

**Measures.** Global ratings of satisfaction with life were measured with the 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) with responses recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*). Global ratings of presence and search for meaning in life were assessed with an adapted version of the 10-item Meaning in Life Questionnaire (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006). The first item was changed from “I understand my life’s meaning” to “My life is full of meaning,” and the second item was changed from “I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful” to “I am searching for something that makes my life feel meaningful.” These items were altered so that the corresponding reworded items administered in the daily questionnaires would make more sense. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Absolutely untrue*, 7 = *Absolutely true*). Global ratings of positive and negative affect were measured with items that have been used in circumplex models that distinguish valence and arousal (e.g., Brandstatter, 2007; Feldman-Barrett & Russell, 1998; Nezlek, 2005). Positive activated (PA) affect items were enthusiastic,

---

<sup>4</sup> Because daily questionnaires in the second study were longer than the daily questionnaires in the first study, daily questionnaires from the second study completed in less than two minutes were also eliminated from final analyses.

delighted, happy, glad, and excited; positive deactivated (PD) items were calm, peaceful, relaxed, contented, and at ease. Negative activated (NA) affect items were stressed, angry, annoyed, tense, and nervous; negative deactivated (ND) affect items were depressed, disappointed, miserable, gloomy, and sad. Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *do not feel this way at all*, 4 = *feel this way moderately*, 7 = *feel this way very strongly*). Global ratings of nostalgia were assessed with the 4-item PINE scale (e.g., “How nostalgic do you feel?”, “To what extent do you feel sentimental for the past?”; Newman, Sachs, Stone, & Schwarz, in press). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*).

Daily well-being measures were assessed by rewording several of the corresponding trait items as is common practice in diary studies (Nezlek, 2012, pg. 32-33). Participants answered questions about their daily affect using the same items that were used in the trait questionnaire, and responses were again recorded on a 7-point scale that reflected the daily nature of the questions (1 = *did not feel this way at all*, 4 = *felt this way moderately*, 7 = *felt this way very strongly*). Daily nostalgia was measured with the PINE scale, but questions were reworded to be appropriate for daily reports, e.g., “How nostalgic did you feel today?” Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*). Daily satisfaction with life was measured with two items that were adapted from the Satisfaction with Life Questionnaire (“I was satisfied with my life today” and “The conditions of my life today were excellent”). Responses were recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*). Presence and search for meaning in life were also measured with two items each that were adapted from the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (presence: “My life today was full of meaning” and “My life had a clear sense of purpose today”; search: “Today, I was searching for something that makes my life feel meaningful” and “I was looking to find purpose in my life today”) (Steger et al., 2006).

Responses were also recorded on a 7-point scale (1 = *Absolutely untrue*, 7 = *Absolutely true*). Response scales for the daily measures were the same as the response scales for the corresponding trait scores so that the averages could be compared.

Because the daily questions about meaning in life and satisfaction with life contained the word “life,” we tested for any ambiguities in interpretation by randomly assigning half of the participants in the second sample to answer the same questions reworded with the word “day” instead of “life.” For example, the first item measuring presence of meaning in life was “My life (day) today was full of meaning.” The wording of these items had no substantive effect on the averages, so the analyses presented below reflect the aggregated scores across conditions.

It is also important to note that given the added burden of repeated daily questionnaires on participants, we could not administer all of the daily items for satisfaction and meaning that we administered for the global reports. To facilitate an appropriate comparison of the daily reports and the global reports, we selected the two items from the global reports that mirrored the daily report questions as reasonable indicators of the construct. Analyses that follow reflect the two-item global reports of satisfaction with life, presence of meaning in life, and search for meaning in life.

## **Results**

**Preliminary analyses.** Descriptive statistics and reliability estimates from Cronbach’s alpha for all global reports are reported in Table 7. To calculate descriptive statistics for the daily reports, we used multilevel modeling to account for between- and within-person variation and used the program HLM 7.01 (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2011). To examine reliabilities of the daily measures, we first created an item level file that contained the scores of the individual items. Items were nested within days, and days were nested within persons. The item variable for

each measure was entered as the outcome measure in separate unconditional models. The reliability of the intercept provides a ratio of true variance over total variance, a common definition of reliability (Nezlek, 2017). All daily measures had reasonably high reliabilities (See Table 7).

Next, we ran two-level (days nested within people) unconditional models to examine the amount of within- and between-person variation (See Table 7). These analyses showed that a considerable amount of variation occurred at both levels. Next, the corresponding global measure was entered at level 2 to examine the correlation between the global score and the average of the corresponding daily measure. The correlation is sometimes referred to as a measure of validity. The decrease in level 2 variation was divided by the total level 2 variation from the unconditional model. The square root of this is analogous to a Pearson's correlation. The correlation between the trait measure and corresponding daily averages were all reasonably high with the exception of searching for meaning in life.

**Primary analyses.** Finally, critical to the main purpose of the study, we compared the means of the global reports with the corresponding aggregated means of the daily reports (See Table 8). To do so, we subtracted each daily score from that person's corresponding global evaluation score. We then built unconditional models in which this new difference score variable was entered as the outcome measure. The intercept was allowed to vary randomly, and no predictors were entered into the model. Error terms with random effect  $p$ -values greater than .15 were trimmed from the models as recommended by Nezlek (2012, pp. 65-68). The intercept of this model provides an estimated difference between the global reports and the aggregated daily scores while maintaining the nested data structure. There were significant main effects for all variables such that global reports were higher than daily averages.

Although all global measures were higher than aggregated daily states, some differences were stronger than others. The satisfaction with life global-state difference was the smallest (.30), followed by PD (.41) and the presence of meaning in life (.55). To compare these differences statistically, we “stacked the data” by creating an outcome variable that alternated between two difference scores (see Bauer, Preacher, & Gil, 2006, for a discussion of a similar procedure). A dummy coded variable representing one of the difference scores was entered uncentered at level 1 and the level 1 intercept was kept. The coefficient of the dummy-coded variable represents the difference between the respective difference scores. These models indicated that the satisfaction with life global-state difference was not significantly different from the PD global-state difference,  $\gamma_{10} = -.12$ , 95% CI [-.27, .03],  $t = 1.59$ ,  $p = .112$ ,  $r = .43^5$ , but it was significantly different from the presence of meaning in life global-state difference,  $\gamma_{10} = -.25$ , 95% CI [-.41, -.10],  $t = 3.23$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $r = .45$ , and from all other measures (all  $\gamma_{10} < -.30$ ,  $ps < .003$ ,  $rs > .44$ ). These results show that the discrepancy between global reports of satisfaction with life and aggregated daily states of satisfaction is not as large as the other respective well-being discrepancies.

Finally, we examined the interaction of order (global reports completed before vs. after) by measure (global vs. daily), which was significant for most measures (see Table 8). The difference between global reports and aggregated daily states was larger among people who completed the global reports before the daily diaries. The one exception to this pattern was

---

<sup>5</sup> An effect size estimate,  $r$ , was calculated by taking the square root of the percent the within-person variance from the null model was reduced when the dummy-coded variable was entered as a predictor at Level 1.

satisfaction with life. The discrepancy between global satisfaction and aggregated daily satisfaction was larger among those who completed the global reports after the daily diaries.

In addition to examining differences in means, we compared the correlations between 1) peaks (maximum values), recent states (last three daily reports), and averages of daily states and 2) global reports across conditions. As expected, many of the correlations were stronger among those who completed the global reports after the daily diary reports (see Table 9). These differences were most pronounced in the correlations involving peak states and were more evident in measures of satisfaction with life, meaning in life, and nostalgia than they were in affective states. These findings reiterate the difference between the aggregation of daily states, which are influenced by the present day, and global evaluations, which are influenced by peak states, recent states, and frequently occurring states.

## **Discussion**

The present study investigated two different methods of depicting how people's lives are going. Global evaluations of satisfaction with life, affect, presence of and search for meaning in life, and nostalgia were consistently higher than their corresponding daily aggregates. This confirms that people are not able to accurately replay their entire lives and create an average report of how their lives have been (Bradburn, Rips, & Shevell, 1987). Rather, they appear to reflect on key aspects of their lives, such as peak experiences and recent memories. The memorable aspects of people's lives are more extreme than daily life. Stated in other words, daily life is more mundane and less intense than our biased reconstructions of our lives.

The discrepancy between global evaluations and daily states is consistent with and builds upon previous research but also extends the research in important ways. Much of the previous research has compared recollections of specific experiences, such as spring break vacations

(Wirtz et al., 2003), menstrual cycles (McFarland, Ross, & DeCourville, 1989), or EMA reporting periods (Stone et al., 1998), with aggregated states during the experience. Other studies have compared global reports of specific aspects of their lives (e.g., math anxiety) with online experiences of the specific event (e.g., taking a math test; Goetz, Bieg, Lüdtke, Pekrun, & Hall, 2013). The general pattern that has emerged in these studies is that as psychological distance increases, reports tend to increase, presumably because the level of abstraction has also increased. Additionally, recalls tend to converge with lay beliefs about how their experiences typically are or should be.

The present study has extended the current research by comparing global evaluations with aggregated states, as opposed to recalls of specific periods. It has also increased the range of well-being measures to include meaning in life. This has yielded several implications not only in the field of well-being research, but more broadly in the areas of social and personality psychology.

For example, is it better to measure personality traits by asking people to reflect on their life at one time or should researchers measure momentary or daily states of personality in daily life and examine the distribution of these states? The latter method, referred to as Whole Trait theory has been advocated recently as a method of measuring individual differences in personality traits while still capturing within-person variation (Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015). Although beneficial in many regards, aggregating daily or momentary states may miss the peak experiences that rarely happen but nevertheless influence people's perceptions of themselves. The aggregation of daily states may not capture individual differences in important life events that do not occur on a daily basis.

Relatedly, the correlation between aggregated daily or momentary states and the global report of that particular variable has been a common metric of scale validation in personality psychology. Correlations in the range of .60 to .70 have typically been considered a reasonable standard for convergent validity. The present results showed that although the correlations between aggregated daily states of well-being and global reports of well-being were reasonably high, the means were consistently higher in the global reports than the daily states. That is, people who report high levels of global life satisfaction tend to report high levels of daily life satisfaction, but the two measures are not capturing the same construct. Global evaluations involve the reflection of peak experiences of their lives, whereas daily reports do not (Schwarz, 2012). Moreover, the correlation between aggregated daily states and global reports, often labeled as a measure of validity, is influenced by the order in which these measures are completed. When global reports are completed after repeated daily reports, the correlation between the two are much stronger. Thus, the “validity” statistics should consider the order in which these measured are completed.

The results also have several important implications more specifically for well-being research. For example, according to a thorough review of published reports of global reports of meaning in life, Heintzelman and King (2014) showed that the average is higher than the midpoint of the scale and concluded that life is actually pretty meaningful. The present study qualifies this conclusion by noting that life is pretty meaningful when people consider their life as a whole, but it is less meaningful when people consider their daily experiences. This discrepancy between global meaning in life and daily meaning in life is consistent with some recent experimental findings that have shown that life is more meaningful as psychological distance is increased, for example by imagining themselves in a distant location or by thinking

about themselves in the future or the past (Waytz, Hershfield, & Tamir, 2015). Our results suggest that meaning can be found at higher levels when thinking about your life more broadly, which allows for the recollection of specific experiences that may imbue life with meaning but may not provide much daily meaning. For example, the recollection of saving someone's life five years ago may provide someone with lots of meaning when asked to reflect on life more generally, but it may not provide much meaning every day, particularly if the saved person is not involved in this person's daily life.

The present research also contributes to a growing body of research comparing meaning in life with satisfaction with life (e.g., Newman, Schwarz, Graham, & Stone, 2019; Tov & Lee, 2016). The discrepancy between global reports and daily aggregates was smaller for satisfaction with life than it was for meaning in life or several of the affect measures. In thinking about this discrepancy between global reports and daily aggregates, it is useful to think about affect first. The gold standard for measuring affect in daily life is through EMA or daily diary methods. How happy or sad someone is in daily life is best measured by asking that person how happy or sad they are during randomly selected moments in daily life. Any discrepancy between a global report or recall of affect and the online experience is considered an error, misremembering, or a biased recall. It is noteworthy that this discrepancy is not as pronounced for satisfaction as it is for affect. People's global evaluation of how satisfied they are with their life is more consistent with their daily experience than a global rating of affect is with their daily affective experience. It is possible that daily satisfaction reports reflect not only daily experiences but also an integration of how their life is currently going with how their day was.

The discrepancy between global and daily meaning was more similar to the affect discrepancy than the satisfaction discrepancy. Whereas previous research has shown that daily

affect is more highly related to daily satisfaction than daily meaning in life (Tov & Lee, 2016), our findings show that the affect discrepancy is more highly similar to the meaning in life discrepancy than the satisfaction discrepancy. However, the meaning in life discrepancy needs to be interpreted differently. There is no gold standard for meaning in life as there is for affect. That is, how meaningful someone's life is at the present (e.g., while writing a dissertation) may depend on future life circumstances (e.g., whether that person becomes a productive and successful professor).

It is also worth noting that the discrepancy between global reports and aggregated daily states was considerably larger for searching for meaning in life and nostalgia than the other variables. This could be due to the non-normal distributions of each variable in daily life. Moreover, the correlation between aggregated daily states and global reports of searching for meaning in life was considerably lower than other validity measures. This suggests that people think about different aspects of their lives when they search for meaning in their lives in general as opposed to searching for meaning in their daily lives, consistent with the results from Newman et al. (2018).

Another interesting implication concerns the distinction between positively- and negatively-valenced well-being measures. When reflecting on life in general, life seems more meaningful, more satisfying, and more intensely full of positive emotions. This may lead some to conclude that when evaluating your life, it is best to think of the big picture. However, doing so would also lead to the conclusion that life is more stressful, sad, and depressing than it truly is. This is consistent with much of the mindfulness research that shows that people can reduce stress by focusing on the present (Fjorback, Arendt, Ørnbøl, Fink, & Walach, 2011). Focusing on life

in general instead of focusing on the present day or situation may have different effects on well-being depending on the exact measure of well-being.

Finally, it is important to note that the discrepancy between global and daily aggregated states was strongest among those who completed the global reports before the daily diary with the exception of satisfaction with life. This pattern of results could be explained from a consistency motivation account (Ross, 1989). Among those who completed the diary reports first, those particular days provide a more accessible input than the distant days, which would only be accessible if they were extreme. The daily reporting attenuates the advantage of memorable episodes at the expense of more recent episodes. The stronger correlations between peak, recent, and average daily states and global reports among those who completed the daily reports before the global reports attests to this account. Accessible information influences a subsequent judgment (e.g., Schwarz et al., 1991).

**Limitations and future directions.** There are a couple of limitations worth mentioning. The first is that the two-week daily diary period may not be long enough to capture a truly random and representative sample of days of the year. The goal of the study was to capture typical days of the year. If we had included non-normal days, such as the final exam period or a spring break vacation, average levels of well-being may have differed, which would alter the discrepancy between daily aggregates and global reports. Comparing global reports with daily averages over longer periods of time that include unique experiences remains a fruitful avenue for future research.

Another limitation of the study was that participants' affective reports were assessed at the end of the day rather than in the moment. This daily recall introduces a certain amount of

bias (Shiffman, Stone, & Hufford, 2008). In future studies, aggregated affective states could be measured with the use of EMA techniques.

**Conclusion.** There are different ways of assessing people's well-being. Thinking about and reflecting on how your life is going at one time involves a cognitive process that differs considerably from how your life is going in real time. Global reports were consistently higher than aggregated daily states. This has several important implications for the interpretation of results that rely on these different methods. In sum, life is considered more satisfying, more meaningful, and is characterized to a greater extent by more intense positive and negative emotions when reflecting on life in general than it is when reflecting on daily life in real time.

## General Discussion

The studies in each chapter have utilized daily diary and ecological momentary assessment techniques to measure well-being in daily life and have challenged some conclusions drawn from studies that have relied on different methods. For example, is nostalgia beneficial for your well-being? The answer depends on the type of nostalgic experience brought to mind. When asked to reflect on their most nostalgic experience, people believe their lives seems more meaningful and they feel more optimistic about the future. In daily life, in contrast, people often feel nostalgic when negative events occur, and they do not feel particularly happy during those moments. Similarly, is life pretty meaningful? It depends on whether you reflect on your life generally or on your day-to-day life. A general life reflection allows people to bring to mind the peak experiences that imbue life with meaning, whereas much of daily life is routine, mundane, and less meaningful.

Clearly, daily diary and ecological momentary assessment techniques offer a unique perspective, particularly in fields that have traditionally relied on one type of method. Experiments excel at testing causal processes and can precisely determine which specific mechanisms are involved in particular processes. They often lack ecological validity though, as the manipulation may simulate a situation that does not often occur in the real world and that does not adequately reflect real-world psychological processes. EMA methods can address this limitation quite well because the random selection of time points should capture moments that are typical in daily life. Although EMA methods can address these types of concerns quite well, they typically do not provide as much support for causal relationships as experiments do because of potential third variable issues. As noted by Joe McGrath (1982), all methods are seriously flawed. The best strategy, therefore, is to try to combine methods to offset the limitations of each

particular method. When research in a particular field or area relies too heavily on one type of method, new insights can often be gained through the use of a different method. The present set of studies builds on the research that attempts to integrate and compare results across different methods.

## References

- Affleck, G., Zautra, A., Tennen, H., & Armeli, S. (1999). Multilevel daily process designs for consulting and clinical psychology: A preface for the perplexed. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*(5), 746–754.
- Anusic, I., Lucas, R. E., & Brent Donnellan, M. (2016). The validity of the day reconstruction method in the German socio-economic panel study. *Social Indicators Research, 130*(1), 213–232.
- Barrett, F. S., Grimm, K. J., Robins, R. W., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., & Janata, P. (2010). Music-evoked nostalgia: Affect, memory, and personality. *Emotion, 10*(3), 390–403.
- Batcho, K. I. (1995). Nostalgia: A psychological perspective. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 80*(1), 131–143.
- Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J., & Gil, K. M. (2006). Conceptualizing and testing random indirect effects and moderated mediation in multilevel models: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods, 11*(2), 142–163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.11.2.142>
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology, 5*(4), 323–370.
- Bentler, P. M. (2017). Specificity-enhanced reliability coefficients. *Psychological Methods, 22*(3), 527–540.
- Bless, H., & Schwarz, N. (2010). Mental construal and the emergence of assimilation and contrast effects. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 319–373.
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 579–616.

- Bolger, N., Stadler, G., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2012). Power analysis for intensive longitudinal studies. In M. R. Mehl & T. S. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 285–301). New York: Guilford.
- Bradburn, N. M., Rips, L. J., & Shevell, S. K. (1987). Answering autobiographical questions: The impact of memory and inference on surveys. *Science*, *236*(4798), 157-161.
- Brandstätter, H. (2007). The time sampling diary (TSD) of emotional experience in everyday life situations. In J. Allen & J. Coan (Eds.), *The handbook of emotion elicitation and assessment* (pp. 318–331). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Broderick, J. E., Schwartz, J. E., Vikingstad, G., Pribbernow, M., Grossman, S., & Stone, A. A. (2008). The accuracy of pain and fatigue items across different reporting periods. *Pain*, *139*(1), 146–157.
- Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments*. Univ of California Press.
- Butler, A. C., Hokanson, J. E., & Flynn, H. A. (1994). A comparison of self-esteem lability and low trait self-esteem as vulnerability factors for depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(1), 166–177.
- Cattell, R. B. (1973). *Personality and mood by questionnaire*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cheung, W.-Y., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Hepper, E. G., Arndt, J., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (2013). Back to the future: Nostalgia increases optimism. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(11), 1484–1496.
- Costello, A. B., & Osbourne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *10*(7), 1–9.

- Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2011). The disaggregation of within-person and between-person effects in longitudinal models of change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 583–619.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*(1), 113–126.
- Deaton, A., & Stone, A. A. (2016). Understanding context effects for a measure of life evaluation: How responses matter. *Oxford Economic Papers*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oep/gpw022>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71–75.
- Diener, E., Tay, L., & Myers, D. G. (2011). The religion paradox: If religion makes people happy, why are so many dropping out? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(6), 1278–1290.
- Doane, L. D., & Adam, E. K. (2010). Loneliness and cortisol: Momentary, day-to-day, and trait associations. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 35*(3), 430–441.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(5), 804–818.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2010). Approach and avoidance temperament as basic dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality, 78*(3), 865–906.
- Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods, 12*(2), 121–138.
- Evans, B. (2016). Paco-Appling computational methods to scale qualitative methods.

- Conference Proceedings. Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference, 2016(1), 348–368.*
- Feldman Barrett, L., & Russell, J. A. (1998). Independence and bipolarity in the structure of current affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(4), 967–984.*
- Fjorback, L. O., Arendt, M., Ørnbøl, E., Fink, P., & Walach, H. (2011). Mindfulness-based stress reduction and mindfulness-based cognitive therapy: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01704.x>
- Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80(6), 1011–1027.*
- Fleeson, W., & Jayawickreme, E. (2015). Whole trait theory. *Journal of Research in Personality, 56, 82–92.*
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Kahneman, D. (1993). Duration neglect in retrospective evaluations of affective episodes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(1), 45–55.*
- Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Behavioral activation and inhibition in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(6), 1135–1149.*
- Goetz, T., Bieg, M., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Hall, N. C. (2013). Do girls really experience more anxiety in mathematics? *Psychological Science, 24(10), 2079–2087.*
- Hamaker, E. L. (2012). Why researchers should think “within-person” a paradigmatic rationale. In M. R. Mehl & T. S. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (p. 43-61). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Heintzelman, S. J., & King, L. A. (2014). Life is pretty meaningful. *The American Psychologist, 69(1), 1–10.*

69(6), 561–574.

- Hepper, E. G., Ritchie, T. D., Sedikides, C., & Wildschut, T. (2012). Odyssey's end: Lay conceptions of nostalgia reflect its original homeric meaning. *Emotion, 12*(1), 102–119.
- Hepper, E. G., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Ritchie, T. D., Yung, Y.-F., Hansen, N., ... Zhou, X. (2014). Pancultural nostalgia: Prototypical conceptions across cultures. *Emotion, 14*(4), 733–747.
- Hofmann, W., Wisneski, D. C., Brandt, M. J., & Skitka, L. J. (2014). Morality in everyday life. *Science, 345*(6202), 1340–1343.
- Hudson, N. W., Anusic, I., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2017). Comparing the reliability and validity of global self-report measures of subjective well-being with experiential day reconstruction measures. *Assessment, 1073191117744660*.
- Iyer, A., & Jetten, J. (2011). What's left behind: Identity continuity moderates the effect of nostalgia on well-being and life choices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(1), 94–108.
- Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. (1951). *Research methods in social relations, with especial reference to prejudice*. New York: Dryden Press.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jonason, P. K., Webster, G. D., & Lindsey, A. E. (2008). Solutions to the problem of diminished social interaction. *Evolutionary Psychology, 6*(4), 147470490800600.
- Kahneman, D. (1999). Objective happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 3–25). New York: Russell Sage.

- Little, T. D. (2013). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press.
- Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(3), 616–628.
- Marchegiani, C., & Phau, I. (2013). Development and validation of the Personal Nostalgia Scale. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 19*(1), 22–43.
- Mather, M., & Carstensen, L. L. (2005). Aging and motivated cognition: The positivity effect in attention and memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 9*(10), 496–502.
- McCrae, R. R. (2015). A more nuanced view of reliability: Specificity in the trait hierarchy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19*(2), 97–112.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81–90.
- McFarland, C., Ross, M., & DeCourville, N. (1989). Women's theories of menstruation and biases in recall of menstrual symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(3), 522–531.
- McGrath, J. E. (1982). Dilemmantics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. In J. E. McGrath, J. Martin, & R. A. Kulka (Ed.), *Judgment calls in research* (pp. 69–102). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McNeish, D. (2017). Thanks coefficient alpha, we'll take it from here. *Psychological Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144>
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods, 17*(3), 437–455.
- Morelli, S. A., Rameson, L. T., & Lieberman, M. D. (2014). The neural components of empathy: Predicting daily prosocial behavior. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 9*(1),

39–47.

Morewedge, C. K., Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2005). The least likely of times: How remembering the past biases forecasts of the future. *Psychological Science, 16*(8), 626–630.

Muthén, L.K. and Muthén, B.O. (1998-2017). Mplus User's Guide. Eighth Edition.  
Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén

National Research Council. (2013). *Subjective well-being: Measuring happiness, suffering, and other dimensions of experience*. (A. A. Stone & C. Mackie, Eds.). Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Newman, D. B., & Nezlek, J. B. (2019). Private self-consciousness in daily life: Relationships between rumination and reflection and well-being, and meaning in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences, 136*, 184-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.06.039>

Newman, D. B., Nezlek, J. B., & Thrash, T. M. (2018a). The dynamics of searching for meaning and presence of meaning in daily life. *Journal of Personality, 86*(3), 368-379.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12321>

Newman, D. B., Nezlek, J. B., & Thrash, T. M. (2018b). Within-person relationships between prayer, daily events, and well-being. Data Blitz talk presented at the Happiness and Well-Being Pre-conference at the 19<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Newman, D. B., Nezlek, J. B., & Thrash, T. M. (in preparation). Within-person relationships between prayer, daily events, and well-being.

Newman, D. B., Sachs, M. E., Stone, A. A., & Schwarz, N. (in press). Nostalgia and well-being in daily life: An ecological validity perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social*

- Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000236>
- Newman, D. B., Schug, J., Yuki, M., Yamada, J., & Nezlek, J. B. (2018). The negative consequences of maximizing in friendship selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 114*(5), 804-824. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000141>
- Newman, D. B., Schwarz, N., Graham, J., & Stone, A. A. (in press). Conservatives report greater meaning in life than liberals. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550618768241>
- Newman, D. B. & Stone, A. A. (2019). Understanding daily life with ecological momentary assessment. In F. Kardes, P. M. Herr, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in consumer psychology*. New York: Routledge
- Nezlek, J. B. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event- and interval-contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(7), 771–785.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2005). Distinguishing affective and non-affective reactions to daily events. *Journal of Personality, 73*(6), 1539–1568.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2012). *Diary methods for social and personality psychology*. London, England: Sage.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2017). A practical guide to understanding reliability in studies of within-person variability. *Journal of Research in Personality, 69*, 149–155.
- Oishi, S., Diener, E., Choi, D.-W., Kim-Prieto, C., & Choi, I. (2007). The dynamics of daily events and well-being across cultures: When less is more. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(4), 685–698.
- Parrigon, S., Woo, S. E., Tay, L., & Wang, T. (2017). CAPTION-ing the situation: A lexically-

- derived taxonomy of psychological situation characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *112*(4), 642–681.
- 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.
- Philippe Rushton, J., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Cynthia Fekken, G. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *2*(4), 293–302.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, *1*, 385–401.
- Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., & Congdon, R. (2011). HLM for Windows (Version 7). Skokie, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Rauthmann, J. F., Gallardo-Pujol, D., Guillaume, E. M., Todd, E., Nave, C. S., Sherman, R. A., ... Funder, D. C. (2014). The situational eight DIAMONDS: A taxonomy of major dimensions of situation characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(4), 677–718.
- Reid, C. A., Green, J. D., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2015). Scent-evoked nostalgia. *Memory*, *23*(2), 157–166.
- Ritchie, T. D., Skowronski, J. J., Wood, S. E., Richard Walker, W., Vogl, R. J., & Gibbons, J. A. (2006). Event self-importance, event rehearsal, and the fading affect bias in autobiographical memory. *Self and Identity*, *5*(2), 172–195.
- Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(6), 934–960.
- Robinson, W. S. (1950). Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals. *American*

- Sociological Review*, 15(3), 351–357.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ross, M. (1989). Relation of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories. *Psychological Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.96.2.341>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- Routledge, C., Arndt, J., Sedikides, C., & Wildschut, T. (2008). A blast from the past: The terror management function of nostalgia. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(1), 132–140.
- Routledge, C., Arndt, J., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Hart, C. M., Juhl, J., ... Schlotz, W. (2011). The past makes the present meaningful: Nostalgia as an existential resource. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(3), 638–652.
- Rush, J., & Grouzet, F. M. E. (2012). It is about time: Daily relationships between temporal perspective and well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 7(5), 427–442.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063–1078.
- Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Life-satisfaction is a momentary judgment and a stable personality characteristic: The use of chronically accessible and stable sources. *Journal of Personality*, 70(3), 345–384.
- Schneider, S., & Stone, A. A. (2015). Mixed emotions across the adult life span in the United States. *Psychology and Aging*, 30(2), 369–382.

- Schwartz, B., Ward, A., Monterosso, J., Lyubomirsky, S., White, K., & Lehman, D. R. (2002). Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(5), 1178–1197.
- Schwarz, N. (2012). Why researchers should think “real-time”: A cognitive rationale. In Mehl M R Conner T (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 22–42). New York: Guilford.
- Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1983). Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.45.3.513>
- Schwarz, N., Kahneman, D., Xu, J. (2009). Global and episodic reports of hedonic experience. In Belli, R., Stafford, F., & Alwin, D. (Eds.), *Using calendar and diary methods in life events research* (pp. 157-174). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Schwarz, N., & Strack, F. (1999). Reports of subjective well-being: Judgmental processes and their methodological implications. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 61-84). New York: Russell-Sage.
- Schwarz, N., Strack, F., & Mai, H.-P. (1991). Assimilation and contrast effects in part-whole question sequences: A conversational logic analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/269239>
- Schwarz, N., & Xu, J. (2011). Why don't we learn from poor choices? The consistency of expectation, choice, and memory clouds the lessons of experience. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *21*(2), 142–145.
- Sedikides, C., & Wildschut, T. (2018). Finding meaning in nostalgia. *Review of General*

*Psychology*, 22(1), 48-61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000109>

- Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., Routledge, C., Arndt, J., Hepper, E. G., & Zhou, X. (2015). To nostalgize: Mixing memory with affect and desire. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 51, 189–273.
- Seidlitz, L., & Diener, E. (1993). Memory for positive versus negative life events: Theories for the differences between happy and unhappy persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), 654–663.
- Sherman, R. A., Nave, C. S., & Funder, D. C. (2010). Situational similarity and personality predict behavioral consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(2), 330–343.
- Shiffman, S., & Stone, A. A. (1998). Ecological momentary assessment: A new tool for behavioral medicine research. In D. S. Krantz & A. Baum (Eds.), *Technology and Methods in Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 117–131). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., & Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 4, 1–32.
- Shipp, A. J., Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2009). Conceptualization and measurement of temporal focus: The subjective experience of the past, present, and future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110(1), 1–22.
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 117–143.
- Steger, M. F., & Frazier, P. (2005). Meaning in life: One link in the chain from religiousness to well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(4), 574-582.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.574>

- Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 80–93.
- Steger, M. F., & Kashdan, T. B. (2013). The unbearable lightness of meaning: Well-being and unstable meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 8*(2), 103–115.
- Steger, M. F., Kashdan, T. B., Sullivan, B. A., & Lorentz, D. (2008). Understanding the search for meaning in life: Personality, cognitive style, and the dynamic between seeking and experiencing meaning. *Journal of Personality, 76*(2), 199–228.
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 87*(2), 245–251.
- Stephan, E., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Zhou, X., He, W., Routledge, C., ... Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (2014). The mnemonic mover: Nostalgia regulates avoidance and approach motivation. *Emotion, 14*(3), 545–561.
- Stephens, A., Deaton, A., & Stone, A. A. (2015). Subjective wellbeing, health, and ageing. *The Lancet, 385*, 640–648. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)61489-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61489-0)
- Stone, A. A., Broderick, J. E., & Schwartz, J. E. (2010). Validity of average, minimum, and maximum end-of-day recall assessments of pain and fatigue. *Contemporary Clinical Trials, 31*(5), 483–490.
- Stone, A. A., Broderick, J. E., Shiffman, S. S., & Schwartz, J. E. (2004). Understanding recall of weekly pain from a momentary assessment perspective: Absolute agreement, between- and within-person consistency, and judged change in weekly pain. *Pain, 107*(1-2), 61–69.
- Stone, A. A., Kessler, R. C., & Haythomthwatte, J. A. (1991). Measuring daily events and

- experiences: Decisions for the researcher. *Journal of Personality*, 59(3), 575–607.
- Stone, A. A., Schwartz, J. E., Neale, J. M., Shiffman, S., Marco, C. A., Hickcox, M., ... Cruise, L. J. (1998). A comparison of coping assessed by ecological momentary assessment and retrospective recall. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1670–1680.
- Stone, A. A., & Shiffman, S. (1994). Ecological momentary assessment (EMA) in behavioral medicine. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 16, 199–202.
- Tennen, H., Suls, J., & Affleck, G. (1991). Personality and daily experience: The promise and the challenge. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 313–338.
- Thrash, T. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2003). Inspiration as a psychological construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 871–889.
- Thrash, T. M., Elliot, A. J., Maruskin, L. A., & Cassidy, S. E. (2010). Inspiration and the promotion of well-being: tests of causality and mediation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3), 488–506.
- Trapnell, P. D., & Campbell, J. D. (1999). Private self-consciousness and the five-factor model of personality: Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(2), 284–304.
- Tov, W., & Lee, H. W. (2016). A closer look at the hedonics of everyday meaning and satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(4), 585–609.
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440–463.
- Turner, R. N., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2012). Dropping the weight stigma: Nostalgia improves attitudes toward persons who are overweight. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 130–137.

- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(1), 4–70.
- Vess, M., Arndt, J., Routledge, C., Sedikides, C., & Wildschut, T. (2012). Nostalgia as a resource for the self. *Self and Identity*, 11(3), 273–284.
- Walker, W. R., Vogl, R. J., & Thompson, C. P. (1997). Autobiographical memory: Unpleasantness fades faster than pleasantness over time. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 11, 399–413.
- Walters, N. T., & Horton, R. (2015). A diary study of the influence of Facebook use on narcissism among male college students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 326–330.
- Waytz, A., Hershfield, H. E., & Tamir, D. I. (2015). Mental simulation and meaning in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(2), 336–355.
- Wenninger, H., Krasnova, H., & Buxmann, P. (2014). Activity matters: Investigating the influence of Facebook on life satisfaction of teenage users. *European Conference on Information Systems*, June 9-11, 2014, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- West, S. G., & Hepworth, J. T. (1991). Statistical issues in the study of temporal data: Daily experiences. *Journal of Personality*, 59(3), 609–662.
- Whitson, J. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Lacking control increases illusory pattern perception. *Science*, 322(5898), 115–117.
- Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Arndt, J., & Routledge, C. (2006). Nostalgia: Content, triggers, functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 975–993.
- Williams, E. J. (1959). *Regression analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Wirtz, D., Kruger, J., Napa Scollon, C., & Diener, E. (2003). What to do on spring break? The

- role of predicted, on-line, and remembered experience in future choice. *Psychological Science*, 14(5), 520–524.
- Yuan, K.-H., & Bentler, P. M. (2000). Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with nonnormal missing data. *Sociological Methodology*, 30(1), 165–200.
- Zhou, X., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., & Gao, D.-G. (2008). Counteracting loneliness: On the restorative function of nostalgia. *Psychological Science*, 19(10), 1023–1029.
- Zhou, X., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Chen, X., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (2012). Heartwarming memories: Nostalgia maintains physiological comfort. *Emotion*, 12(4), 678–684.
- Zhou, X., Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Shi, K., & Feng, C. (2012). Nostalgia: The gift that keeps on giving. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(1), 39–50.
- Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1271–1288.

## Appendix

Personal Inventory of Nostalgic Experiences (PINE) scale.

Item Number	Statement
1	How nostalgic do you feel?
2	To what extent do you feel sentimental for the past?
3	How much do you feel a wistful affection for the past?
4	To what extent do you feel a longing to return to a former time in your life?

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and trait correlations between nostalgia and predictors.

<b>Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Omega (alpha)</b>	<b><i>r</i></b>
Nostalgia	596	4.23	1.49	.92 (.91)	
<u>Personality/Individual differences</u>					
Approach	525	5.31	0.98	0.89 (.84)	0.00
Avoidance	525	4.46	1.28	0.88 (.83)	0.22***
Agreeableness	279	3.71	0.61	0.81 (.72)	0.05
Conscientiousness	279	3.41	0.66	0.87 (.83)	-0.08
Extraversion	279	3.27	0.77	0.89 (.84)	-0.07
Neuroticism	279	3.13	0.77	0.89 (.86)	0.21***
Openness	279	3.69	0.71	0.89 (.86)	0.05
Past positive	356	3.55	0.67	0.84 (.77)	0.40***
Past negative	356	3.02	0.77	0.87 (.84)	0.40***
Future	356	3.47	0.59	0.83 (.79)	-0.02
Present fatalistic	356	2.58	0.65	0.81 (.76)	0.32***
Present hedonic	356	3.42	0.61	0.88 (.85)	0.20***
<u>Well-being/Relevant measures</u>					
Satisfaction with life	526	4.73	1.32	0.89 (.88)	-0.08 <sup>a</sup>
Positive activated affect	283	4.54	1.21	0.92 (.90)	-0.02
Positive deactivated affect	283	4.34	1.24	0.92 (.90)	-0.07
Negative activated affect	283	3.72	1.18	0.88 (.80)	0.34***
Negative deactivated affect	283	2.89	1.37	0.79 (.91)	0.34***
Meaning in life (presence)	525	4.56	1.29	0.89 (.87)	-0.11*
Meaning in life (search)	525	4.98	1.3	0.93 (.91)	0.19***
Self-esteem	299	3.28	0.89	0.95 (.90)	-0.12*
Regret	526	4.52	1.12	0.80 (.75)	0.30***
Depression	220	21.09	12.12	0.93 (.91)	0.35***
Inspiration Frequency	452	4.95	1.28	0.93 (.91)	-0.02
Inspiration Intensity	452	4.58	1.26	0.94 (.91)	0.11*
Inspiration Aggregate	452	4.77	1.17	0.96 (.93)	0.05
Empathy	108	3.44	0.45	0.89 (.82)	0.23*

Note: <sup>a</sup> $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 2. Correlation comparisons between the PINE scale and the SNS scale.

Variable	N	Correlation	Correlation	Correlation
		with PINE	with SNS	comparison
		<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>t</i>
Approach	231	0.03	0.23**	-3.72***
Avoidance	231	0.22**	0.25***	-0.70
Agreeableness	174	0.10	0.16*	-1.06
Conscientiousness	174	-0.07	0.06	-1.99*
Extraversion	174	-0.10	0.11	-3.43**
Neuroticism	174	0.23**	0.21**	0.20
Openness	174	0.02	0.24**	-3.72***
Satisfaction with life	232	0.02	0.13 <sup>a</sup>	-2.06*
Meaning in life (presence)	231	-0.04	0.09	-2.43*
Meaning in life (search)	231	0.23**	0.34***	-2.20*
Regret	232	0.29***	0.26***	0.67
Depression	113	0.29**	0.14	2.03*
Inspiration Frequency	232	0.12 <sup>a</sup>	0.28***	-3.19**
Inspiration Intensity	232	0.14*	0.31***	-3.24**
Inspiration Aggregate	232	0.14*	0.32***	-3.46**

Note: <sup>a</sup> $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for all daily measures for Study 3.

Daily Measure	# Daily reports	Intercept	Variance		Reliability
			Within	Between	
Nostalgia	2723	2.69	1.47	1.45	.90
<u>Daily events</u>					
Positive social events	2724	.88	.38	.22	
Negative social events	2723	.31	.14	.08	
Positive achievement events	2724	.73	.29	.15	
Negative achievement events	2724	.62	.24	.14	
Nostalgia events	2721	.63	.49	.17	
Social media active	2703	1.77	.36	.41	
Social media passive	2702	3.52	.92	1.54	
Helping	2028	.25	.09	.07	
<u>Temporal Thoughts</u>					
Past	2722	3.86	3.51	1.96	
Present	2722	5.93	3.06	2.05	
Future	2721	5.86	3.72	2.00	
<u>Well-being and relevant measures</u>					
Positive activated affect	2722	3.72	1.33	1.11	.84
Positive deactivated affect	2722	3.66	1.13	1.01	.85
Negative activated affect	2722	3.04	1.21	.75	.67
Negative deactivated affect	2724	2.31	1.05	.86	.79
Loneliness	2721	2.31	1.23	1.26	.81
Satisfaction with life	2016	4.58	1.42	.99	
Meaning (presence)	2723	3.76	1.46	1.53	.86
Meaning (search)	2723	2.67	1.28	1.38	.88
Self-esteem	1321	4.98	.93	.99	.52
Inspiration	2721	3.19	2.00	1.17	.90
Optimism	1321	4.30	1.24	1.45	.82
Regret	1321	3.19	1.14	.99	.64
Rumination	695	3.02	1.46	.93	.79
Reflection	695	3.59	1.43	1.25	.63

Note: Reliability statistics were not calculated for single item measures or for daily events as we did not expect them to be internally consistent as suggested by Stone, Kessler, and Haythomthwatte (1991).

Table 4. Relationships between nostalgia and well-being/well-being related variables with and without controlling for negative events.

Variable	# Daily reports	Without control		With control			
		Nostalgia		Nostalgia		Negative events	
		Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio
Positive activated affect	2721	.00	<1	.03	1.08	-.68	7.76***
Positive deactivated affect	2721	-.04	1.69 <sup>a</sup>	-.01	<1	-.73	9.50***
Negative activated affect	2721	.13	5.55***	.08	4.00***	1.25	15.10***
Negative deactivated affect	2723	.20	8.13***	.16	6.98***	1.06	14.12***
Loneliness	2720	.17	6.53***	.15	5.92***	.55	6.73***
Satisfaction with life	2016	-.12	3.92***	-.09	2.85**	-1.06	9.64***
Meaning (presence)	2722	-.01	<1	.01	<1	-.55	5.41***
Meaning (search)	2722	.11	4.45***	.11	4.61***	-.06	<1
Self-esteem	1321	-.12	4.14***	-.08	3.12**	-.85	8.78***
Inspiration	2721	.11	3.69***	.13	4.41***	-.48	5.04***
Optimism	1321	-.02	<1	-.00	<1	-.54	5.01***
Regret	1321	.18	6.32***	.17	5.70***	.38	4.76***
Rumination	695	.49	9.84***	.48	9.98***	.75	5.13***
Reflection	695	.36	7.17***	.34	6.99***	.48	3.27**

Note: <sup>a</sup> $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of variables in Study 4 and within-person relationships between momentary nostalgia and momentary well-being after adjusting for a linear time trend.

	Reliability	Variation				Within-person relationships	
		Unconditional model intercept		Between-person	Within-person	Coeff	t-ratio
		Between-day	Within-day	Between-day	Within-day		
Nostalgia		2.25	1.73	.19	.79		
Meaning in life		4.09	1.24	.19	.57	.04	1.50
Optimism		4.34	1.14	.22	.64	.04	1.49
Positive activated affect	.79	3.41	.73	.37	1.16	.05	1.32
Positive deactivated affect	.80	4.02	.63	.37	1.11	.01	<1
Negative activated affect	.75	2.78	.69	.57	.97	.01	<1
Negative deactivated affect	.78	1.91	.78	.29	.50	.16	5.44***

Note: <sup>a</sup>  $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 6. Averages of Event Reflection Task and diary ratings, and comparisons of the averages in Study 5.

	Averages			ERT vs. nostalgic days		ERT vs. ordinary days		Nostalgic days vs. ordinary days	
	ERT (n = 81)	Nostalgic days (n = 278)	Ordinary days (n = 206)	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Nostalgia	4.61	3.14	1.00	1.57	9.11***				
Positivity	5.95	5.02	4.81	.92	4.53***	1.21	5.18***	.23	1.26
Negativity	1.99	2.47	2.49	-.42	2.21*	-.63	3.34**	-.06	<1
Meaning in life	5.40	4.79	4.62	.61	4.66***	.87	6.28***	.16	1.44
Self-esteem	5.44	5.25	5.32	.11	<1	.22	1.51	-.07	<1
RA longing for the past	.34	.27	.09	.07	3.84***	.25	16.96***	.18	16.51***
RA positive affect	.27	.22	.14	.06	2.98**	.13	7.38***	.08	7.03***
RA negative affect	.08	.07	.08	.01	<1	-.00	<1	-.01	1.36

Note: ERT = Event Reflection Task. RA = research assistant coding. Nostalgic days refer to days when participants reported a daily nostalgic score greater than 1. Ordinary days refer to days when they reported nostalgic scores of 1 (*not at all*). Nostalgia scores on ordinary days had no variance so those models did not converge, nor were they necessary.

<sup>a</sup>  $p < .10$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 7. Descriptive statistics of daily and global reports.

<b>Variable</b>	<b><u>Daily Reports</u></b>					<b><u>Global Reports</u></b>		
	<b>Intercept</b>	<b><u>Variation</u></b>		<b>reliability</b>	<b>validity</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b>Reliability</b>
Positive activated affect	3.76	1.27	1.32	.84	.72	4.46	1.29	.91
Positive deactivated affect	3.54	1.06	.98	.82	.71	3.96	1.14	.86
Negative activated affect	3.06	1.18	.72	.61	.60	3.66	1.16	.79
Negative deactivated affect	2.27	1.07	.82	.79	.68	2.86	1.26	.87
Satisfaction with life	4.57	1.54	.92	.79	.71	4.87	1.41	.78
Meaning in life – presence	4.20	1.20	1.17	.78	.67	4.75	1.36	.82
Meaning in life – search	3.45	1.22	1.22	.84	.33	4.98	1.35	.91
Nostalgia	2.76	1.54	1.54	.89	.62	3.88	1.58	.91

Table 8. Comparisons of global reports and aggregated daily state reports.

Variable	Daily report averages		Global reports		Main effect				Interaction			
	Global report first group	Diary first group	Global report first group	Diary first group	<i>b</i> [95% <i>CI</i> ]	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>b</i> [95% <i>CI</i> ]	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Positive activated affect	3.71	3.81	4.47	4.46	.71 [.58, .83]	11.31	< .001	.72	.11 [-.13, .36]	.90	.369	.11
Positive deactivated affect	3.45	3.64	3.99	3.93	.41 [.31, .52]	7.46	< .001	.48	.25 [.04, .47]	2.29	.023	.29
Negative activated affect	3.00	3.13	3.81	3.51	.60 [.47, .72]	9.44	< .001	.60	.43 [.19, .67]	3.46	.001	.44
Negative deactivated affect	2.17	2.38	3.01	2.71	.58 [.46, .71]	9.46	< .001	.60	.50 [.26, .73]	4.14	< .001	.54
Satisfaction with life	4.61	4.53	4.76	4.99	.30 [.16, .43]	4.36	< .001	.28	-.32 [-.58, -.06]	2.38	.018	.30
Meaning in life – presence	4.17	4.23	4.78	4.72	.55 [.41, .68]	8.03	< .001	.52	.10 [-.16, .37]	.76	.446	.09
Meaning in life – search	3.29	3.62	5.15	4.78	1.51 [1.32, 1.70]	15.59	< .001	1.00	.71 [.34, 1.08]	3.77	< .001	.48
Nostalgia	2.67	2.85	4.31	3.44	1.12 [.95, 1.28]	13.28	< .001	.85	1.04 [.74, 1.35]	6.77	< .001	.87

Note: The main effect refers to the difference between trait reports and aggregated daily states collapsed across condition. Because reliable effect sizes could not be calculated for the specific multilevel models that used difference scores, we calculated Cohen's *d* effect sizes from repeated measures ANOVA models.

Table 9. Correlations between global reports and 1) peak states, 2) last three daily reports, and 3) daily averages across conditions.

Variable	Correlation between peak (maximum) and global report					Correlation between last three days and global report					Correlation between daily average and global report				
	Global first	Diary first	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>q</i>	Global first	Diary first	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>q</i>	Global first	Diary first	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>q</i>
Positive activated affect	.53	.69	1.98	.048	.257	.63	.61	.25	.802	.033	.68	.70	.25	.806	.032
Positive deactivated affect	.45	.58	1.31	.189	.170	.55	.62	.78	.434	.101	.66	.73	1.05	.293	.136
Negative activated affect	.56	.40	1.61	.107	.209	.45	.49	.44	.662	.057	.60	.56	.43	.671	.055
Negative deactivated affect	.63	.48	1.72	.086	.222	.52	.57	.59	.559	.076	.63	.70	1.00	.315	.130
Satisfaction with life	.34	.63	2.98	.003	.386	.47	.63	1.75	.079	.227	.57	.76	2.64	.008	.342
Meaning in life – presence	.44	.62	1.98	.048	.256	.52	.59	.68	.494	.089	.64	.66	.30	.765	.039
Meaning in life – search	.22	.46	2.10	.036	.272	.09	.45	3.06	.002	.396	.20	.49	2.57	.010	.333
Nostalgia	.49	.61	1.32	.187	.171	.44	.61	1.86	.063	.241	.52	.76	3.28	.001	.425

Note: Comparisons of correlations were conducted with a Fisher's *r* to *z* transformation and Cohen's *q* is provided as an effect size estimate.