

Dr.  
PSY  
322  
C-2

**PURCHASE PROCESS IN MIDDLE CLASS URBAN FAMILIES: A  
STUDY OF GENDER EGALITARIANISM**



**BY**

**SALMAN HAIDER**

*Dr. Muhammad Ajmal*  
**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
Center of Excellence  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

**2006**

**PURCHASE PROCESS IN MIDDLE CLASS URBAN FAMILIES: A  
STUDY OF GENDER EGALITARIANISM**

BY

**Salman Haider**

*Dr. Muhammad Ajmal*  
**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
Center of Excellence  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

2006

**PURCHASE PROCESS IN MIDDLE CLASS URBAN FAMILIES: A  
STUDY OF GENDER EGALITARIANISM**

**BY**

**SALMAN HAIDER**

**A dissertation submitted to the**

*Dr. Muhammad Ajmal*  
**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
Centre of Excellence  
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

**In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the**

**DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**IN**

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**2006**


**PURCHASE PROCESS IN MIDDLE CLASS URBAN  
FAMILIES: A STUDY OF GENDER EGALITARIANISM**


**BY**

**Salman Haider**

**Approved by**

  
**Supervisor**

  
**Director, NIP**

  
**External Examiner**

## CERTIFICATE

Certified that M. Phil Dissertation titled **Purchase Process in Middle Class Urban Families: a Study of Gender Egalitarianism** prepared by Mr. Salman Haider has been approved for submission to Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

  
Dr. Seema Pervez  
Supervisor

**Dedicated to**

*Government College Lahore*

## CONTENTS

List of Tables	i
Acknowledgments	vi
Abstract	vii
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
Gender	1
Egalitarianism	15
Equality of Opportunity	17
Equality of conditions	18
Locke's Rights	19
Karl Marx and Equal Rights	19
Stake Holders of Equality	22
Consumer Purchase Decision Process	24
Five Stage of Purchase Process	24
Problem Recognition	25
Information Search	25
Internal Search	25
External search	26
Sources of Information	26
Alternative Evaluation	26
Purchase Decision	27
Socio-cultural Influences on Consumer Behavior	27
Personal Influence	28
Reference Groups	28

Family Influence	29
Social Class	29
Culture and Subculture	30
Rationale of the Study	30
<b>METHOD</b>	
Objectives	33
Hypotheses	33
Sample	33
Research Tool	34
Operational Definitions	34
Research Design	35
Development of Questionnaire	36
Tryout of Questionnaire	36
Pilot Study	36
Main Study	37
<b>RESULTS</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	79
<b>REFERENCES</b>	91
<b>APPENDENCES</b>	



## List of Tables

<b>Table 1</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decisions about FMCGs and durable goods of personal and common use.	34
<b>Table 2</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families	35
<b>Table 3</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families	36
<b>Table 4</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of common use in single and dual career families	37
<b>Table 5</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of Fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families	38
<b>Table 6</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families	39
<b>Table 7</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of Fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families	40
<b>Table 8</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families	41
<b>Table 9</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of common use in High and low educated families	42

<b>Table 10</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of personal use in Single and dual career families.	43
<b>Table 11</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of common use in Single and dual career families	44
<b>Table 12</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in Single and dual career families.	45
<b>Table 13</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of common use in Single and dual career families	46
<b>Table 14</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.	47
<b>Table 15</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of common use in high and low educated families	48
<b>Table 16</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families.	49

<b>Table 17</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families	50
<b>Table 18</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search for durable goods of personal use in Single and dual career families	51
<b>Table 19</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of common use in Single and dual career families	52
<b>Table 20</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search of FMCGs of personal use in Single and dual career families	53
<b>Table 21</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of FMCGs of common use in Single and dual career families.	54
<b>Table 22</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families	55
<b>Table 23</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families	56
<b>Table 24</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search of FMCGs of personal use in High and low educated families.	57
<b>Table 25</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of FMCGs of common use in high and low educated families	58

<b>Table 26</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation for durable goods of personal use in Single and dual career families	59
<b>Table 27</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of common use in Single and dual career families	60
<b>Table 28</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation of FMCGs of personal use in Single and dual career families.	61
<b>Table 29</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of FMCGs of common use in Single and dual career families.	62
<b>Table 30</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families	63
<b>Table 31</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families	64
<b>Table 32</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation of FMCGs of personal use in high and low educated families	65
<b>Table 33</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of FMCGs of common use in high and low educated families	66
<b>Table 34</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase of durable goods of personal use in Single and dual career families.	67

<b>Table 35</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of common use in Single and dual career families.	68
<b>Table 36</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of FMCGs of personal use in Single and dual career families.	69
<b>Table 37</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of FMCGs of common use in Single and dual career families.	70
<b>Table 38</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.	71
<b>Table 39</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families.	72
<b>Table 40</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of FMCGs of personal use in Single and dual career families.	73
<b>Table 41</b>	Frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of FMCGs of common use in high and low educated families	74

## List of Appendices

Appendix I Demographic Sheets

Appendix II Questionnaires

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I find it an obligation to say thanks to the participants who spared their precious time, listened to me patiently and co-operated with me as without their cooperation it would have not been possible for me to complete the task assigned to me. I am thankful to Dr. Seema Pervez whose confidence in my skills enabled me to keep the research up to the mark. When ever I lacked confidence she was the one to assure me that I can do this. I also owe her thanks for her guidance cooperation and timely help. She never left me alone in times of intellectual deprivation and rational destitute. I am thankful to my parents for their emotional support in the dark days of my research. It was their help that made the black velvet of night touch the gray. I also owe thanks to my younger brothers for their support in data collection. Thanks to Rashid for data entry. And it is not the end of the list. I have a couple of friends who are the best friends of the world-at least I believe it- thank you Saro & Ashu I will always be grateful to you people. Thanks Fami. It's not enough but I have to end it with thanks to all who care for me and my work....thumbs up to all...

Salman

## Abstract

*The research was carried out to study gender egalitarianism in purchase process in urban middle class families. The effects of product categories, personal or common usage, single or dual careers in family and education on egalitarian decisions in purchase process were main focus of study. Sampling strategy was purposive. Data were collected from 200 women of urban middle class families by using Gender Egalitarianism Questionnaire which elicited responses in five categories of, always husband dominated. Often husband dominated, egalitarian, often wife dominated, and always wife dominated decisions. Which were then collapsed into three categories of husband dominated, wife dominated, and egalitarian decisions. Chi-square test was used to know the significance of difference. Purchase processes of durable goods of common use and fast moving consumer goods of personal use were found to be husband and wife dominated respectively. Purchase of durable goods of personal use was egalitarian. Education was found to effect purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of personal use only. Families with high education were found to be more egalitarian than families with low education. Financial autonomy effected purchase processes for all the product categories except durable goods of common use which were highly husband dominated for both single and dual career families. Wife dominated decisions were more prevalent in dual career families as compared to single career families for durable goods and fast moving consumer goods of personal use. For fast moving consumer goods of common use dual career families were more egalitarian than single career families.*



## INTRODUCTION

### Gender

Gender is the symbolic role definition attributed to members a sex on the basis of historically constructed interpretations and role of the member of the sex (Gentry, 2003). It differs from the classification based on sex. The evidence of biological inevitability of gender differences is negligible. Sociological inevitability of these differences is however confirmed but this too diminishes with time.

Risman (1998) has identified three distinct traditions which are theoretical in nature and can render great help in understanding sex and gender. The focus of first tradition is gendered selves i.e. whether the sex differences are due to biology or socialization. This tradition has individual level of analysis as its focus. All theories on gendered selves maintain that most women and men develop very different personalities by adulthood. Women become nurturing, person oriented and child oriented, whereas men become competitive and work oriented (Cited in Gentry 2003).

The relation between social structures and gendered behavior is the focus of second tradition. The basic argument of this approach regarding the behavior of men and women is based on their respective positions in families, institutional settings, and work organization. Risman (1998) has discerned a flaw in the logic supporting this approach. If the structural conditions for men and women were same the empirical gender differences should disappear but this does not happen. The approach of third tradition is interactional with emphasize on contextual issues e.g. Cultural

expectations and situational meanings which are taken for granted. (Cited in Gentry 2003)

In late 1960s and 1970s the term Gender was more commonly used in the professional literature of the social sciences .A useful purpose of this term was to distinguish social rather than biological aspects of life. (Unger & Crawford, 1992).

Males and females were categorized, as biological entities, cross-culturally but men and women were not easily catalogued as they played a multitude of different roles which they played in diversified societies. These anthropological life-style differences came to be accepted as social and cultural constructs. Indeed, most of the investigators used the term sex and gender to signify different areas of consideration. They referred sex to biological traits while gender was referred to social/cultural ones. The investigators more sensitive to biological studies were more prone to this attitude. Among the investigators with sociological and anthropological thinking these differences did not appear so clear cut and they often used the terms sex and gender interchangeably.

In 1978 Kessler and McKenna (Kessler & McKenna, 1978), in their now classic work, challenged the way in which relationship between sex and gender was being considered. They even challenged if the two concepts were different or interchangeable. Usually the biological differences in males and females determine to the gender differences of men and women with regard to their behavior patterns and roles. Most of the common public even many scientists accept it as such. But, Kessler and McKenna, object to this approach with the question that if these differences were so clear cut, why do transsexuals in their pursuit of the life-style of the "opposite" sex, struggle to prove to the outside world what they feel they are on the inside? Kessler and McKenna point out transsexuals reconstruct their sex to coincide with their

psychological gender. It implies that it is their gender is primary while their sex secondary.

In demonstrating their point, Kessler and McKenna accept that transsexuals are what they say they are (they interviewed fifteen transsexual individuals). A male transsexual has the body of an anatomic male but the conviction (mind-set) of actually being a woman and a female transsexual has the body of an anatomical female but the conviction (mind-set) of actually being a man (Benjamin, 1966). Then, to rectify the dichotomy, the transsexual is seen as not wanting to change gender but change genitals and body. It thus appears a reversal from the way the two had come to be considered. The sex is variable and gender invariant. But the transsexual, then learn or perfect how to be the man or woman of mind's desire. In so doing, the transsexual proves that gender is a construction that doesn't necessarily follow from anatomy.

The sociologists, women's studies scholars and some psychologists accepted Kessler and McKenna thesis, that gender and sex were actually both variable and not immutable . It supported the widely held nurturist belief that most of the gender differences were product of the culture and had a flexible nature. During the years 1978 to 1995 only two references to the Kessler and McKenna book, both in psychological journals, could be found in the Science Citation Index (Deaux, 1985; Deaux & Major, 1987). This proves that, for most biologically oriented scholars and others that studied behavior, the questions or thesis had little importance.

This presentation, however, was problematic as most sociologists, many psychologists and others at the time had thought that gender was a function of upbringing and social forces, e.g., Bandura & Walters (1963) and Mischel (1966), or cultural conditions, e.g., D'Andrade (1966). Others had thought an individual's gender developed from and along with cognitive maturity e.g., Kohlberg, 1966, and some

even attributed it to a sort of imprinting phenomenon (Baill & Money, 1980) or socio-cultural expectations leading to self-fulfilling prophecy (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977) and of course there was the classical Freudian model of gender development (Freud, 1925; 1953). Since in the transsexuals brining up, their genitals, chromosomes, and other biological aspects play a vital role the question of the presence of gender desire is of utmost importance. Where does this typical gender desire come from? And why don't they, like others, follow the same influence of social and cultural attribution. Kessler and Mckennea did not pay attention to this question as their attention was attracted by another question the gender being more important than sex.

Bullogh and Bullogh (1993), Deny (1998), and Devor (1989) observed that many transsexuals unlike their majority don't feel they were born that way. But identify themselves as transgendered, gender blending or gender bending persons and they find a constructed gender evident in their life. Leaving aside strict male female dichotomy they reach for a wide range of admixture of male and female anatomies restructured in them which is shown in their masculine and feminine lifestyles.

Certainly there are numerous other ways to consider sex and gender. Kulick in 1997 reported that in Slavador, Brazil gender is grounded not so much in sex as it is grounded in sexuality. This Brazilian Travesties who is a male prostitute has the same appearance as that of American transsexuals. He wears female's dresses and adopts a female behavior but unlike his American counterpart has no desire to be identified as women. He likes to maintain his penis and avoids gaining breasts and rounded female hips. He desires to be a perfect homo-sexual man. The travesties bring in changes in language to describe his customer or himself according to the demand of the sexual action performed.

Sex and gender interact in yet another way. One is born with a biological psychosexual predisposition that is fixed by genetic-endocrine heritage and with it a propensity for certain sexual and gender patterns to be expressed (Diamond, 1968; 1976, 1995). Which patterns will be expressed, however, depends upon the societal and cultural mores and the degrees of tolerance they allow (Diamond, 1979). With this comes another concept. Every individual lives with two simultaneous visions of self; an inner private *sexual identity* and an outer social and public *gender identity*. One's sexual identity is prenatally organized as a function of the genetic-endocrine forces and emerges (is activated) with development. One's gender identity, recognition of how he or she is viewed in society, develops with post-natal experiences. It comes from general observation of society's norms and expectations and from comparing self with peers (Diamond, 1997; 1999; Harris, 1998) and asking: "Who am I like and who am I not like?" "With which group, males/boys or females/girls am I similar or different?" The transsexual or travestis or homosexual or indeed everyone, male, female, or intersex, reconciles these two images and answer those questions. For most individuals these identities are in concert so reconciliation occurs more or less easily with the ups and downs that come with puberty, a challenge to keep up with peers through adolescence, and then an acceptance of life's vagaries in adulthood. For some, however, attaining this reconciliation remains a constant struggle. Transsexuals, who Diamond, Binstock, & Kohl, 1996; Goy, Bercovitch, & McBrair (1988) believe are intersexed, have the body and genitals of one sex and the brain of the other making reconciliation of their sexual and gender identities problematic. They solve their problems of reconciling, their disparate sexual identity and gender identity, by saying, in essence, "Don't change my mind; change my body."

One view about the question why does the mind take precedence is because the brain template for sexual identity is forged by more significant forces and events (Diamond, 1965; 1979). These early anagrams are more potent than the later ones activated by rearing. This, for instance, was the force telling John/Joan and other males who had been sex-reassigned they were not girls although they had no penis and were reared, rewarded and reinforced as girls (Diamond & Sigmundson, 1997).

John/Joan was an individual widely written about in dozens of psychology, sociology and women's study texts. According to the original reports (Money, 1975; Money & Ehrhardt, 1972) John was a male twin who, due to a surgical accident wherein his penis was burned off, was subsequently sex reassigned as a female. The thinking was it would be better for an individual without a penis to be raised as a girl with a constructed vagina than to be a boy without a phallus. John was thus castrated, had a vulva prepared and given estrogens and reared as a girl, Joan. Contrary to the early reports of success, however, Joan never did accept the transition (Colapinto, 1997; Diamond, 1982; Diamond & Sigmundson, 1997).

John, and other males sex-reassigned as females, "knew" they were not girls despite their castration, absence of male genitalia, female rearing, and the administration of estrogens. The gender that was attributed to them was not in accord with their sexual identity. In trying to understand the discrepancies they saw in their lives, they attended to and recognized it was the characteristics of males in general and females in general, and the realities they saw of both sexes around them in every day life, that led them to recognize, in their cases, the male in themselves (Diamond, 1997; 1999). This works similarly, on the other side of the coin, for those individuals mal-assigned as males who discover the female in themselves (Diamond, 1997).

The research in 1950's show "traditional" positioning that is similar to what Parsons (1949, 1964) labeled "instrumental and expressive functions," in which husbands embrace the responsibility for providing for the family and wives embrace the legacy of meeting the everyday needs of the family members. This "functional" perspective (or consumer research's notion of "traditional") Feb be quite limited in scope historically. Janeway (1971) noted that the notion of "the home" as a distinct sphere of life, as a stronghold of family and leisure, did not exist before the eighteenth century in Europe. Connell (1987) noted that the notion that women ought to be dependent on men would have seemed absurd in the context of the reciprocities of village agriculture and commercial towns, and that the gender-division construction of "breadwinner" and "housewife" has never been a reality for much of the working class.

Allen and Walker (2000) noted that the functionalist perspective is based on a narrow slice of history in the United States, peaking in popularity in the 1890s, at the height of the industrial era. "Prior to the 1940s, wage work for women was invisible; the labor participation of working-class and minority women was ignored, while middle-class women earned money in ways that were concealed from the economy, such as taking in boarders" (Bose 1987). The post WWII era brought a resurgence of the functionalist view of gendered-segregated roles in the family. The 1950s were a strange decade in U.S. history, as there was a backlash to the temporary empowerment of women when they entered the workforce in large numbers during WWII. The gender conflict faced after the war resulted in the return of most middle class women to their "place" in the home. These traditional "inside/outside" roles are still prevalent in parts of the U.S. as well as across the world.

Firat's (1994) perspective of the separation of the home (stead) and the workplace in post-agrarian United States includes the notion that production was delegated to the public domain and was attributed positive values such as useful and creative. The home was for recreation, leisure, and consumption, and those in the private domain did not work. Though we now use the term "non-paid work" in discussing domestic labor, these domestic activities have been devalued because of their association with women and of the greater "usefulness" associated with work in the public domain. Daniels (1987) described "family work" as unseen and unacknowledged because it is private, unpaid, commonplace, done by women, and mingled with love and leisure.

The functionalist perspective of inside/outside roles has been questioned due to the dynamic nature of "gender." Risman (1998) noted that gender is a "human invention and is subject to re-invention and re-creation." Similarly, Allen and Walker (2000) noted that "although gender is a dominant structural force in families, it is constructed and reconstructed on a daily basis in private relationships." In Marketing, Ferber and Birnbaum (1980) suggested that since "there is a diminishing utility for professional and house work, spouses are likely to find a more balanced sharing of housework beneficial, and the husband Feb enjoy getting to know the children better." Sussman (1993) predicted that changes within the family will not revert to the old superordinate/subordinate pattern, but rather that equity and sharing will grow in both prevalence and incidence in the coming years. The sharing of housework prediction appears to have little support, but fathers in the 1990s did spend significantly more time with their children than their fathers did with them (Gardyn 2000).

Firat (1994) predicted that post-modernity would be associated with the break between gender and sex categories, arguing that feminine and woman and masculine



and man are no longer seen as exclusive representations part of what is causing this change is the empowerment of the consumer (traditionally the woman) as consumption is becoming "the production and signification of one's self-image" (Firat 1994).

While the research cited above would suggest that there is a blurring of gender, whether that is observable in household interactions with the marketplace remains to be established. We will review the family literature in Consumer Research to see how gender differences have been observed (measured) in terms of household production and consumption behaviors.

Then we will make the case that the behaviors reported in such research Feb not be indicative of the underlying gendered differences; for example, though the husband Feb do much of the cooking or dress a child in the morning, the wife Feb still be responsible for menu planning or purchasing the child's clothes. Next we will look at the gendered nature of family conflict. Much of this literature comes from sociology, and will deal far more with household production issues than consumption issues. We conclude with a discussion of avenues for future research aimed at understanding how doing gender in the household is undergoing change.

As noted earlier, in nearly all societies, there has been an inside/outside dichotomy. Women, due to the stronger link to young children because of the birth process and to their generally smaller physiques, have been assigned roles inside the home, while men have been responsible for the outside roles, whether it was the provision of fresh meat, financial dealings with others, or, more recently, yard work. Thus, men have fulfilled the more instrumental family roles while women have traditionally fulfilled the more nurturing, supportive roles. To a great extent, these

sex-differentiated roles have become perpetuated without being questioned sufficiently as to their appropriateness to modern (or post-modern) society.

The stream of research investigating family consumer decisions offers insight into changing family dynamics. Much of the early work focused on decision roles and provided results consistent with the provider/instrumental/financial officer role for men and the nurturing/supportive/home role for women. As will be discussed below, patterns changed for some households with the entry of women into the work force, but less so for more traditional sub-cultures. For example, Webster's (1994) study of Hispanic-Americans found the relatively simple inside/outside dichotomies that had been found among Anglo-Americans thirty years earlier. The gender perspective that seemed to underlie this stream of research is that of the gendered-self, and the implicit assumption was that men and women embrace household responsibilities consistent with respective biologically-based capabilities.

The changing work status of women in the 1970s and 1980s stimulated a great deal of research concerning decision roles and shifts in role responsibilities. In part, this research reflects the assumption that roles within the family were expected to change as the wife entered the outside domain. Cunningham and Green (1974) found that decision roles had shifted, with there being more shared decision making for cars, vacations, and housing, but with the wife having more decision-making role in terms of food and groceries while the husband's influence had increased in the case of insurance.

Belch, Belch, and Ceresino (1985), however, found rather "traditional" roles with men making the decisions for automobiles and televisions, and women dominating the purchase of appliances, furniture, and cereal. In other words, such investigations indicated that while men and women have taken on new structural roles,

their allegiance to masculinity and femininity respectively remains undeterred. Such assertions can be challenged (as will be discussed in detail toward the end of the paper) as they are steeped in an assumption that social actions result in the same outcomes for men and women and all that is of interest is who is performing those actions, not whether the actions mean different things for men and for women given how the meanings are uniquely socially constructed.

Much of the research dealing with the impact of the wife's changing work status on family decision-making was based on the fairly simple premise that working wives would be more time crunched, and would seek "time-saving" products and services in order to fulfill traditional gender roles. The assumption implicit here was that women would be compelled to continue to enact their feminine household roles and, therefore, time saving durables will allow them to take on new roles without relinquishing old ones. Such investigations did not reveal any conclusive evidence. It is possible that we have not been able to find any conclusive evidence of, say, how households manage time (and which time-managing and timesaving strategies work and which do not) because we have adopted a gender-free lens to investigate that problem. Given that gender is a social construction, it is possible that when a woman spends time outside the home, neither she nor the rest of her family feel a need for a prorated compensation via freeing-up time at home. In other words, when a woman spends time away from housework, is that in addition to the time she spends at home or is that at the cost of the time she should have spent at home? When we assume that human actors are free from gendered skins, there is no need to ask that question. However, given that genders have been assigned primary responsibilities for various roles in a household. it is imperative that we use a gendered lens when we investigate behaviors that Feb carry gender overtones.

From a gendered perspective, it can be proposed that when a wife spends time outside the home, she (and possibly others around her) may perceive such an activity to be at the cost of the time she should have spent at home. Under such circumstances, we can see why there has been little evidence that husbands take over traditionally "female" household roles. Berk and Berk (1979), Meissner et al. (1975), Pleck and Rustad (1980), Robinson (1977), and Walker and Woods (1976) found husbands' behavior regarding household production to be the same regardless of the wife's working status. For example, DeVault (1997) found that working wives reported doing more housework than did single mothers. Such findings only make sense when inspected through a gendered lens; without such a lens, "all the talk about egalitarian ideology, abstract beliefs about what women and men 'ought to do' are not connected with the division of family work" (Thompson and Walker 1989). Using a gendered lens, Allen and Walker (2000) concluded "there is no better predictor of the division of household labor than gender. Regardless of one's attitude about 'gender' roles, the resources one brings to the relationship, and the time one has available, there is nothing that predicts who does what and how much one does in families than whether one is a woman or a man.

In marketing and consumer behavior, even when efforts were made to understand the roles of femininity and masculinity, the constructs were often reduced to a single measure of sex-role orientation. Green and Cunningham (1970) were the first to examine this variable in the context of consumer behavior while Scanzoni (1977) made the strongest effort to outline the relevance of shifts in gender roles for consumer behavior. Scanzoni identified two key demographic and social changes that bear relevance to gender roles: (1) women defining their paid employment in the same terms as men and (thus) (2) a change in relationships between men and women.

Subsequently, Qualls (1982) found that not only did sex roles affect the distribution of influence and the extent of interaction within the family, but that they also accounted for differences in the reports of relative influence. Similarly, Rosen and Granbois (1983) found that sex-role attitudes and education were the most relevant determinants of how finances were handled within the household.

One significant departure from this general conclusion regarding traditional" divisions of domestic labor is the phenomenon of a "gender switch" occurring in later life or as Gottman (1979) concluded, a decline in gender differences in later life. Within consumer research, Webster and Rice (1996) found that, upon retirement, a shift in power favoring women occurs, but only in cases where the incomes of the couples were significantly unequal before retirement. In other words, while men and money have been associated closely in our research (given the underlying gendered-self perspective), one can call for a decoupling of those two and suggest that household research should include independent variables that are not coupled with sex.

As mentioned earlier, the emphasis on household behaviors Feb not represent a true picture of gender in household responsibilities. Komter (1989) argued that the focus on observable outcomes diverted attention from the underlying processes. Even if women receive help in domestic chores from family members, many women report that they need to supervise such help (Berheide 1984). Similarly, DeVault (1997) noted that even in households in which husbands did most of the cooking, the wife was still the household manager and controlled most planning functions related to cooking.

Some women found it easier to do the housework themselves than to get other family members to do it to their standards. In a study of fairly "egalitarian" dual-career

couples, Coltrane (1989) found there were at least six frequently performed household chores over which the mother retained almost exclusive managerial control and made sure they were performed adequately. In general, mothers were more likely than fathers to act as managers for cooking, cleaning, and child care, even though half of the couples said that they "shared" responsibility in these areas. Helper-husbands often waited to be told what to do, when to do it, and how it should be done. Schwartz (1998) found that, among couples with high-earning career wives, men felt their partners were entitled to do less housework, but did little to integrate an egalitarian process. Ehrensaft (1987) found that women usually bought children's clothes and made sure they looked presentable, even when the father actually dressed the child. Hertz (1986) found that, even in high earning couples that hired housework done by others, the ultimate responsibility for household management still fell to the wives.

Without a gendered perspective, it is easy to propose attributions of expertise as bases for such divisions of labor. However, as Twiggs, McQuillan, and Ferree (1999) found, where men participate substantially in household chores, they must cross a series of hierarchical gendered thresholds in order to become high participators. It was not merely an issue of who was good at what but an issue of who is supposed to be seen doing what. For example, the lowest level tasks, or those that appear to be more gender neutral, include doing dishes and going grocery shopping, while at the high end is cooking meals. Therefore, husbands and wives do not easily take on a task if it calls for crossing a gender boundary. Even when they suggest that they are involved in a task, it may be important to look beyond and verify that involvement includes an actual responsibility for the task.

Davis (1976) wrote a classical review integrating previous works on relative spousal influence on decision. These have focused on durable goods, including homes or housing (Cunningham and Green, 1974; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Hample 1974); automobiles (Davis, 1970; Green and Cunningham, 1975; Davis and Rigaux, 1974); home furnishing, living room furniture and/or other furniture (Davis, 1970; Green and Cunningham, 1975; Davis and Rigaux, 1974); and other including major appliances (Green and Cunningham, 1975) household appliances excluding television and televisions, hi-fi, tape recorders (Davis and Rigaux, 1974). Services, covering life or other insurance, and vacations (Cunningham and Green, 1974; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Green and Cunningham, 1975); doctors (Green and Cunningham, 1975); children's school programme and other outside entertainment (Davis and Rigaux, 1974) and other economic decisions like form and/or objectives of family savings and keeping track of money and bills (Cunningham and Green, 1974; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Green and Cunningham, 1975).

In his synthesis Davis (1976) pointed out the variability in spousal involvement in these purchase and economic activities by product categories.

### **Egalitarianism**

Egalitarianism believes that everyone is equal or has equal rights (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English). Egalitarianism is a trend of thought in political philosophy. An egalitarian favors equality of some sort: people should get the same, or be treated the same, or be treated as equals, in some respect. Egalitarian doctrines tend to express the idea that all human persons are equal in fundamental worth or moral status. So far as the Western European and Anglo-American philosophical

tradition is concerned, one significant source of this thought is the Christian notion that God loves all human souls equally. Egalitarianism is a protean doctrine, because there are several different types of equality, or ways in which people might be treated the same, that might be thought desirable. In modern democratic societies, the term "egalitarian" is often used to refer to a position that favors, for any of a wide array of reasons, a greater degree of equality of income and wealth across persons than currently exists.

Keeping in view the above given definition a non-egalitarian would be one who believes that people born into a higher social caste, or a favored race or ethnicity, or with an above-average stock of traits deemed desirable, ought somehow to count for more than others in calculations that determine what morally ought to be done.

Instrumental egalitarians are those who believe egalitarianism as a mean to some other goal whereas on the other hand non-instrumental egalitarians are the people who believe in egalitarianism as a goal in itself either it be moral, social or political. For example, someone who believes that the maintenance of equality across a group of people brings relations of solidarity and community among them, and is desirable for that reason, qualifies as an instrumental egalitarian. Someone who believes that equality of some sort is a component of justice, and morally required as such, would be a non-instrumental egalitarian.

Equality can be valued conditionally or unconditionally, Conditional value implies that equality can be sought when some condition is in place for example that equality in distribution of resources in one group of persons is valuable but only on the condition that individuals equally deserve whereas the other holds that equality must be sought without any qualification or condition.



## **Equality of Opportunity**

In a hierarchical caste society, positions of advantage are assigned to people on a basis of birth lineage. If one is a legitimate offspring of parents who are aristocrats, one will also enjoy the privileges of aristocratic rank. A historically important form of equality associated with the rise of competitive market economies is the ideal of equality of opportunity. This ideal is also known as formal equality of opportunity or careers open to talents.

Equality of opportunity implies that jobs in firms and opportunities to borrow money for investment should be open to all applicants should be assessed on relevant criteria of merit and top ranked applicants should be offered with the job. The merit is to be set so that those who score highest would be the best to further the purpose of the enterprises. This equality also implies that companies should sell the goods or services to all the potential customers. Finally the equality of opportunity requires that purchasers of goods and services must be responsive to the prices and quality of goods offered to them for purchase. It also implies equal chances of university entrance and public sector jobs for all.

In theory the equality of opportunity could be fully satisfied in a society in which wealth passed along by inheritance. In this society chance will be equal but the applicants who qualify for the job will be sons and daughters of wealthy people as they alone will have access to training. The society that establishes a state sponsored educational system goes someway ahead of equality of opportunity and provides all of its members of some opportunity to develop skills. The same is the position of the society that that enforces minimal standards of child raising to which all the parents must conform.

An alternative to the equality of opportunity is to eliminate the advantages that family wealth and social status confer upon an individual in competition. Achieving this goal means a society classless in a sense. John Rawls formulated this principle of equality of fair opportunity. It holds that any individual in society with same native talent and ambitions should have same prospects of success in competition for positions. EFO also opposes racial and sexual prejudices that work to deprive disfavored individuals from enjoying opportunities to become qualified so that they would benefit from equality of fair opportunity. EFO cannot be fully achieved without conflict with other values e.g. Locke's Principle that's why it is not practiced or desired by any nation.

### **Equality of conditions**

A society that even provides ideals of equality of fair opportunity might provide bad conditions of life for those who are unsuccessful in competition for example the persons who have native talent but fail to make good use of it or the persons who had a bad luck to be born with out much of that native talent. The question here is whether there are any substantive ideals of equality beyond meritocratic ideals.

One group of substantive equality ideals are equality of democratic citizenship and civil liberties but something beyond civil liberties and democratic citizenship can be rather should be distributed equally among the members of a society.

## **Locke's Rights**

This approach is named after a prominent exponent of this doctrine John Lock . This philosophy is also seen as the rejection of egalitarianism rather than a version of it. Locke's (1690) view is that every person has equal basic moral rights-natural rights. These rights exist independent of institutional arrangements and customs or beliefs. These rights give her a set of claim against every other person that all must respect. The traditional content of Locke's rights are right of ownership, right of not to be harmed child's right to be nurtured till adulthood by those who are responsible for her creation etc. person can voluntarily waive any of these rights or she can voluntarily transfer her right to nay other person or these rights can be forfeited from her in case of misconduct. Locke's rights put constraints on what one Feb do but do not set goal- what one ought to do. (Cited in C. B. Macpherson 1980)

A more egalitarian version of Locke's right doctrine shows skepticism about Locke's account of moral basis of private ownership right. Left wing Locke asserts that each person is rightful owner of herself and each adult person has a right to a per capita share of ownership of the unimproved land and resources of the earth.

## **Karl Marx and Equal Rights**

Marxist tradition in politics and economics finds desirable to eliminate inequalities associated with the institutions of a capitalist market economy. Marx (1875) asserts that in first phase of communist society the economy will distribute goods according to norms that is to each according to his labor contribution. This

norm can be defined as moral principle but is defective. One defect is that some people are naturally more able than others and so amount of labor contribution will vary by luck that is beyond one's power of control. So Marx asserted that it will be desirable when a higher phase of community is attained that society move from each for his ability to each for his need. Marx did not want it to be considered a moral principle to eliminate chances of enforcement he foresaw voluntary adoption of this law by communist society. (Cited in R. C. Tucker, 1978)

In modern societies with market economies an egalitarian is generally thought to be one who supports equality of income and wealth. Money is a conventional medium of exchange given any array of goods for sale at various prices with some money one has the option to purchase any combination of goods within the budget constraints set by money. State economy and cultural and legal norms also restrict these choices. Having money gives one freedom to variety of experience and activities. The ideal of equality of income and wealth is about people enjoying this effective freedom to same extent.

One serious objection is that to bring about and sustain the condition in which all people have the same amount of money would require continuous and extensive violation of people's Locke's idea of rights, which as standard understood include the right to gain more property than others possess by gift or trade or hard work. Another, closely related objection is that a regime of equal money could be maintained only by wrongful interference with people's liberty, because if money is distributed equally at one time people will choose to act in ways that over time will tend to result in unequal distribution of money at later times.

Another objection to the ideal of monetary equality is that its pursuit would inhibit people's engagement in wealth-creating and wealth-saving activity, and in the

not very long run would reduce society's stock of wealth and make us all worse off in the terms of the effective freedom that was being equalized. Yet another objection is that people behave in ways that render those more and less deserving, and monetary good fortune is among the types of things that people come to deserve differentially.

The advocate of egalitarianism in the broad sense has some replies. Unless some substantive argument is given as to why Locke's rights should be accorded moral deference, the mere fact that equality conflicts with Locke's rights does not by itself impugn the ideal of equality. Febbe some purported "rights" should not be regarded as momentous, and their sacrifice to secure equality might be acceptable on balance. In the same vein, one might hold that the fact that continuous restriction of individual liberty is needed to satisfy some norm does not by itself tell us whether the moral gain from satisfying the ideal is worth the moral cost of lessened freedom. Some restrictions of liberty are undeniably worth their cost, and some ideal of equality might be among the values that warrant some sacrifice of liberty.

Another concern about monetary equality is that purchasing power interacts with individuals' personal powers and traits, and real freedom reflects the interaction, which an emphasis on purchasing power alone conceals. Consider two persons, one of whom is blind, legless, and armless, while the other has good eyesight and full use of her limbs. Given equal money, the first must spend his money on devices and services to cope with his handicaps, while the second Feb purchase far more of what she likes. Here equality of purchasing power seems to leave the two very unequal in real freedom to live their lives as they choose. But the case of handicaps is just an extreme instance of what is always present, namely each individual has a set of traits and natural powers bestowed by genetic inheritance and early socialization, and these

differ greatly across persons and greatly affect people's access to valuable ways to live.

### **Stake Holders of Equality**

Settling which aspect of people's conditions should be the same for all and fixing a measure of people's conditions in this aspect does not satisfy the question among whom should this equality exist. In what ways members of society or a nation state be made equal and why not human beings why only members of a nation state? If equality is a means to other values it Feb be the case that equality among the individuals who interact in significant way can promote desired goal. For example if we aspire for equality to promote social solidarity producing equality in Norwegians and South East Asians is not effective as they do not interact significantly. For instrumental egalitarianism one should seek equality among the collection of the people in which equality will produce desired results.

If equality is valued for its own sake rather than as means for further goals one should not limit the domain of people in terms of time space or political boundaries. One view is that when people set up a wide-ranging system of coercion on the scale of a political nation, special moral requirements come into play, including a requirement that all whose lives are ruled by this system of coercion should be treated equally or brought to an equal condition in some respects.

The question, whether the requirement of equalizing people's condition applies within particular societies but not across societies on a global scale, might be thought to raise a rough dilemma for the normative attractiveness of any equality ideal. The dilemma arises in the following train of thought. On the one hand, there is no good

basis for restricting the scope of equality. If equality matters, the group that should be made equal is people everywhere. On the other hand, a global equality requirement will strike many as deeply counterintuitive because it seems to impose very demanding requirements on prosperous individuals and nations to share their wealth with less prosperous strangers in distant lands. The dilemma paints egalitarianism as either parochial or Quixotic and utopian. To remove this impression of dilemma, it would suffice either to defend the restriction of egalitarian requirements to single societies or to show that the requirements of demanding global egalitarianism are not really counterintuitive.

Further issues may be raised about the nature of the individuals among whom equality should obtain. One might hold that across whatever kind of group is deemed to be the relevant domain of equality; individuals should be made equal in condition over the course of their lives. Another possibility is that the individual persons at the same stage of the life cycle should be rendered equal in condition. On this latter view, a society in which over time the people who are old all enjoy the same condition, and likewise the people who are young and those who are middle-aged, could perfectly conform to the ideal of equality of condition even if the old are (say) far better off than the middle-aged and the middle-aged are always far better off than the young. Another possible view is that equality should be formulated so it demands that from now, the condition of all those living should be equalized.

Another issue emerges if one asks: why focus on individual persons rather than on groups? One might hold that it is not important that individual persons have equal life prospects, but it is morally valuable that men and women on the whole should have equal life prospects, that heterosexuals and non-heterosexuals should have the same life prospects, that people of different supposed races should have the same life

prospects on the whole, and so on. To fill out this proposal one would need to develop a normative account that explains what sorts of group classifications matter for this purpose and on what grounds. Notice that one might be troubled, for example, if it is found that men have better life prospects on the average than women, because that would be an indicator that perhaps equality of opportunity and equality of fair opportunity are not satisfied.

## **Consumer Purchase Decision Process**

According to Wilkie (1994) consumer decision process involves the actions a person takes in purchasing and using products and services, including the mental and social processes that precede and follow these actions.

The study of consumer behavior help answer questions such as why people choose one product or brand over another, how they make these choices, and how companies use this knowledge to provide value to consumers. Behind the visible act of making a purchase there is a decision process. The purchase decision process is the stages a buyer passes through in making choices about which products and services to buy.

There are five stages of decision making process.

### **Five Stage of Purchase Process**

According to Wilkie (1994) there are five stages of consumer purchase process

- Problem recognition,
- Information search,



- Alternative evaluation,
- Purchase decision,
- Post purchase behavior

### **Problem Recognition**

Problem recognition means to perceive a need. It means perceiving a difference between a person's ideal and actual situations. If the difference is big enough to trigger a decision the person moves on to the next stage. Activities in this stage can be numerous and can range from as simple as noticing an empty milk carton to many folds analysis of persons skills. The problem recognition can be initiated by the person himself as well as activated by marketing efforts of some company. (Wilkie,1994)

### **Information Search**

The information search stage clarifies the options open to the consumer for satisfying the need recognized in the previous stage. This stage Feb involve two steps of information search.(Wilkie, 1994)

### **Internal Search**

Internal search includes scanning one's memory to recall previous experiences with products or brands. This kind of search is usually sufficient for frequently

purchased products but for the products that are not so frequently purchased external search is also used.

### **External search**

When past experience or knowledge is insufficient the risk of making a wrong purchase decision is high. To decrease this risk external search is done cost of the search is usually low as compared to the cost of gathering information.

### **Sources of Information**

The primary sources of external information are:

- Personal sources, such as friends and family.
- Public sources, including various product-rating organizations such as Consumer Reports.
- Marketer-dominated sources, such as advertising, company websites, and salespeople

### **Alternative Evaluation**

Buchana in 1988 suggested that In alternative evaluation one assesses the value of the alternatives one has found out in the search. This evaluation clarifies the problem for the consumer by Suggesting criteria to use for the purchase, yielding

brand names that might meet the criteria and developing consumer value perception. (Buchana, 1988)

A consumer's evaluative criterion includes both the objective attributes of a brand (such as locate speed on a portable CD player) and the subjective factors (such as prestige). These criteria establish a consumer's evoked set the group of brands that a consumer would consider acceptable from among all the brands in the product class of which he or she is aware.

### **Purchase Decision**

The purchase decision includes the aspects of buying place and time. The place of buying or the decision of from whom to buy which depends on a number of considerations for example terms of sale, past experience buying from the seller, return policy etc The decision of time of buying or when to buy can be influenced by store atmosphere, time pressure or a sale. (Wilkie, 1994)

### **Socio-cultural Influences On Consumer Behavior**

Purchase decision is not done in social isolation. It is affected by a number of socio-cultural factors which evolve from formal and informal relationships with other people. The socio-cultural influences include (Bulch & Bulch, 1980)

- Personal influence
- Reference groups
- The family
- Social class

- Culture and subculture

### **Personal Influence**

Opinion leaders individuals exert a considerable amount of influence in purchase decision making these are the individual who exert direct or indirect social influence over others on the basis of their knowledge, experience or even just wit the rhetorical power. (Bulch & Bulch, 1980). Word of mouth is the influence people exert to each other during face-to-face conversations. Power of word of mouth has been magnified by the Internet and e-mail.

### **Reference Groups**

Reference groups are people to whom an individual looks as a basis for self-appraisal or as a source of personal standards. Reference groups have an important influence on the purchase of luxury products but not of necessities.

According to Bulch & Bulch (1980) three groups have clear marketing implications.

- Membership Group
- Aspiration Group
- Dissociative Group

Membership group is the one to which a person actually belongs. Aspiration group is the group one with which a person wishes to be identified. Dissociative group is the one from which a person wants to maintain a distance because of differences in values or behaviors.

## **Family Influence**

According to Ganesh (1997) family influences on consumer behavior result from three sources that are consumer socialization, passage through the family life cycle, decision making within the family. Consumer socialization is the process by which people acquire the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to function as consumers. Family Life Cycle is the distinct phases that a family progresses through from formation to retirement. Each phase brings with it identifiable purchasing behaviors. In family decision making two decision-making styles usually exist. Spouse-dominant (either wife or husband is responsible) or joint decision making (most decisions are made by both husband and wife). Increasingly, preteens and teenagers are assuming these roles for the family, given the prevalence of working parents and single-parent households. There are five roles played by every individual family member in the purchase process i.e. information gatherer, influencer, decision maker, purchaser, user

## **Social Class**

Social Class is the relatively permanent, homogeneous divisions in a society into which people sharing similar values, interests, and behavior are grouped. Determinants of social class include occupation, source of income (not level of income), education etc. (Belch & Belch, 1980)

Social class is a basis for identifying and reaching particularly good prospects for products and services. Upper classes are targeted by companies for items such as

financial investments, expensive cars, and evening wear. Middle classes represent a target market for home improvement centers and automobile parts stores. Lower classes are targeted for products such as sports and scandal magazines.

### **Culture and Subculture**

Culture refers to the set of values, ideas and attitudes that are accepted by a homogeneous group of people and transmitted to the next generation. Subcultures are the groups within the larger, or national, culture with unique values, ideas, and attitudes. (Ganesh,1997). Sub culture consumer behavior literature has typically focused on black and Hispanic groups in America (Cromwell and Cromwell, 1978; Deshpande et al., 1986; Saegert et al., 1985) yet Asian Americans have also been studied (Dalrymple et al., 1971; Mehta and Blek, 1991).

Indian spouse have more power in dual-career marriages than in single career marriages, and dual career marriages have more egalitarian sex roles (Shukla, 1987). Ramu (1987) found no differences in ideal husband's role between dual and single career Indian families, but did find decision making differences similar to Sshukla (1987).

### **Rationale of the Study**

Becker (1965) labeled family a "small factory" that produces commodities (children, health, leisure, etc.) of value to the family. As mentioned earlier, not only are the most basic forms of gender enacted in a household but also, as Risman (1998) suggested, a household is a gender factory. Therefore, understanding gendered

differences in production and consumption rituals within the household is important. This need is further accentuated by the fact that, as stated earlier, our discipline has embraced a gendered-self perspective coupling man with masculine and woman with feminine. Such a categorical dichotomization across biological and social differences has not only led to an overall lack of acknowledgement of the lenses necessary in interpreting the findings of our research but also a corresponding under-interpretation of the findings. As Bristor and Fischer (1993) noted, it is one thing to observe a pattern of behavior in the household, and another to be able to interpret it fully upon acknowledging the gendered nature of the behaviors observed.

The latter results in contextualizing the findings and prevents any researcher-imposed artificial labeling of the observed patterns of behavior. Despite the centrality of the gendered (and not biological) differences observed between men and women in households.

The study of gender egalitarianism in purchase decision making is important in the perspective of changing gender roles in Pakistani society. This study will establish the relationship between change of roles and economic autonomy that can help concerned quarters to pay attention towards emphasizing the raise in economic autonomy of women in order to provide them an equal chance of participation in decision making not only in households but also in other walks of life. As if autonomy is related to egalitarianism in household decisions we can fairly hope it to effect other decisions.

With the perspective of consumer behavior this study will estimate the growing market segment i.e., women in Pakistan. The growing economy of Pakistan and emphasis on women education is making this segment of more and more importance as both the factors increase the role of women in purchase decision.

Customized advertising and segment based marketing policies should be made to capture this market. This study will identify the kind of products about which purchase decision is made by women solely or about which they can influence the decision.



## METHOD

**Objectives**

- To study gender egalitarianism in purchase process in connection with educational level of spouse.
- To study role of financial autonomy in gender egalitarianism in purchase process.
- To study gender egalitarianism in purchase process as a function of sustainability of commodity.
- To study gender egalitarianism in purchase process as a function of personal and common use.
- To study role of education and career at various stages of purchase process.

**Hypotheses**

- Dual career families are more egalitarian than single career families.
- Families are more egalitarian in purchase process about fast moving consumer goods than in purchase process about durable goods.
- Husbands have more influence in decision making about purchasing goods of common use.
- Families with high education are more egalitarian than families with low education.

**Sample**

Sample of the study consisted of 200 married women from urban middle class families of Faisalabad and Lahore. Purposive sampling was used.

## **Research Tool**

1. Demographic information sheet (Education, Career, Age, Socio-economic Status)
2. Gender Egalitarianism Questionnaire

Gender egalitarianism questionnaire was developed by the researcher using the stages as described and used in previous research by Ganesh (1997). It consists of 10 items and measures gender egalitarianism by eliciting responses on three categories of husband dominated decision, wife dominated decision and joint decision at four stages of purchase decision process i.e. Need identification, Search for information, Product choice, and Actual purchase.

## **Operational Definitions**

### **Gender Egalitarianism**

A response of joint decision on Gender Egalitarianism Questionnaire was the evidence of egalitarianism.

### **Low Education**

Education was considered low if the respondent had an education of 10 years or below.

### **High Education**

Education was considered high if the respondent had education above 14 years.

### **Urban Middle Class Families**

SES was measured through a SES grid prepared by Gallop International, Pakistan Chapter.

### **Dual Career Families**

Families whose both male and the female heads were earning members were considered dual career families

### **Single Career Families**

Families with male head as earning member were considered single career families.

### **Fast Moving Consumer Goods**

Goods which are purchased by the respondents once or more than once a month were considered fast moving consumer goods.

### **Durable Goods**

Goods which are purchased once or twice in five years were considered durable goods.

### **Goods of Personal Use**

Goods used by only one member of the family for his or her personal needs were considered personal goods

### **Goods of Common Use**

Good consumed by more than one family member were considered goods of common use.

### **Research Design**

The research was conducted in four phases as mentioned above.

- Development of questionnaire
- Tryout of questionnaire
- Pilot Study
- Main Study

## **Development of Questionnaire**

In the first phase of the research the statements were translated by nine bilingual translators having at least Masters Degree in relevant fields i.e., English, Urdu, Psychology. The most convincing translations were adopted by the translator in consultation with supervisor. In case of any difference of opinion among translators the item was sent back to a committee for decision. The committee consisted of five persons having at least a Masters Degree in psychology. This draft of questionnaire was back translated by five independent judges and examined by the committee. The questionnaire was approved with a few minor changes in wording of Urdu.

### **Validity**

Content and face validity of the questionnaire was established through committee approach. 7 judges evaluated the questionnaire and found it appropriate and adequate.

### **Tryout of Questionnaire**

In the second phase i.e. try out of the questionnaire data were collected from a sample of ten respondents to account for any unprecedented and unforeseen problem in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was found unambiguous and was easily understood by the respondents.

### **Pilot Study**

In the third phase i.e. pilot Study data were collected from 40 respondents. This pilot study was conducted to foresee problems in data collection and analysis. Chi-Square test was conducted to study the differences in frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated, and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable and fast moving consumer goods of common and personal use of respondents in families with high and low education as well as single and dual career families.

Chi-Square test for husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions was not significant for durable and fast moving consumer goods in families with high and low education as well as single and dual career families.

On the other hand dual career families were found to be significantly ( $p < .05$ ) more egalitarian in purchase process of durable goods of personal use than the single career families.

Purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of personal and durable goods of common use was highly wife and husband dominated respectively both in single and dual career families. Purchase of fast moving consumer goods of personal use was significantly ( $p < .01$ ) wife dominated in dual career families as compared to single career families.

### **Main Study**

In the third stage the main study was conducted. Independent group research design was used in the study. SPSS was used for the analysis of the data. Chi-Square test for significance of difference was used as the dependent variables were categorical.

**Table 1**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decisions about fast moving consumer goods and durable goods of personal and common use. (N = 200)*

	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total	Chi-Square
FMCGs of common use	63 31%	80 40%	57 29%	200	4.27
Durable goods of common use	118 59%	19 10%	63 31%	200	73.81**
FMCGs of personal use	16 8%	143 71%	41 21%	200	135.79**
Durable goods of personal use	42 21%	73 37%	85 42%	200	14.77*

$df = 2$ , \*\* $p < .000$ , \* $p < .001$

Table 1 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are significant for durable goods of common and personal use and fast moving consumer goods of personal use.

**able 2**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families*

Durable Goods of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	29 26%	32 29%	50 45%	111
Dual Career	13 15%	41 46%	45 39%	89
Total	42 21%	73 37%	85 42%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 7.523, p < .05$$

Table 2 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are significant for durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families.

**Table 3**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families*

Fast Moving Consumer Goods of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single career	27 24%	58 52%	26 24%	111
Dual Career	36 40%	22 25%	31 35%	89
Total	63 31%	80 40%	57 29%	200

$$\chi^2(2, N = 200) = 15.108, p < .01$$

Table 3 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are significant for fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families.



**Table 4**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of common use in single and dual career families*

Durable Goods of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	71 64%	8 7%	32 29%	111
Dual Career	47 53%	11 12%	31 35%	85
Total	118 59%	19 10%	63 31%	192

$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = 2.987, p = ns.$

Table 4 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are not significant for durable goods of common use in single and dual career families.

**Table 5**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of Fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families*

FMCGs of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	14 13%	72 65%	25 22%	111
Dual Career	2 2%	71 80%	16 18%	89
Total	16 8%	143 71%	41 21%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 8.667, p < .05$$

Table 5 shows that the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are significant for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families.

**Table 6**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families*

Durable Goods of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	27 20%	48 35%	61 45%	136
Low Education	12 21%	23 41%	21 38%	56
Total	39 20%	71 37%	82 43%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = .909, p = ns$$

Table 6 shows the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are not significant for durable goods of personal use for families with high and low education.

**Table 7**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of Fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families*

FMCGs of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	15 11%	88 65%	33 24%	136
Low Education	1 2%	48 85%	7 13%	56
Total	16 8%	136 71%	40 21%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = 9.174, p < .05$$

Table 7 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are significant for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in families with low and high education.

**Table 8**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families*

Durable Goods of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	78 57%	15 11%	43 32%	136
Low Education	34 60%	4 7%	18 33%	56
Total	112 58%	19 10%	61 32%	192

$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = .686, p = ns.$

Table 8 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are not significant for durable goods of common use in families with high and low education.

**Table 9**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families*

Fast Moving Consumer Goods of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	48 35%	53 39%	35 26%	136
Low Education	12 21%	24 43%	20 36%	56
Total	60 31%	77 40%	55 29%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 3, p = ns$$

Table 9 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions are not significant for fast moving consumer goods of common use in families with high and low education.

**Table 10**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Identification of Need for Purchase of Durable Goods of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	28 26%	28 26%	52 48%	108
Dual Career	4 2%	46 52%	38 46%	88
Total	32 16%	74 38%	90 46%	196

$$\chi^2(2, N = 196) = 22.752, p < .001$$

Table 10 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of durable goods of personal use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 11**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of common use in single and dual career families*

	Use			Total
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	
Single Career	39 36%	32 29%	39 35%	110
Dual Career	27 30%	17 19%	45 51%	89
Total	66 33%	49 25%	84 42%	199

$$\chi^2(2, N = 199) = 5.042, p = ns$$

Table 11 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of durable goods of common use is not significant for single and dual career families.



**Table 12**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Identification of Need for Purchase of FMCGs of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	8 7%	82 77%	17 16%	107
Dual Career	2 2%	75 85%	11 13%	88
Total	10 5%	157 81%	28 14%	195

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 195) = 3.379, p = ns$$

Table 12 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of personal use is not significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 13**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families*

Identification of Need for Purchase of FMCGs of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	32 29%	49 44%	30 27%	111
Dual Career	8 9%	42 48%	38 43%	88
Total	40 20%	91 46%	68 34%	199

$$\chi^2(2, N = 199) = 13.4, p < .01$$

Table 13 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of common use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 14**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Identification of Need for Purchase of Durable Good of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	20 15%	47 35%	66 50%	133
Low Education	11 20%	24 44%	20 36%	55
Total	31 16%	71 38%	86 46%	188

$$\chi^2(2, N = 188) = 2.786, p = ns$$

Table 14 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of durable goods of personal use is non-significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 15**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for durable goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Identification of Need for Purchase of Durable Good of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	41 30%	31 23%	64 47%	136
Low Education	23 42%	17 31%	15 27%	55
Total	64 34%	48 25%	79 41%	191

$\chi^2 (2, N = 191) = 6.325, p < .05$

Table 15 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of durable goods of common use is significant for families with high level and low level education.

**Table 16**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Identification of Need for Purchase of FMCGs of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	9 7%	98 75%	24 18%	131
Low Education	1 2%	51 91%	4 7%	56
Total	10 5%	149 80%	28 15%	187

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 187) = 6.472, p < .05$$

Table 16 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of personal use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 17**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about identification of need for fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families*

Identification of Need for Purchase of FMCGs of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	18 13%	64 48%	53 39%	135
Low Education	21 37.5%	21 37.5%	14 25%	56
Total	39 20%	85 45%	67 35%	191

$$\chi^2(2, N = 191) = 14.488, p < .01$$

Table 17 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian identification of need for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of common use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 18**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search for durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Information Search for Durable Goods of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	28 25%	27 24%	56 51%	111
Dual Career	8 9%	45 51%	36 40%	89
Total	36 18%	72 36%	92 46%	200

$$\chi^2(2, N = 200) = 17.754, p < .001$$

Table 18 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for durable goods of personal use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 19**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of common use in single and dual career families*

Information search of durable goods of common use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single	61	8	42	111
Career	55%	7%	38%	
Dual Career	35	11	43	89
	39%	12%	49%	
Total	96	19	85	200
	48%	9%	43%	

$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 5.170, p < .05$

Table 19 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for durable goods of common use is significant for single and dual career families.



**Table 20**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Information Search For FMCGs Of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	11 10%	77 69%	23 21%	111
Dual Career	2 2%	75 84%	12 14%	89
Total	13 7%	152 76%	35 17%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 7.384, p < .05$$

Table 20 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 21**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families.*

Information Search For FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single	42	30	39	111
Career	38%	27%	35%	
Dual Career	11	43	35	89
	12%	49%	39%	
Total	53	73	74	200
	27%	36%	37%	

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 18.467, p < .001$$

Table 21 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for fast moving consumer goods of common use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 22**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Information Search Of Durable Goods Of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	25 18%	50 37%	61 45%	136
Low Education	8 14%	19 34%	29 52%	56
Total	33 17 %	69 36%	90 47%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = .883, p = ns$$

Table 22 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for durable goods of personal use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 23**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Information Search Of Durable Goods Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	64 47%	15 11%	57 42%	136
Low Education	29 52%	4 7%	23 41%	56
Total	93 48%	19 10%	80 42%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = .795, p = ns$$

Table 23 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for durable goods of common use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 24**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about information search of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Information Search For FMCGs Of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	11 8%	95 70%	30 22%	136
Low Education	2 3%	49 88%	5 9%	56
Total	13 7%	144 75%	35 18%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 6.594, p < .05$$

Table 24 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 25**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for information search of fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Information Search Of FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	34 24%	51 38%	51 38%	136
Low Education	18 32%	17 30%	21 38%	56
Total	52 27%	68 36%	72 37%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 1.319, p = ns$$

Table 25 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian information search for fast moving consumer goods of common use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 26**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation for durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Alternative evaluation for durable goods of personal use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	47 42%	38 34%	26 24%	111
Dual Career	28 31%	38 43%	23 26%	89
Total	75 37%	76 38%	49 25%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 2.609, p = ns$$

Table 26 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for durable goods of personal use is not significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 27**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of common use in single and dual career families.*

Alternative Evaluation Of Durable Goods Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single	79	9	23	111
Career	71%	8%	21%	
Dual Career	58	10	21	89
	65%	11%	24%	
Total	137	19	44	200
	69%	9%	22%	

$$\chi^2(2, N = 200) = .954, p = ns$$

Table 27 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for durable goods of common use is not significant for single and dual career families.



**Table 28**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Alternative evaluation for FMCGs of personal use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	16 14%	73 66%	22 20%	111
Dual Career	9 10%	63 71%	17 19%	89
Total	25 12%	136 68%	39 20%	200

$$\chi^2(2, N = 200) = .928, p = ns$$

Table 28 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is not significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 29**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of fast moving consumer goods of common use in single and dual career families.*

Alternative Evaluation For FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	62 56%	24 22%	25 22%	111
Dual Career	40 45%	23 26%	26 29%	89
Total	102 51%	47 24%	51 25%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 2.395, p = ns$$

Table 29 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for fast moving consumer goods of common use is not significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 30**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Alternative Evaluation Of Durable Goods Of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	55 40%	45 33%	36 27%	136
Low Education	17 30%	26 47%	13 23%	56
Total	72 37%	71 37%	94 49%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 3.149, p = ns$$

Table 30 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for durable goods of personal use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 31**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Alternative Evaluation Of Durable Goods Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	94 69%	13 10%	29 21%	136
Low Education	37 66%	5 9%	14 25%	56
Total	131 68%	18 9%	43 23%	192

$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = .310, p = ns$

Table 31 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for durable goods of common use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 32**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about alternative evaluation of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Alternative evaluation for FMCGs of personal use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	21 15%	80 59%	35 26%	136
Low Education	4 7%	50 89%	2 3%	56
Total	25 13%	130 68%	37 19%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 17.646, p < .001$$

Table 32 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 33**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for alternative evaluation of fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Alternative Evaluation Of FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	61 45%	36 26%	39 29%	136
Low Education	36 64%	10 18%	10 18%	56
Total	97 51%	46 24%	49 25%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 6.013, p < .05$$

Table 33 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian alternative evaluation for fast moving consumer goods of common use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 34**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase of durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Purchase Decision For Durable Goods Of Personal Use				
	Husband	Wife	Egalitarian	Total
	Dominated	Dominated		
Single Career	27 24%	35 32%	49 44%	111
Dual Career	15 17%	42 47%	32 36%	89
Total	42 21%	77 39%	81 40%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 5.277, p < .05$$

Table 34 indicates that differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for durable goods of personal use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 35**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of common use in single and dual career families.*

Purchase Decision For Durable Goods Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single	59	15	37	111
Career	53%	14%	33%	
Dual Career	46	16	27	89
	52%	18%	30%	
Total	105	31	64	200
	52%	16%	32%	

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = .794, p = ns$$

Table 35 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for durable goods of common use is not significant for single and dual career families.



**Table 36**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in single and dual career families.*

Purchase decision for FMCGs of personal use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single Career	12 11%	71 64%	28 25%	111
Dual Career	4 5%	60 67%	25 28%	89
Total	16 8%	131 65%	53 27%	200

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 2.706, p = \text{ns}$$

Table 36 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is not significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 37**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of common use in Single and dual career families.*

Purchase Decision For FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
Single	56	29	26	111
Career	51%	26%	23%	
Dual Career	28	28	33	89
	32%	32%	36%	
Total	84	57	59	200
	42%	28%	30%	

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 7.856, p < .05$$

Table 37 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for fast moving consumer goods of common use is significant for single and dual career families.

**Table 38**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of personal use in high and low educated families.*

Purchase Decision Of Durable Goods Of Personal Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	28 21%	50 36%	58 43%	136
Low Education	11 20%	24 43%	21 37%	56
Total	39 20%	74 39%	79 41%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = .655, p = ns$$

Table 38 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for durable goods of personal use is not significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 39**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of durable goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Purchase Decision Of Durable Goods Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	67 49%	21 15%	48 36%	136
Low Education	32 57%	10 18%	14 25%	56
Total	99 52%	31 16%	62 32%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = 1.923, p = ns$$

Table 39 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for durable goods of common use is not significant for families with low and high education.

**Table 40**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of personal use in families with high and low education.*

Purchase decision for FMCGs of personal use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	14 10%	80 59%	42 31%	136
Low Education	2 4%	45 80%	9 16%	56
Total	16 8%	125 65%	51 27%	192

$$\chi^2(2, N = 192) = 8.252, p < .05$$

Table 40 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for fast moving consumer goods of personal use is significant for families with high and low education.

**Table 41**

*Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions for purchase of fast moving consumer goods of common use in high and low educated families.*

Purchase Decision Of FMCGs Of Common Use				
	Husband Dominated	Wife Dominated	Egalitarian	Total
High Education	56 41%	41 30%	39 29%	136
Low Education	25 45%	13 23%	18 32%	56
Total	81 42%	54 28%	57 30%	192

$$\chi^2 (2, N = 192) = .951, p = ns$$

Table 41 indicates the differences in Chi-Square of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian purchase decision for fast moving consumer goods of common use is not significant for families with high and low education.

## DISCUSSION

The relationships of gender egalitarianism with education, career and product category were the basic focus of the present study. Egalitarianism in purchase process was hypothesized to be exercised more frequently in families with high education and dual career. It was also assumed that families will be more egalitarian in purchase of FMCGs as compared to durable goods and the spousal influence will be more evident in purchase of common goods as compared to personal goods of respondent. The research showed mixed results for different product categories.

Hypothesis that spouse will be more influential in purchase decision of goods of common use is supported for both FMCGs and durable goods by the present research. Davis in 1976 in a comprehensive synthesis of researches showed that there exists variability in spousal influence in purchase decision and economic activity by product categories. This variability also exists in the present research. There are no significant differences in frequencies of husband dominated (31.5%) wife dominated (40%) and egalitarian (28.5%) decisions in FMCGs of common use where as FMCGs of personal use show a significant difference with a large shift in favour of wife dominated (71.5%) decisions with a decrease in both egalitarianism and husband domination.

Durable goods of common and personal use show significant differences in husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions. For durable goods of common use 59% decisions were husband dominated 31.5% decisions were egalitarian where as only 9.5% decisions were wife dominated. Whereas in

durable goods of personal use there were 21% decisions which were husband dominated 42.5% decisions were egalitarian and 36.5% decisions were wife dominated. The results show a decrease in husband domination in durable goods of personal use as compared to that of durable goods of common use and a comparative increase both in wife domination and egalitarianism.

The hypothesized relationship between egalitarianism and product categories was not supported by the present research. Families were not found to be more egalitarian in purchase decision regarding FMCGs as compared to their purchase decisions about durable goods. For goods of common use there were 28.5% egalitarian decisions for FMCGs and 31.5% egalitarian decisions about durable goods. In purchase decision about goods of personal use families were found to be more egalitarian about durable goods (42.5%) as compared to FMCGs (20.5%).

There were significant differences in frequencies of husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase of durable goods of personal use in single and dual career families. Single career families were more husbands dominated in the above said decisions as compared to dual career families with single career families showing 26.1% husband dominated decisions and dual career families showing 14.6% husband dominated decisions. An increase in percentages of wife dominated decisions was very much evident in dual career families yet percentage of egalitarian decisions was less for dual career families than single career ones. The same trend with a significant difference in percentages of husband dominated wife dominated and egalitarian decisions was seen for FMCGs of personal use. A decrease in husband domination from 12.6% in single career families to 2.2% in dual career families accompanying decrease in



egalitarianism from 22.5% in single career families to 18% in dual career families and the decrease ended up in a large scale increase in wife domination from 64.9% in single career families to 91.8% in dual career families. So we can see that for the goods of personal use either they be durable or FMCGs the decisions in purchase are significantly wife dominated, more in dual career families as compared to single career families. The hypothesized relation of an existence of more egalitarian decisions in dual career families is not supported by this research at least for goods of personal use.

On the other hand for the decisions about goods of common use either they are fast moving consumer goods or they are durable the dual career families show more egalitarian decisions than single career families though the differences are significant ( $p < .01$ ) only for FMCGs. For FMCGs of common use there 23.4% egalitarian decisions in single career families as compared to 34.8% egalitarian decisions in dual career families where as in durable goods of common use there are 34.8% egalitarian decisions in dual career families as compared to 28.8% egalitarian decisions in single career families. Single career families are more wife dominated about purchase of FMCGs of common use with 52.3% wife dominated decisions as compared to 24.7% wife dominated decisions in dual career families. Husbands have a greater role in purchase of FMCGs of common use in dual career families (40.4%) as compared to single career families (24.3%). For durable goods of common use the differences in purchase decisions in single and dual career families are not significant.

The results show that women in dual career families show more influence in decision making about goods of personal use whereas decisions about goods of common use are more entrusted to the husband or are made jointly. This

behaviour can be explained keeping the dual responsibility of job related work and house related chores in view. The shortage of time and burden of dual responsibility can explain the increased shared and husband dominated decisions in purchase process of goods of common use. Webster proposed the gender blending in dual career families and expressive and instrumental roles in single career families. This gender blending as well as both kinds of roles was evident in the present research. (Webster 1994)

Education though has been described by the Rosen and Granbois (1983) as one of the relevant determinants of how are the finances handled with in the house hold yet the results of the present study show the effect of education in some categories and not in others. In purchase of FMCGs of personal use highly educated families show more egalitarianism than low educated families with high educated families having 24.3% egalitarian decisions as compared to 12.5% egalitarian decisions of low educated families. Less wife dominated decisions and increased husband dominated decisions about purchase of FMCGs of personal use is also seen in families with high education as compared to the ones with low education. The differences in husband dominated wife dominated and egalitarian decisions about purchase process of durable goods of personal use and FMCGs and durable goods of common use are not statistically significant.

To see the effects of education and career on egalitarianism at different stages of purchase process a stage wise analysis was done for all product categories. There were significant differences in single and dual career families in need identification for FMCGs of common use. There were more egalitarian decisions in dual career families (43.2%) as compared to single career families(27%). Need identification was also found to be slightly more wife

dominated and to a great extent less husband dominated in dual career families as compared to single career families in need identification of FMCGs of common use.

For need identification of durable goods of personal use the differences were also significant in single and dual career families. Both the single and dual career families had almost equal percentage (48.1% and 49.5%) of egalitarian decisions yet dual career families were more wife dominated in need identification of durable goods of personal use as compared to single career families with 25.9% wife dominated decisions in single career families and 52.3% wife dominated decisions in dual career families. Differences in need identification for FMCGs of personal use and durable goods of common use were not significant and the need identification for FMCGs of personal use was highly wife dominated for both single and dual career families.

Information search for FMCGs of common use exhibited significant differences in wife domination in single and dual career families. 27% of the decisions about information search of FMCGs of common use were wife dominated in single career families as compared to 48.4% wife dominated decisions in dual career families. Less husband dominated decisions in dual career families and almost equal egalitarian decisions in both single and dual career families were seen.

Differences were also significant for FMCGs of personal use. Information search was highly wife dominated within single and dual career families yet it was more wife dominated in dual career families (84.2%) as compared to single career families (69.3%). Dual career families made less egalitarian and less husband dominated decisions as compared to single career families. Information search for

durable goods of personal use was more wife dominated in dual career families (50.5%) as compared to single career families (24.3%). Single career families were more egalitarian than dual career families about information search of durable goods of personal use. In dual career families (8.9%) the information search for durable goods of personal use was less husband dominated as compared to single career families (25.2%). The differences in information search for durable goods of common use were not significant for single and dual career families. Information search for this category of goods was highly husband dominated for both types of families with dual career families making a bit more egalitarian decisions than single career ones.

There were no significant differences in alternative evaluation for FMCGs and durable goods of personal and common use in single and dual career families. For FMCGs of personal use the alternative evaluation was highly wife dominated for both single and dual career families. For durable goods of common use it was highly husband dominated for both single and dual career families.

The differences were significant or purchase decision of FMCGs of common use in single and dual career families. More decisions were egalitarian in dual career families as compared to single career families with 23.4% single career families making an egalitarian decision and 37% dual career families making an egalitarian decision about purchase of FMCGs of common use. More wife dominated and less husband dominated decisions were made in dual career families as compared to single career families. Purchase decisions of durable goods of common use and FMCGs and durable goods of common use do not show any significant differences in single and dual career families. Purchase decisions for FMCGs of personal use and durable goods of common use were

highly wife and husband dominated respectively in both single and dual career families.

Education has been found to determine finance management by Rosen and Granbois (1983). It also was found to affect different stages of purchase process in the present research. There were significant differences in need identification of durable goods of common use, FMCGs of common use, and FMCGs of personal use in families with high and low education. Families with high education were found to be more egalitarian in need identification of durable goods of common use as compared to families with low education. 47.1% decisions about need identification of durable goods of common use were egalitarian in families with high education as compared to 27.3% egalitarian decisions in families with low education. The families exhibited same characteristics for FMCGs of common use. Families with high education showed 39.3% egalitarian decisions as compared to 25% egalitarian decisions in families with low education. For FMCGs of common use wife domination is also more prevalent in families with high education (47.4%) as compared to families with low education (37.5%). Decisions are fewer husbands dominated about need identification of FMCGs of common use in families with high education (13.3%) as compared to families with low education (37.5%).

For FMCGs of personal use need identification was more egalitarian in families with high education (18.3%) as compared to families with low education (7.1%). This area was highly wife dominated for both families as need identification for FMCGs in families with low education were 91.1% wife dominated and in families with high education it was 74.8% wife dominated. There was almost no husband domination in families with low education (1.8%)

and very little husband domination was seen in families with high education (6.9%). Differences in need identification for durable goods of personal use were not significant in families with high and low education.

The differences were also significant in information search for FMCGs of personal use in families with high and low education. Families with high education (22.1%) were more egalitarian in information search about FMCGs of personal use as compared to families with low education (9%). This information search was highly wife dominated in both types of families as in 87.5% families with low education and 69.8% families with high education search was carried out by wives. The information search for durable goods of personal use and FMCGs and durable goods of common use did not exhibit any significant differences.

The differences were also significant in alternative evaluation for FMCGs of personal and common use in families with high and low education. More families with high education were egalitarian in alternative evaluation for FMCGs of personal use as compared to families with low education. 25.6% families with high education were egalitarian as compared to 3.7% with low education. This stage for FMCGs of personal use was highly wife dominated in families with low education. In alternative evaluation for FMCGs of common use also the families with high education (28.6%) showed more egalitarianism as compared to families with low education (17.9%). This area was husband dominated for families with low education with husband dominated decision being 64.2%. There were no significant differences in alternative evaluation of durable goods of common and personal use in families with high and low education. Families with high and low education both were highly husband dominated in alternative evaluation for durable goods of common use.

## Summary

We can say that the purchase process of durable goods of common use was found to be husband dominated and purchase process for FMCGs of personal use was found to be wife dominated. Durable goods of personal use were purchased jointly and there were no significant differences in husband domination wife domination and egalitarian decisions about purchase of FMCGs of common use.

Education was found to have significant effect on purchase process of FMCGs of personal goods only. Families with high education were more egalitarian in purchase of FMCGs of personal goods than families with low education. Career was found to effect purchase process for all the categories except durable goods of common use which were highly husband dominated for both single and dual career families. Wife dominated decisions were more prevalent for FMCGs and durable goods of personal use in dual career families as compared to egalitarianism or husband domination. Wife dominated decisions were also more frequent in dual career families as compared to single career families. For FMCGs of common use dual career families were more egalitarian than single career families yet the percentage of decisions made by husbands was more for dual career families as compared to single career families.

In the stage wise analysis career and education were found to effect different stages of purchase process. For need identification dual career was seen to be associated with decreased husband domination and increased egalitarianism and wife domination for FMCGs of common and durable goods of personal use. Both single and dual career families were wife dominated in need identification of

FMCGs of personal use and egalitarian in need identification of durable goods of common use.

Education was also found to effect need identification for FMCGs and durable goods of common use and FMCGs of personal use. Families with high education were more egalitarian in need identification of above mentioned goods as compared to families with low education. Highly educated families in comparison t families with low education made more wife dominated decisions in need identification of FMCGs of common use and more husband dominated decisions in need identification of FMCGs of personal use.

Career was found to effect information search for FMCGs and durable goods of personal use and FMCGs of personal use. Information search was found to be highly husband dominated for both single and dual career families in durable goods of common use. It was more wife dominated for durable goods of personal use and FMCGs of common use and more egalitarian for FMCGs of personal use in dual career families as compared to single career families. Education was found to affect FMCGs of personal use only, for information search. Families with high education were more egalitarian than families with low education. Information search was egalitarian for durable goods of personal use and highly husband dominated for durable goods of common use in families with high education as well as families with low education.

Career did not appear to have any significant effect on alternative evaluation for any kind of goods. For FMCGs and durable goods of common use alternative evaluation was husband dominated and for FMCGs of personal use it was wife dominated in both single and dual career families. For durable goods of personal use most of the alternative evaluation was done by husbands in single



career families and by wives in dual career families though the differences were not significant.

Education effected the alternative evaluation for FMCGs of personal and common use. This stage was highly wife dominated for FMCGs of personal use and husband dominated for FMCGs of common use in families with high as well as low education yet the families with high education made significantly more egalitarian decisions in alternative evaluation as compared to families with low education. Alternative evaluation was highly husband dominate or durable goods of common use for both kind of families.

For purchase decision career was found to effect purchase of FMCGs of common use only. Dual career families were more egalitarian than single career families in making purchase decision. It was wife dominated for FMCGs of personal use and husband dominated for durable goods of common use in both single and dual career families. for durable goods of personal use most decisions were made by wife in dual career families and jointly in single career families yet the difference was not significant.

In purchase decision making education affected decisions about only one category of goods i.e. FMCGs of personal use. Families with high education were more egalitarian as compared to families with low education in purchase decision o above mentioned category. For goods of common use purchase decision was husband dominated and for durable goods of personal use it was egalitarian in families with high education and wife dominated in families with low education but the differences were not significant.

## **Conclusions**

- Purchase processes of durable goods of common use, FMCGs of Personal use and, durable goods of personal are husband dominated, wife dominated and egalitarian respectively.
- Dual career families are more egalitarian as compared to single career families in purchase process.
- Families with high education were more egalitarian in purchase process of FMCGs of personal use as compared to families with low education.

## **Implications**

In the light of the findings of present research we can say that if we want to promote egalitarianism, we should encourage women to take part in in economic activity by providing more and more chances of employment for them. As career has been found to affect the role of women in purchase process.

The increased wife domination in dual career families in purchase processes exhibits that women with career are making more and more decisions by themselves. It shows the increase in their responsibility as the decisions being made are not joint decisions. They should be made aware of the fact that increase in responsibility means increase in work. So they should share the work load by making joint decisions.

It was also found that women are not making decisions for purchase of durable goods of common use even in highly educated and dual career

families. Purchase of these goods need technological information and women should be provided with this know-how to make it more egalitarian.

### **Limitations**

- Sampling was purposive so no generalization should be done without proper precautionary measures.
- Study was carried out on a small sample in a short span of time.
- Participants were selected from two cities only.
- The number of participants was not equal for both cities.
- Share of the respondents in the house-hold income was nt included in the analysis.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, K. R. & Walker, A.J. (2000). Constructing Gender in Families. In Gentry, J.W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Baill, C., & Money, J. (1980). Physiological Aspects of Female Sexual Development. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. (1963). Social Learning and Personality Development. In Diamond, M. (2000). "Sex and Gender: Same or Different". *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10. 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Belch, G. E., Belch, M. A., & Ceresino G. (1985). Parental and Teenage Child Influences in Family Decision Making. *Journal of Business Research*. Vol. 13, 163-176. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Berheide, C. W. (1984). Women's Work in the Home: Seems like Old Times. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Bose, C. E. (1987). Dual Spheres. In Hess, B. B., & Ferree, M. M. Analyzing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 267-285.
- Bristor, J. M., & Fischer, E. (1993). Feminist Thought: Implications for Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol.19, 518-536. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006

- Bullough, V. L., & Bullough, B. (1993). *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Colapinto, J. (1997). The true story of John/Joan. *Rolling Stone*, In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Coltrane, S. (1989). Household Labor and the Routine Production of Gender. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cromwell, V.L. and Cromwell, R.E. (1978), "Perceived dominance in decision making and conflict resolution among anglo, black and Chicano couples". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol 40, 749-60. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Cunningham, I. M., Green, R. T. (1974). Purchasing Roles in the US Family, 1955 and 1973. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol.38, 61-64. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- D'Andrade, R. (1966). Sex differences and Cultural Institutions. In Maccoby, E. E. *The Development of Sex Differences*. Standord, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dalrymple, D.J., Robertson, T.S., and Yoshino, M. (1971), " Consumption behavior across ethnic categories", *California Management Review*, Vol. 14, 65-70. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Daniels, A. K. (1987). Invisible Work. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing*

- Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Davis, H.L. (1970). Dimensions of Marital Roles in Consumer Decision-Making. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. 7, 168-177. Retrieved From <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Davis, H.L. (1976). Decision-Making within the Household. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 2, 241-60. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Davis, H.L. and Rigaux, B.P. (1974). Perception of Marital Roles in Decision Processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 1, 51-62. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Deaux, K. (1985). Sex and Gender. *Annual Review of Psychology*. Vol. 36, 49-81. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> on 4 Feb 2006
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting Gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review*. Vol. 94, 3, 369-389.
- Denny, D. (Ed.). (1998). Current Concepts in Transgender Identity. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Deshpande, R., Hoyer, W.D., and Dounthu, N. (1986), The intensity of Ethnic affiliation; a study of sociology of Hispanic Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, 214-20. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> on 14 Feb 2006
- DeVault, Marjorie. (1997). Conflict and Deference.. In Gentry, J, W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006

- Devor, H. (1989). *Gender Blending: Confronting the Limits of Duality*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Diamond, M. (1968). Genetic-Endocrine Interaction and Human Psychosexuality. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (1976). Human Sexual Development: Biological Foundation for Social Development. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (1979). Sexual Identity and Sex Roles. . In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different". Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (1982). Sexual Identity, Monozygotic Twins Reared in Discordant Sex Roles and a BBC Follow-Up. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (1995). Biological Aspects of Sexual Orientation and Identity. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10. 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006

- Diamond, M. (1997). Sexual Identity and Sexual Orientation in Children with Traumatized or Ambiguous Genitalia. *Journal of Sex Research*. Vol. 34(2), 199-222. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (1999). Management of Ambiguous Genitalia. *Journal of Urology*. Vol. 33 66-69. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M., & Sigmundson, H. K. (1997). Sex Reassignment at Birth: Long Term Review and Clinical Implications. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Diamond, M., Binstock, T., & Kohl, J. V. (1996). From Fertilization to Adult Sexual Behavior: Nonhormonal Influences on Sexual Behavior. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Ehrensaft, D. (1987). Parenting Together: Men and Women Sharing the Care of Their Children. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on Feb, 2 2006
- Ferree, M. M. (1991). The Gender Division of Labor in Two-Earner Marriages. *Journal of Family Issues*. Vol. 12 Issue 2, 158-180. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006



- Firat, A. F. (1994). Gender and Consumption: Transcending the Feminine. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Ganesh, G. (1997). Spousal Influence in Consumer Decisions: A Study of Cultural Assimilation". *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. Vol. 14. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Gardyn, R. (2000). Make Room for Daddy: Fathers Become a Potentially Lucrative Demographic. *American Demographics*. 34-36. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Gottman, J. M. (1979). Marital Interactions: Experiential Investigators. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Goy, R. W., Bercovitch, F. B., & McBair, M. C. (1988). Behavioral Masculinization is Independent of Genital Masculinization in Prenatally Androgenized Female Rhesus Macaques. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Green, R.T. and Cunningham, I. M. (1975), Feminine Role Perception and Family Purchasing Decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 12, 325-332. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Green, R.T. and Cunningham, I. M. (1970). Employee Status, Feminine Role Perception, and Family Purchase Decisions. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006

- Green, R.T. and Cunningham, I. M. (1975). Feminine Role Perception and Family Purchasing Decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. 12, 325-332.  
Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Greenberg, J. (1983). Equity and Equality as Clues to the Relationship between Exchange Participants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 13: 95-96  
Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> 2 Feb 2006
- Hempel, D. J. (1974). Family Buying Decisions: a Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. 11: 295-302. Retrieved from  
<http://web101.epnet.com> 2 Feb 2006
- Hertz, R. (1986). More Equal than Others: Women and Men in Dual-Career Marriages. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Hirschman, E. C. (1993). Ideology in Consumer Research 1980 and 1990: A Marxist and Feminist Critique. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 19: 537-555.  
Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Janeway, E. (1971). Man's World, Women's Place. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Kessler, S. J. (1998). *Lessons from the Intersexed*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kessler, S., & McKenna, W. (1978). *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kohlberg, L. (1966). A Cognitive Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex-Role Concepts and Attitudes. In Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from

[http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006

Komter, A. (1989). Hidden Power in Marriage. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006

Kulick, D. (1997). The Gender of Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes. *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 99. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> 4 Feb 2006

Mehta, R. and Belk, R. W. (1991), Artifacts, identity, and transition; favorite possession of Indians and Indian immigrants to the United States", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 17, 398-411. Retrieved from <http://web108.epnet.com> 4 Feb 2006

Meissner, M., E.W. Humpheys, S.M. Meis, and W.J. Scheu. 1975. "No Exit for Wives: Sexual Division of Labour and Cumulation of Household Demands. In R. Anshen. *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S, (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on Feb, 2 2006

Mischel, W. (1966). A Social-Learning View of Sex Differences in Behavior. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006

Money, J. (1975). Ablatio Penis: Normal Male Infant Sex-Reassignment as a Girl. In Diamond, M. (2000). *Sex and Gender: Same or Different. Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006

- Money, J., & Ehrhardt, A.A. (1972). Rearing of a Sex-Reassigned Normal Male Infant After Traumatic Loss of the Penis., Man and Woman/Boy and Girl. As cited in Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and Gender: Same or Different. *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol.10, 46-54. Retrieved from [http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online\\_artcls/intersex/sex\\_gender.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/online_artcls/intersex/sex_gender.html) on 4 Feb 2006
- Parsons, T. (1949). The Social Structure of the Family. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Pleck, J. H., & Rustad, M. (1980). Husbands' and Wives' Time in Family Work and Paid Work in the 1975-1976 Study of Time Use. Transition. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Qualls, W. J. (1982). Changing Sex Roles: Its Impact upon Family Decision Making. in *Advances in Consumer Research* 9, 267-270. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on Feb, 2 2006
- Qualls, W. J. (1988). Toward Understanding the Dynamics of Household Decision Conflict Behavior. In *Advances in Consumer Research* 15. Ed. Michael J. Houston. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 442-448. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on Feb 2, 2006
- Ramu, G.N. (1987), Indian Husbands: their role perceptions and performance in single and dual career families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 49, 903-16. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on Feb 2, 2006
- Risman, B. J. (1998). Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006

- Robinson, J. P. (1977). How Americans Use Time: A Social-Psychological Analysis. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Rosen, D. L., Granbois, D, H. (1983). Determinants of Role Structure in Family Financial Management. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 10: 253-258. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Saegert, J., Hoover, R.J. and Hilger, M.T. (1985), Characteristics of Mexican-American Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 12, 104-9 Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Scanzoni, J. (1977). Changing Sex Roles and Emerging Directions in Family Decision Making. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 4: 185-188. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Schwartz, P. (1998). Peer Marriage. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006
- Shukla, A. (1987), Decision-making in Single and Dual Career Families in India. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 49, 621-30. Retrieved from <http://web101.epnet.com> on 2 Feb 2006
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social Perception and Interpersonal Behavior: On the Self-fulfilling Nature of Social Stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 656-666.
- Sussman, M. B. (1993). Families in Time to Come: Taking a Position on Trends and Issues. In Gentry, J. W., Commuri, S., & Jun, S. (2003). Review of Literature on Gender in the Family. Academy of Marketing Science Review. Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/gentry01-2003.pdf> on 2 Feb 2006