This study introduces a new consumer behavior construct, “Dual Spousal Work Involvement” (DSWI), which represents a natural extension of earlier work on wife’s work status, gender role norms, and social class. The basic premise is that the joint impact of both husbands’ and wives’ occupation and work involvement more effectively captures important underlying values, gender role norms, and lifestyles than do extant approaches based on wives’ work involvement or social class. The proposed DSWI model outperforms extant wives’ work involvement models and the various DSWI segments exhibit strong and meaningful differences in attitudes and consumption of both non-durables and durables.
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Social class and (some) related wives’ work involvement (WWI) variables have long been valued by marketers as primary or supplemental bases for segmentation because they capture differences in values, norms, roles, lifestyles, and broad consumption patterns. These constructs have also been embraced because they capture the composite effects of a number of related demographic descriptors such as occupation, education, income, age, and family size. In the general domain of family research, WWI has emerged as a substantive research area in large part due to the vast social changes in the past few decades (Reilly 1982; Zeithaml 1985). The purpose of this research effort is to develop a new consumer behavior construct “Dual Spousal Work Involvement” (DSWI), and to compare its performance to that of alternative WWI models. DSWI represents the occupation and work involvement of both spouses, not just wives (WWI) or husbands (social class). This concept represents a natural step forward in the evolution of earlier work in the areas of WWI, social class, and gender-role norms. The basic premise is that the joint impact of both husbands’ and wives’ occupation and work involvement more effectively captures important underlying values, gender role norms, and lifestyles than do extant approaches.

The manuscript develops a conceptual framework depicting the various antecedents (e.g., social class at birth, gender role norms) and consequents (e.g., work and time pressure, consumption patterns) of both spouses. This approach leads to an eight-category classification scheme based on the relative occupational status and career commitment of both husbands and wives. The results show that the DSWI model outperforms extant WWI models and that this scheme isolates strong and meaningful consumption pattern differences for both non-durables and durables.

RELEVANT LITERATURE

Social Class Measurement: Social class models have generally not devoted appropriate attention to the wife’s educational and occupational status. Traditional social class scales included only husband’s status measures based on the assumption that a family’s social class didn’t change when the wife went to work. However, researchers have reported that social class misclassifications are likely when they do not incorporate the wife’s occupation status (Coleman 1983; Haug 1973). Despite such findings, no one has developed a widely accepted scale that accurately reflects the impact of women’s work status to a household’s social class.

Wives’ Work Status/Involvement: Early studies on WWI simply compared working vs. nonworking wife households with the expectation that differences in shopping behavior, food consumption, and appliance expenditures would emerge due to time pressures and greater income. Even though these expectations were not supported (Douglas 1976; Strober and Weinberg 1977), that simple division continued to receive research attention (Jackson, McDaniel, and Rao 1985; Weinberg and Winer 1983). However, these early counter-intuitive findings led other researchers to search for more complex classification schemes and more refined operational definitions. For example, by classifying working wives into high versus low occupational status, scholars have found significant differences in food and beverage consumption, shopping behavior, deal proneness, makeup usage, television viewing and ownership, and restaurant patronage (Joag, Gentry, and Hopper 1985; Schaninger and Allen 1981). Similarly, Bartos’s (1982) classification of working women into “just-a-job” and “career” segments and nonworking women into “plan-to-work” and “stay-at-home” segments has been shown to capture some differences in norms and values, food and beverage consumption, and shopping behavior (Schaninger, Nelson, and Danko 1993; Zeithaml 1985). While these approaches have been useful, they have not provided consistent insights into household consumption behavior (Commuri and Gentry 2000). Hence, a new approach that incorporates the work involvement of both spouses seems to be in order.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF DSWI

The objective of the DSWI model is to incorporate changing values and gender norms and develop a comprehensive framework to understand and classify modern families (see Figure 1 for a pictorial representation). The DSWI model is based on a cross-classification of occupational status and career commitment of both spouses. Since DSWI provides a more appropriate representation of modern households, it should be more useful than existing models in capturing and explaining attitudinal and consumption differences. Hence,

H1: The DSWI framework would outperform alternate WWI models.

H2: The various segments that emerge from the DSWI classification scheme would exhibit meaningful differences in attitudes, motivations, and consumption patterns.

BACKGROUND DEMOGRAPHIC AND ATTITUDINAL/MOTIVATIONAL INFLUENCES

Parents’ education and occupation (augmented by interactions with parents, teachers, and peers) positively influence a child’s academic aptitude, teenage educational and occupational aspirations, and, thus, subsequent educational and occupational attainment (Alexander, Eckland, and Griffin 1975; Stevens 1986). Household social class and mother’s work experience positively influence the child’s gender role modernity and education, which, in turn, leads to having a full-time job prior to marriage (for women), age at marriage, and career orientation. Year of birth and parental education and occupation are positively related to holding nontraditional social values and non-conventional gender role norms (Schaninger and Buss 1986; Yankelovich 1981).

Current Demographic and Attitudinal/Motivational Influences: There seems to be an interactive, reciprocal relationship between demographic status and attitudes and motivations. For example, the educational and occupational attainment of each spouse plays a significant role in shaping their attitudes and motivations—through their education, workplace socialization, and interactions with peer groups. Similarly, gender role norms influence a person’s (especially women’s) educational and occupational attainment, openness to nontraditional values, and subsequent work involvement and delayed ‘family’ life cycle progression (Scanzoni 1975, 1983); these effects are more pronounced among children of dual-career families (Stephan and Corder 1985). Modern gender role norms are tied to more egalitarian division of household responsibilities and rewards. Such changes in gender role norms are accompanied by shifts in self-fulfillment aspirations and social values (i.e., increase
in working wives and mothers, acceptance of women pursuing careers, and more individualistic (self-fulfillment) rather than traditional familial gratifications (Scanzoni 1983).

Current Household Demographics: Family income and presence/number of children have been recognized as covariates of WWI. Family income influences expenditures on major appliances and other durables, services, food and beverages, and restaurants. Presence and/or number of children covaries positively with major appliance ownership and expenditures (Nickols and Fox 1983; Strober and Weinberg 1977, 1980) and consumption of convenience and junk foods, but covaries negatively with meals prepared away from home and with alcohol consumption (Schaninger and
Danko 1993). Mothers of young children prepare more meals at home, but spend less time on housework and prepare less difficult food items (Nickols and Fox 1983). While upper-middle and upper social classes tend to be more gender role non-conventional, and lower classes tend to reflect the ‘old’ traditionalism, the (lower) middle class is split between those who emphasize traditional norms and those who subscribe to more modern values (Assael 1998; Coleman 1983).

**Work and Time Pressures/Role Conflict and Overload:** Role conflict exists when two or more positions (e.g., wife, mother, career woman) result in roles with conflicting or inconsistent expectations. Role overload is a type of role conflict that occurs when the expectations of the various roles exceeds available time and energy. Time pressures and psychological stresses due to role conflict and role overload are highest among dual career families and full-time career wives, particularly those with young children (Reilly 1982). Working wife families are motivated to reduce time pressures and psychological stresses through the use of timesaving and time-buying strategies, including purchase of appliances, services, convenience foods, and meals away from home; and reduced time on cooking, household work, and food shopping (Reilly 1982; Zeithaml 1985).

**Household Consumption Behavior:** Household demographics influence food and beverage consumption. Working wives were more frequent purchasers of restaurant, fast-food, and take-out meals, even after adjusting for family income and husband’s occupation (Kim 1989; Nickols and Fox 1983). Research suggests that high proportions of working wives used convenience foods, and that the type of convenience foods used varied with life cycle stage. Non-career wives, who worked long hours and had young children, were heavy users of prepared dinners. In contrast, career wives with high education and income levels, who worked long hours and had small children, were more likely to purchase meals outside the home (Madill-Marshall, Heslop, and Duxbury 1995; Schaninger, Nelson, and Danko 1993). Also, high occupational status wife households consume quality foods, distilled alcohol and imported wines more frequently (Schaninger and Allen 1981; Schaninger, Nelson, and Danko 1993; Waldrop 1989). The social class literature has suggested greater dollar values for home furniture, primary homes, and automobiles among higher social class households (Assael 1998; Schaninger 1981). However, neither the WWI classifications nor econometric studies have been able to isolate differences in expenditures for durables. Given its comprehensiveness, the proposed DSWI classification is more likely to capture differences in values of home entertainment devices, furniture, and major durable acquisitions.

**METHOD**

**Sample and Procedure:** The data was collected using systematic random sampling from the telephone directory of a top 50 Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Overall, 2171 households were reached. Of these 1160 agreed to participate and were sent the survey. This mailing returned 307 usable, 19 undeliverable, and 10 unusable surveys. Three additional mailings of 500 surveys each were conducted on the non-respondent sub-samples: first-wave resulted in 54 usable responses and 10 undeliverables; second-wave resulted in 34 usable returns and 37 undeliverables; and the third-wave resulted in 49 usable responses and 27 undeliverables. No significant differences were found between the three latter samples and the original sample for a variety of demographic characteristics. Thus, they were combined to yield a total of 444 households, representing a 20.45 percent response rate (i.e., 444/2171). The combined sample did not significantly differ from MSA or nationwide census estimates with respect to percent of owner occupied housing, age, marital status, presence of children, or male and female labor force participation.

**Questionnaire:** The first section was completed jointly by both spouses. It ascertained household demographics, household food and beverage consumption, dollar values of major durable acquisitions, home entertainment devices, and furniture, as well as dichotomous ownership of major and minor durables and use of services. Frequency of use of household food and beverage consumption was ascertained for 46 food and beverage items, using seven-point itemized scales ranging from “nearly every day” to “never”. Those items were developed based on previous studies of socio-cultural consumption influences (Schaninger and Allen 1981; Yankelovitch 1981) and were subjected to content, factor, and reliability analyses. The remaining parts of the survey consisted of an individual questionnaire for each spouse eliciting attitudinal/motivational determinants and consequences. Thirty-five six-point Likert scale items were examined for each spouse, subdivided into four categories based on content and exploratory factor analyses (maximum likelihood factor analysis with oblique rotation and delta=0): gender role norms; self-fulfillment aspirations; traditional family and moral values; and work and time pressures. Wife’s shopping behavior was measured using six-point Likert scale items.

**Classification Measures:** Part-time, full-time, nonworking, and retired status, as well as occupation, was ascertained for both spouses. Occupational status was determined by open-ended questions asking for occupation and job title. Following the method prescribed by Schaninger and Allen (1981), families with working wives in the top three occupational categories of the Hollingshead social class index (managerial-professional, administrative, and lesser professional) were classified as high wife’s occupational status. Those in the lower categories (secretarial, clerical, retail sales, technicians, blue collar, and service workers) were classified as low status. The Wife’s Occupational Status scheme was based on separating high and low occupational status working wives from nonworking wives. Both spouses, if not currently working, were asked whether they “do not plan to (return to) work”, “plan to (return to) work in the near future”, or “plan to (return to) work when my children are older”. Similarly, both (if working or planning to work) were asked to indicate whether they regarded their work as “just a job” or as “a career”. The Bartos scheme was based on separating ‘career’ from ‘just-a-job’ working wives and ‘plan-to-work’ from ‘stay-at-home’ nonworking wives. Comparative multivariate results are subsequently presented for the four most widely used WWI models (Working vs. Nonworking; Full-/Part-time/Nonworking; Wife’s Occupational Status, and the Bartos scheme), plus the new DSWI scheme, detailed below.

In contrast to extant models, the proposed DSWI scheme is based on occupation and work involvement for both spouses, not just that of the wife (as in wife’s work involvement studies), or husband (as in most social class studies). The guiding rule in developing categories was that they represent at least 2.5% of the sample and attain a sample size of at least 20. This is larger than the minimum of 12 specified by Pazer and Swanson (1972) as sufficient to yield a normal distribution of means for a uniformly distributed population. This procedure yielded eight categories for DSWI: 1) Retired Couples; 2) Non-working Wife Low Husband Occupation Status Couples; 3) Non-working Wife High Husband Occupation Status Couples; 4) Dual Low Occupation Status Blue-Collar Husband Couples; 5) Dual Low Occupation Status Low White-Collar Husband Couples; 6) High Husband Low Wife Occupation Status Couples; 7) Medium High Wife Occupation Status Couples (sub-...
divisions of high and low husbands’ occupations were not significa-
cantly different and led to a decline in overall model performance); and 8) Dual Very High Occupation Status Career Couples. If a wife was working and her husband was retired or currently unemployed, his occupational status was based on his prior occupation and job title.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The performance of DSWI model is compared to that of alternative WWI models and the substantive attitudinal and consump-
tion differences are discussed in detail. Table 1 presents summary multivariate and univariate test results for wives’ and husbands’ attitudes and values, household food and beverage consumption, wives’ shopping behavior, and values of home entertain-
tainment devices, furniture, and major durable assets. The number of significant univariate F-values is listed in Table 1 (i.e., 3 + 1
indicates 3 values significant at the .05 level and 1 additional value significant at the .10 level). In addition, values of [1–Wilks’λ]
representing the proportions of explained multivariate variance, 1
and multivariate F-values for Holling’s T2 are presented for all variable sets. For both dollar value sets (with many zero values), square root transformations (√(x + √(x + 1))) were employed to alleviate skewness and heterogeneity (Kirk 1968). The F-tests of the DSWI model are relatively conservative because they consume a large number of between group degrees of freedom compared to the other models, and because they test for bi-directional differences among all eight groups. The modest cell sizes are likely to increase type II errors at traditional levels (<.05) levels of signifi-
cance. Hence, the univariate significance counts at (.p<.10) are presented separately. The ratio of the observed to the critical value for an alpha of .001 is provided to permit comparisons of the relative strengths of multivariate significance.

While all models produced multivariate significance for wives’ and husbands’ attitudes and family food and beverages, Wife’s Occupational Status and Bartos models outperformed the more naïve working/non-working dichotomy and full-time/part-time/
nonworking trichotomy. More importantly, the proposed DSWI scheme clearly outperformed all other models on most variable sets in terms of multivariate variance explained and was equivalent to the best wives’ work involvement model in terms of univariate significance counts for wives’ and husbands’ attitudes. It demon-
strably outperformed all WWI models for univariate significance counts, multivariate significance levels, and percent of variance explained for household food and beverages as well as the dollar values of home entertainment devices, furniture, and major durable acquisitions. Under the DSWI scheme, multivariate F-values for all criteria sets were significant, many at the .001 level. The DSWI model accounted for over 80% of the multivariate variance for both husbands’ and wives’ attitudes, versus only 48% for husbands and 66% for wives for the best WWI model. It explained almost 80% of the multivariate variation in household food and beverage con-
sumption versus less than 50% for the best WWI model. Further, it dramatically outperformed extant models, explaining nearly 30% of the multivariate variance for dollar values of home entertainment devices and furniture, and major durable assets when each set is considered separately. When these variable sets were combined, the DSWI model explained around 50% of the total variance compared to 10% for the best alternate WWI model.

Significantly, all the multivariate results and most of the univariate tests hold even after controlling for family income with only slight decrements in value of [1–Wilks’λ] for MANCOVA’s (see Table 1), a result that is in direct contrast to that of econometric studies of WWI. The DSWI scheme does not perform as strongly as more parsimonious wives’ WWI models for wives’ shopping behavior, perhaps a result of consuming larger degrees of freedom and reducing between-group variance. With this exception, the DSWI scheme dramatically outperforms the leading alternative models both before and after controlling for family income. Two additional covariate analyses were conducted: First, using husband’s Hollingshead husband’s occupation, husband’s and wife’s education and age, and number of pre-school-age and total number of children home, as covariates (each taken singly) and second, using family income and all of the above variables together in a combined covariate analysis. As expected, there were declines in univariate significance counts, particularly for husbands’ attitudes, for DSWI after adjusting for the full covariate set. However, all the multivari-
ate results of DSWI held for the single as well as the combined MANCOVA. Thus, DSWI captures meaningful differences in attitudes and consumption patterns that are not attributable to (and in many instances stronger than) traditional social class indicators like husband’s occupation and education, offering a robust and promising segmentation base to marketing practitioners.

Since the MANCOVA and MANOVA results largely parallel each other, only the MANOVA results are discussed further. The main results and a priori comparisons for wives’ and husbands’ attitudes and values, food and beverages, and dollar values of home entertainment devices and furniture, and major durable acquisitions are discussed below:

Norms, Values, and Time Pressures: The wives’ and hus-
bands’ gender role norms, self-fulfillment aspirations, traditional values, and work and time pressures are grouped together for multivariate testing to avoid multi-collinearity. Consistent with theory and prior studies, Dual Very High Occupation Career Couples were the most gender role modern, followed by Medium High Wife Occupation Couples, with husbands in the latter group highest on some items. Retired and Non-working Wife Low Hus-
band Occupation Couples (especially husbands) were most tradi-
tional, followed by Dual Low Occupation Blue-Collar Husband Couples. Other dual working households placed in the middle of the pack.

Though weaker than gender role norms, the results for self-
fulfillment items followed the expected pattern with few excep-
tions. Self-fulfillment aspirations were highest for the Dual Very High Occupation Career and Medium High Wife Occupation Couples and lower for Non-working Wife Low Husband Occupation and Dual Low Occupation Couples. The largest discrepancy between wives and husbands occurred in the Retired Couples category. Specifically, among retirees, women scored much higher on items related to work quality, personal interests, and self-
 improvement than men. This finding suggests that male self-
fulfillment aspirations might be more closely tied to their careers whereas females tend to obtain self-fulfillment in other spheres as well.

As expected, for traditional family values, the pattern of results was the opposite to that of modern gender role norms. The results are strong and consistent for both sexes. Dual Very High Occupation Career Couples held the least traditional values, fol-
lowed by Medium High Wife Occupation Couples. In contrast, Retired Couples held the most traditional values followed by Dual Low Occupation Blue-collar Husband Couples.

With regard to work and time pressures, one would expect differences in the pattern of results between wives and husbands depending on their occupation status and this is borne out by the results. For wives, the group reporting the greatest work and times

---

1The multivariate significance of the value of (1–Wilks’ λ) test adjusts for the number of variables examined and their intercorrelations, and is conservative if multi-collinearity is present.
### OVERALL COMPARISON OF DUAL SPOUSAL WORK INVOLVEMENT AND MAJOR WIFE’S WORK INVOLVEMENT MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE SET</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>NONWORKING vs. WORKING WIFE (0.1)</th>
<th>NONWORKING-PART-TIME WIFE (0.2)</th>
<th>WIFE’S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS (0.3)</th>
<th>BARTOS’ MODEL (1-4)</th>
<th>DUAL SPOUSAL WORK INVOLVEMENT (1-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Attitudes &amp; Values (35)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>22.2 22.3 22.3</td>
<td>17.5 17.5 17.5</td>
<td>23.2 23.1 23.1</td>
<td>19.4 19.4 19.4</td>
<td>24.3 24.3 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Norms (9)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>7.0 6.0 7.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>7.0 7.0 7.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>7.0 7.0 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Fulfillment Aspirations (10)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>3.1 3.1 3.1</td>
<td>3.1 3.1 3.1</td>
<td>3.2 3.2 3.2</td>
<td>2.3 2.3 2.3</td>
<td>3.2 3.2 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Family Values (9)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>3.1 3.1 3.1</td>
<td>8.0 8.0 8.0</td>
<td>4.1 4.1 4.1</td>
<td>8.0 8.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Time Pressures (7)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>6.1 6.1 6.1</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-A)</td>
<td>F₁₁,F₂₂</td>
<td>454 438 570</td>
<td>539 539 539</td>
<td>563 552 552</td>
<td>560 544 544</td>
<td>508 794 794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pressures was Medium High Wife Occupation Couples, followed by Dual Very High Occupation Career Couples—perhaps due to greater stresses among the former still developing their careers, and the presence of young children. Wives in the Dual Low Occupation Low White-Collar Husband group were highest on the two items related to feeling rushed and not having enough time to spend their money, and well above average on several other items. Wives in the Dual Low Occupation Couples (both blue-collar and white-collar husbands) also reported above average work and time pressures. Thus, it appears that being in lower status blue or white-collar jobs or “being on the way up,” leads to greater work and time pressures, and this effect may be influenced by presence of younger children.

Wives in the Retired and Non-working Wife Low Husband Occupation groups felt the least work and time pressures, followed wives in the Non-working Wife High Husband Occupation group. In general, working wives reported greater time pressures than husbands, but lesser work related stresses and interference with family.

The pattern for husbands was less straightforward. Husbands in higher occupation status categories generally reported greater work-related stresses and time pressures, but there was more idiosyncratic variation and the differences were not as large as in the wives. High occupation husbands with either a non-working or low occupation status wife reported the greatest work-related stresses overall and were at or near the top on the seven items,
possibly reflecting greater pressures due to the presence of children, a working spouse earning less income than needed, growing career demands, longer hours, and conflict with family time. Husbands in Dual Very High Occupation Career group felt less work/time pressures than their High Husband Occupation counterparts with non-working or low occupational status wives. This may reflect that the former had already attained success and established their careers. Husbands in the Retired Couples category reported the least work and time pressures as expected.

**Food and Beverage Consumption:** Dual Very High Occupation Career Couples were the heaviest users of all healthy staples (except fresh vegetables) and were generally lower in usage of most convenience foods, including TV dinners, canned foods, hot dogs, and instant coffee. Consistent with prior research, they were the heaviest consumers of restaurant meals and Chinese take-out. They also placed above average on take-out pizza and fast food consumption. Like upper middle class and college-educated consumers, they tended to be very low (next only to Retired Couples) in consumption of most junk foods such as candy, potato/corn chips, presweetened cereal, and powdered drink mixes. They were among the lightest users of sugar substitutes and diet soda, demonstrating the tendency of highly educated consumers to avoid artificial additives. Reflecting the opposite pattern, Dual Low Occupation and Non-working Wife Low Husband Occupation households had the highest consumption of junk and convenience foods and the lowest consumption of healthy staples. Retired households had the highest consumption of sugar free products and lowest consumption of junk foods and meals away from home, a reflection of their dietary needs as well as lifestyles. Couples in which the husband was of low occupation status tended to be lighter users of healthy staples and heavier users of junk foods, both among dual working couples and non-working wife couples, reflecting general social class tendencies.

Due to their social class backgrounds and work related stresses, Dual Very High Occupation Career Couples were the heaviest users of all types of alcoholic beverages, including imported and domestic wines, beer and light beer, and distilled spirits. High Husband Low Wife Occupation households were next highest in alcohol consumption, except for regular beer. In general, heaviest consumption of imported and domestic wines, light beers, and distilled spirits is observed among the highest status, highest work involve-
ment couples. In contrast, lower consumption is observed among lower occupation (especially husband) and retiree households. Retired Couples in general report lower alcohol consumption than other groups (except for distilled spirits) reflecting age effects and absence of work related stresses. Medium High Wife Occupation Couples were below average on alcohol (other than beer) likely due to lower middle class tendencies. Consumption of distilled spirits was lower amongst couples with lower middle class and blue-collar occupations, perhaps due to general social class tendencies, and lower income.

The above pattern of results suggests that occupation status, work and time pressures, income, and social class interact to determine family food and beverage consumption patterns, and that simple linear relationships do not hold. For this reason, the DSWI scheme is able to identify patterns of food and beverage consumption differences that could not be isolated by alternative WWI models or by econometric models using macro-level data.

**Values of Major Durable Acquisitions:** Dual Very High Occupation Career households had the highest mean values for stereos, primary TV’s, VCR’s, primary homes, primary and 2nd autos, the second highest mean values for furniture, and very high values for second homes. These findings do not reflect simple income differences, but appear to reflect upper-middle and upper social class background, desired lifestyles, and self-fulfillment orientations. These couples were below average in mean values of 2nd and 3rd TV’s, and trucks/vans/3rd autos products often associated with affluent blue-collar lifestyles. As expected, Dual Low Occupation Blue-Collar Husband households had the highest expenditures on recreational vehicles (campers, boats, motorcycles, and ATVs). The profile of Non-working Wife High Husband Occupation households seems to reflect affluent upper middle class lifestyles among families with children at home, with full-time housewife mothers reflecting traditional family values. Such households had the highest mean values for 2nd and 3rd TVs, personal computers, furniture, and high mean values for primary homes, 2nd autos, stereos, primary TVs, and VCRs. Non-working Wife Low Husband Occu-
pation households represent less affluent, younger, recreation-oriented, blue-collar households who exhibit very high mean values on trucks/vans/3rd autos, and on recreational vehicles. These house-
holds had very low mean values for 2nd and 3rd TVs, personal computers, primary homes, primary and 2nd autos, stereos and furniture. The highest husbands’ occupational status households tended to own the most expensive primary homes and furniture, consistent with upper-middle/upper social class influences.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This research developed and demonstrated that the DSWI model isolated significant differences in husbands’ and wives’ gender role norms, self-fulfillment aspirations, traditional family values, and work and time pressures. The DSWI scheme exposed key differences in household food and beverage consumption patterns and dollar values of home entertainment devices and major durable acquisitions. It accounted for over 80% of the multivariate variance for both husbands’ and wives’ attitudes, almost 80% for household food and beverage consumption, and, most notably, nearly 50% for dollar values of home entertainment devices and furniture and of major durable acquisitions. Hence, both H1 and H2 are strongly supported. These are not merely income effects as all the results hold even after controlling for family income. The results suggest that incorporating the relative work involvement of both spouses captures rich interactive effects.

While very high status DSWI couples held more modern gender role norms, self-fulfillment aspirations, and non-traditional values, they did not experience the greatest work/time pressures—probably because they were more established and successful, had already attained career success, even though they were more likely to have young children. They were heaviest consumers of healthy staples, restaurant meals, and most forms of alcohol but avoided sugar substitutes, junk foods, and convenience foods. They put forth the least shopping effort, used fewer coupons, and acquired more expensive major durables. This pattern strongly contrasts to those of retired couples, non-working wife couples, and low occupation status dual working households. Hence, as specified by the DSWI framework, work and time pressures, income, gender role norms, and social class background interact to determine household consumption patterns. These findings and this approach should be very useful to marketers, demographers, and sociologists interested in understanding differences between traditional households and their more individualistic and career-oriented counterparts. This approach captures important Gestalt profiles that underlie the different motivations, norms, lifestyles, and consumption patterns that separate such households. Thus, DSWI, at a more macro level, focuses on the fundamental social and cultural changes in values, norms, and lifestyles which have ‘shaken’ most industrialized and many developing societies; changes that have led to a very different world than that which existed a few decades ago. A major limitation of this research is that the findings and specific operational defini-
tions are based on a single study using a modest-size data set from one metropolitan area in the United States. A second limitation is that the data are a few years old. However, given both the marketplace and socio-cultural changes, it is likely that newer data would increase the applicability of the DSWI model. In the past few years, electronic devices, shopping, and food options have expanded and changed dramatically. Most baby boomers have entered later life-cycle stages and remain affluent. Researchers should test the usefulness of DSWI by using new/multiple data sets that include measures of DSWI, attitudes, motives, and consumption patterns. Researchers could also explore whether DSWI would be applicable to rapidly developing and more traditional societies.

The principle contribution of this research is developing a new integrative approach for classifying families/households based on the work involvement of both spouses. The strong empirical support for DSWI suggests that it is a rich, multi-faceted, socio-cultural construct. It offers novel new insights and could be used as a basis for segmenting diverse product markets. For example, advertising high quality healthy foods or restaurant fare more toward career-wife households and food and beverage coupons and sales promotions toward non-working wife households. In addition, marketers could benefit from focusing on specific sub-categories that emerge from the DSWI classification scheme.
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