INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI®

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

FAMILY DECISION MAKING AND SEX ROLE ATTITUDES IN THE CONTEXT OF SELECTION OF A VACATION DESTINATION

Joanne McCarthy

A Thesis
In
The Faculty
of
Commerce and Administration

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science in Administration at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

January 1998

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to investigate family decision making and more specifically, how decisions are made and what factors might impact them. Sex role attitudes have been related to household role behaviors and they are believed to be linked to decision influences within the family.

This research addresses the family decision making process in a vacation decision context. The Brisoux-Laroche model of awareness sets is tested and the husband-wife decision influence patterns within the same decision context are examined, taking into consideration sex role attitudes of the spouses. Finally, the impact of sex role attitudes on the awareness sets is examined.

The results indicate a high level of agreement between spouses when looking at the awareness set analysis: importance ratings, determinant attributes, frequency of destinations in each set, agreement on all measures as well as on presence of attributes in common sets.

The perception of decision influence analysis indicates that spouses perceive certain sub-decisions to be under a different influence (husband or wife) depending on their sex role attitude; however, the trend is not clear.

In terms of influence sharing, the results indicate that, as sex role attitude becomes more modern, six out of seven decisions become more egalitarian according to at least one of the spouses.

Finally, looking at the relationship between awareness set profiles and sex role attitudes, it was found that set sizes and confidence levels were related to sex

role attitude. Also, modern spouses chose destinations that had a different profile than those chosen by the more traditional spouses while attributing less importance to the cost of the trip.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my research supervisor, Dr. Michel Laroche. His guidance and knowledgeable insight have made this research experience very valuable. I would also like to thank Dr. Laroche for his patience and support.

I am also extremely grateful to Ms. Isabelle Miodek, whose support has been indispensable throughout this project.

Last but certainly not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my family and to André for their unwavering support during the course of the whole MScA program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

INTRODUCTION

It is now acknowledged that the family is a critical decision-making and consumption unit. Many decisions within the family are now, more than ever, joint choice processes. Major items of consumer spending are often jointly consumed and preferences for products individually consumed are likely to be influenced by feedback from members of the family.

It is therefore important to understand family decision making and more specifically, how these decisions are made and what factors might impact them. Sex role attitudes have been related to household role behaviors and they are believed to be linked to decision influences within the family. These attitudes are changing rapidly and their relationship with family decision making should be examined.

We propose to look at the family decision making process in a vacation decision context. We will test the Brisoux-Laroche model of awareness sets and examine the husband-wife decision influence patterns within the same decision context, taking into consideration sex role attitudes of the spouses. Finally, we will investigate the impact of sex role attitudes on the awareness sets.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Family decision making and information processing

1. Family decision making

The family is a decision-making unit and decisions within this unit are often made jointly (Burns, 1992). Consumption within a family is also a joint experience and major items of consumer spending are often jointly consumed and members of the family influence choices (Davis, 1976). Most early research in this area however, is characterized by preoccupation with the individual as a decision maker. Even when analyzing group decision making, the focus is always on who makes the final decision, who had the most say in the decision, or who makes the final purchase. Davis (1976) contends that this approach is still prevalent despite the realization that the family is the relevant decision making unit.

According to Filiatrault and Ritchie (1980), three Davis studies (1970, 1971, 1976) stirred up this important area of research, identifying specific elements within numerous purchase decision processes and measuring the structure of shared influence between husband and wife for these elements.

However, as pointed out by Burns and Granbois (1979) in their summary of the state of research on family purchase decision, there is a higher number of empirical studies and few "recent" theoretical or conceptual research papers. The authors found that approximately one-half of empirical studies had some theoretical foundation. Moschis and Moore (1979) report a family communication typology; Ferber and Lee (1974) introduce the concept of the

Family Financial Officer. But generally, the theoretical basis for most of the research studies is based on subjective observation and intuitive reasoning.

At the other end of the spectrum we find empiricist studies with no theoretical framework. Munsigner, Weber and Hansen (1975) only go as far as referring to previous research and Ward and Wackman (1972) do not formulate a conceptual background.

Other pertinent observations made by Burns and Granbois (1979) relate to the fact that most studies deal with large durable goods: family automobile purchasing (Burns and Granbois, 1977), home purchasing (Hempel, 1974, 1975), furniture purchases and automobiles (Davis, 1970 and Suptrine and Samuelson, 1976). Therefore, a lot of the research relates to infrequent purchases of costly, resource-binding products (Davis 1976). Lackman and Lanasa (1993) in their overview of family decision theory came to the same conclusion stating that most studies on joint decision making have dealt with high involvement, infrequently purchased goods.

Research on frequently purchased goods or services is scarce. Most of the studies conducted with respect to involvement of family members in economic decisions were done on behalf of the print media in order to show that husbands have a significant influence on household decisions. (Male vs. Female Influence, 1948, 1950; Starch, 1958; Life, 1964, 1965; Learner Marketing research and Development, 1968; Haley, Overholser and Associates, 1975; Travel Research International, 1968). Indeed, they reveal that husbands are involved in actual

purchasing although wives clearly predominate. Although these studies have the advantage of using large samples and a large product base, they are weak. Even though they reveal that husband and wife have the same brand preference, they do not explain why or which discussions preceeded this agreement, if any. Also, the analyses contained in these commercial studies are very limited. There are no interrelationships among products in terms of who shops or influences (Davis 1976).

Another weakness of the status of research in the family decision making brought out by Burns and Granbois (1979) is that most studies attempt to measure perceived influence shared by husbands and wives on the basis of recall of the last purchase. There are few longitudinal or observational studies which implies that most research is done on spousal influence at a specific point in time or within a specific pre-purchase time interval. Longitudinal studies would also be beneficial to examine the effects of evolving family conditions (Buss & Schaninger, 1983).

The joint decision making process has been investigated through numerous avenues. Many constructs have been examined: Influence has been recognized as a key component of group decision making (March, 1955) and has received considerable attention (Davis, 1971; Davis & Rigaux, 1974; Munsinger, Weber, and Hansen, 1975; Wilkes, 1975, Filiatrault and Ritchie, 1980; Rosen and Granbois, 1983; Szybillo, Sosanie & Tenebein, 1984). Family power (Burns, 1992), participation (Hopper, Burns & Sherrell, 1989), conflict resolution (Belch,

Belch and Sciglimpaglia, 1980) and family sex roles (Qualls, 1987) have also been examined. Research has also attempted to find uniformity across families (Shepherd and Woodruff, 1988). However, none was found (Davis, 1976). Lackman and Lanasa (1993) in their overview of family decision-making point out that since roles are not consistent across or within families (Burns & Ortinau, 1979; Davis & Rigaux, 1974), it would therefore be more pertinent to understand the processes leading to the assignment of such roles.

2. Information Processing in a Family Decision Making Context

Looking more specifically at information processing within the context of family decision making, Burns and Granbois (1979) observed that Davis' studies (1970, 1971) did have an impact in emphasizing the decision-specific nature of role assumption. Sub-decisions such as when, where, what style, are commonly addressed. However, less that 25 percent of the studies deal with the variation across the stages in the decision making process: researchers have not focused much on information processing. Indeed, Davis (1976) pointed out that little has been learned about how families reach decisions since a lot of studies focus on the outcomes of the decisions rather that the process that leads to them. Belch, Belch and Sciglimpaglia (1980) reinforce this position as well as Buss and Schaninger (1983).

Some exceptions are found in the literature: Granbois (1963) as well as Davis and Rigaux (1974) followed traditional problem-solving behavior in their

research: problem recognition, determination of alternatives via search, selection from among recognized alternatives. Gredal (1966) followed somewhat the same pattern in dividing the process into a series of four gradual decisions from initial suggestion to the actual purchase: a general purchasing or budgeting decision, a series of selection decisions and a technical purchasing action. Jaffe and Senft (1966) proposed an elaborate framework that included information seeking, a pre-purchase stage, a buying stage and a post-purchase stage.

We will base our literature review on information processing on the conceptualization established by Davis and Rigaux: problem recognition, who is the first in the household to recognize the need?; information search, who provides and collects information about possible alternatives?; final decision, who makes the final choice? The authors include a large number of decisions which permits a richness of analysis. They eliminate the phase of alternative evaluation included in the classic conceptualization (Dewey, 1910). They feel this stage is unnecessary because it is closely related to the search process. They further state that several researchers have suggested that consumers evaluate information simultaneously with search (Katona and Mueller, 1954; Granbois, 1963). From a practical point of view, it is difficult and already somewhat artificial to ask respondents to break down their decisions in different stages so combining alternative evaluation with search makes the process more natural. Indeed, the consumer is not necessarily aware that s/he goes through

these phases. Also, like any other process conceptualization, this has some time dimension and finally, all phases do not always occur (Engel, Kollat and Blackwell, 1973). However, it is this type of analysis of the different steps of the process that allows us to see the similar nature of all decision problems (Brim, Lavin and Goodman, 1962).

The authors Davis and Rigaux address the specific question: do marital roles in consumer decision-making differ by phase of the process?

A questionnaire was administered to each spouse in 73 Belgian households and investigated the major influence (husband, joint or wife) in the three different phases mentioned above in the context of 25 household purchasing decisions.

The decisions can fall into one of four influence patterns: husband dominant, wife dominant, syncratic or autonomic. Overall, the proportion of decisions falling into the four patterns is quite similar for the first two stages of problem recognition and search and evaluation. However, there is a significant change in the stage of final decision. There is an increase in syncratic decision making for the final decision as opposed to the first two stages. The opposite is true for autonomic decision making for the final decision: there are less final decisions that are autonomic than autonomic problem recognition and search.

Looking at individual decisions, 64 percent of them remain in the same pattern of influence throughout the whole decisions process: insurance is husband dominant; kitchenware, household cleaning products, wife's and children's clothes, food and non-alcoholic beverages are wife dominant; housing, living

room furniture, children's toys, school, entertainment and family vacation are syncratic; garden tools, alcoholic beverages and nonprescription drugs are autonomic. There are nine decisions that change pattern over the three phases. Five of these go from autonomic in the first two phases to syncratic in the final decision: housing upkeep, household appliances, husband's clothing and the objectives and forms of saving. The purchase of a car is the most varied moving from autonomic in the first phase to husband dominant in the second phase and finally it becomes syncratic in the final decision phase.

In order to capture the full effect of relative influence and joint decision making, the authors consider them separately. Looking at the averages, relative influence does not change much among the three phases. There is a "regression toward the mean" in making the final decision. The same analysis performed for joint decision making reveals that the phase of information search is characterized by considerably more role specialization than the other two phases and this is true for a large proportion of the products studied. There are several possible explanations for this result. The degree of specialization may reflect characteristics of the task: setting in motion a consumer decision and the final decision often require legitimization by the other spouse. However, the task of information search may require availability, competence and/or interest of one spouse or the other. Another explanation might be that the phase of problem recognition and final decisions do not necessitate concrete activities whereas information search does. Finally, it might be that social desirability explains

some the movement toward the syncratic region when respondents identified the spouse who made the final decision.

The authors conclude that marital roles were found to vary throughout the three phases of the decision process. The differences were mostly related to role specialization as average relative influence was relatively stable during the phases.

A study by Wilkes (1975) following up on Davis' study of alternative measures of relative spousal influence confirms that marketers have to examine pre-purchase activities and examine the entire decision process since relative influence can vary from one phase to the next.

2.1 Problem recognition

Problem recognition is the first phase of the consumer decision process. The consumer perceives a need and wants to solve the "problem". Conceptually, this means that the consumer perceives a gap between the current state and the desired state. The "problem" is simply the recognition of a goal the consumer wants to achieve. The discrepancy or gap can occur because of two reasons: a change in the current state or a change in the desired state. A change in the current state can be the result of one of several causes: depletion or dissatisfaction with current stock; decrease or increase in finances; marketing inputs. Changes in desired state can occur as follows: new need or want

circumstances; new products available; purchases of other products or marketing inputs. In the context of family decision making, there have been a few studies that touched on this issue of problem recognition and attempted to determine who (husband, wife or both) had the predominant role in identifying a problem and deciding to address it (Wilkie, 1994).

A commercial study was conducted for *Sports Illustrated* (Travel Research International, 1968) examining household decisions for pleasure trips involving airlines. The results showed that husbands had the predominant role in mentioning the initial idea of taking a trip, suggesting the destination and selecting an airline.

Davis (1970) in his study of marital roles and relative influence reports that 68 percent of husband dominate the decision of when to buy an automobile whereas only 18 percent of husbands dominate the decision of when to buy furniture. According to Davis, the relative influence of the spouses varies by product category.

Davis and Rigaux (1974) looked at different products and, as we have seen above, established the change in marital roles to be a function of relative influence of both spouses as well as the extent of role specialization. The stage of problem recognition is either wife dominant, husband dominant, syncratic or

autonomic: the different products/services fall into different categories. For instance, as mentioned earlier, vacation planning is totally syncratic in the problem recognition stage with a high percentage of role specialization.

Munsinger, Weber and Hansen (1975) in their study on the relative influence of spouses in home purchasing decisions found that 65 percent of husbands and wives reported the sub-decision to seek residence as a syncratic one as opposed to other sub-decisions that were either husband dominant, wife dominant or syncratic.

Wilkes (1975) interviewed 60 black husbands and wives in an effort to extend the application of multitrait-multimethod procedures to the stages or phases of the decision process. He wanted to determine the commonality of perceived influence across spouses. Wilkes used an information processing pattern that included four phases: problem recognition, search for information, final decision and purchase. Purchasing decision of major household goods was selected for the study. Both spouses recorded considerable participation over the phases of the decision process. However, the pattern of husband-wife influence varied substantially across the different phases of the decision process. Therefore, according to this study, the problem recognition phase is distinct in terms of influence from the other information processing phases.

2.2 Search for information

In this second phase of information processing, the consumer moves toward achievement of the goal identified in the problem recognition phase. In order to do so, the consumer needs to identify what the options are, process information about them and decide which alternative(s) to choose. The information search is a deliberate attempt to gain information about a product, store or purchase, i.e. one of the alternatives that can be used to attain the goal, in order to reduce uncertainty (Wilkie, 1994).

Davis (1976) supports the position that three general findings emerge from the literature: variability by product category, within product category and among families. Looking specifically at variability within product category, Davis states that husband-wife involvement varies by specific decisions and decision stages. The information search stage is a function of the product or service under consideration. According to the Jaffe report (n.d.), wives were as involved as their husbands in gathering relevant information in automobile purchases. However, it as found that in family planning area, wives are more involved than husbands in information seeking in contrast to initiating search or making the final adoption decision (Lam, 1968; Palmore, 1967). Davis and Rigaux (1974) found that the proportion of couples in the "joint" category was less in the information search phase than for the two other phases. Wilkes (1975) came to the same conclusions.

Jenkins (1978) conducted focus group interviews with husband-wife teams to investigate family vacation decision-making. The author attempted to determine sub-decisions of the vacation decision process, each family member's influence in these sub-decisions and the attributes they felt important in this respect. One of the sub-decisions was the collection of information. Jenkins found that the dominance of either spouse depended on the sub-decision. Both spouses perceived the husband to be dominant in decisions pertaining to among others, information collection. Some sub-decision were perceived as joint and no sub-decisions were perceived as wife-dominant. The respondents were also asked to rank various sources of information in order of importance. The first source is members of the immediate family or close relatives and these other alternatives followed in order: friends, American Automobile Association, media, travel agent, business associate, gasoline company, commercial airline, Chamber of Commerce and American Express. One to three months was the most popular answer with respect to the length of the planning period for a major vacation trip (51% husbands and 47% wives).

Nichols and Snepenger (1988) conducted a study examining decision making by families who vacation in Alaska. They used three decision-making modes (husband dominant, wife dominant and joint) and investigated several variables including information search. They first found that a majority of the families

surveyed employed a joint decision making mode (66%). In terms of information search, joint decision makers used slightly more sources than the others. The authors also found different information sources used differently by joint and wife- and husband-dominant decision makers: joint decision makers seeked information with friends and relatives more so than wife- or husband-dominant families; more husband-dominant and joint decision making families used information gathered on a prior visit to Alaska than wife-dominant families.

Dale Fodness conducted a study in 1992 with respect to the impact of life cycle on family travel decision making with an information processing approach. This study was based on secondary data and focused on two stages of the vacation decision-making process for which data was available: information search and final decision. In order to identify the person in the family who is the information seeker, respondents who had received printed information about Florida were asked who had requested such information. As the author points out, there are limitations to this approach: sending out for written information is not the only way travelers collect material relevant to their planned trip.

The author found that the wife was the primary information seeker, contrary to the results observed in the Jenkins study (1978). This result was particularly likely at the stage of the family life cycle where there are children. Fodness points out that his contradiction in results may be an indication that roles related to family decision making change over time, both in general and within the

specific stages of the family life cycle. We should therefore monitor these patterns periodically and identify such changes.

2.2.1 Selection of alternatives

Consumers are faced with a large number of alternatives or brands from which to choose. They must devise means to simplify their purchasing decisions since consumers have a limited capacity to process information and discriminate among stimuli (Miller, 1956). The Miller-Wallace argument is indeed to the effect that there are too many brands in certain product classes and brands of which the consumer is aware may not be processed because of the consumers' limited cognitive capacity. They screen the brands to form a relevant set called the consideration set (Alba and Chattopadhyay, 1985). They eliminate brands which fail to meet a minimum level of one or more criteria or attributes (Kindra, Laroche, Muller, 1989). Purchase or consumption decisions are then made from the brands in this set (see hypotheses in Belonax and Mittelstaedt, 1978; Howard and Sheth, 1969; Parkinson and Reilly, 1979). The theoretical construct of a consideration set is those brands that the consumer considers seriously. The size of the consideration set tends to be small relative to the total number of brands that could be evaluated. It can contain more than one brand but not necessarily all brands (Hauser and Wernerfelt, 1990).

Decision roles and choice strategies

Davis (1970) conducted a study investigating the dimensions of husband-wife roles in consumer purchase decisions and the extent to which they agreed in the perception of their roles. He solicited responses from both husbands and wives with respect to various interrelated decisions (when, how much, make, model, color, store) in the purchase of two durable products (automobile and furniture). The results with respect to relative influence of each decision point towards multidimensional role structure contrasting with the uni- or bi-dimensional authority structures proned in the existing sociological literature. With respect to furniture buying decisions for instance, marked differences in the wife's influence can be seen by comparing decisions about how much to spend and when to buy with those concerning style, color and fabric. The same trend is evident in the automobile purchase decisions. There are also differences in roles in a particular decision (i.e. where to buy) depending on the product category. The decision of where to buy the automobile is husband-dominant while the decision of where to buy the furniture is wife-dominant. The study revealed a considerable amount of variability in roles between families. Consider now the pattern of husband-wife influence across several decisions. There is little evidence to develop family types based upon patterns of relative influence. There is too much variability in the number of unique patterns. The analysis of the dimensions of decision roles reveals two bases for role differentiation: one basis is the product itself meaning that decisions roles in the purchase of one

product, i.e. automobile, are not related to decision roles in the purchase of furniture. The other basis is the nature of the decision: roles in product-selection (model, make, color) differ from roles in allocation (how much). This evidence supports the earlier findings of Gredal (1966). Davis (1976) points out the similarity between the "product selection" decision and Gredal's selection decisions. The "allocation" decisions are similar to her general purchasing or budgetary decision.

Munsinger, Weber and Hansen (1975) interviewed husbands and wives to research their roles in the purchase of a home. Of particular interest are the relationships between perceived relative influence in the various decision elements.

The results with respect to perceived dominance of husbands and wives indicate considerable variance in the roles played by husbands and wives in the different elements of the housing decision. More specifically, the authors looked at the following sub-decisions: seek residence; rent or buy; floor plan; style; price; location; size. The results indicated considerable variance in the roles played by both spouses in the different elements of the housing decision. In general, they agree in their perceptions of these varying roles (except for "Floor Plan").

The results of this study and the one by Davis (1970) are similar with respect to the range of extent of agreement between husbands and wives. Both studies

used the same measurements and interviewed both spouses, but used different sampling methods.

C. Whan Park (1982) conducted a study to examine the joint decision-making process using a method called the "decision plan net" in the context of a husband and wife's joint decision in home purchasing. In contrast to the "synoptic ideal" which assumes that the husband-wife dyad is rational, analytical and maximizes his/her own utility while attempting to minimize conflict. This process is achieved more easily than it appears through use of a set of conflict-avoiding heuristics.

The method used to examine each spouse's decision strategy is the "decision plan net": it examines the structural similarity of a dyad's choice decision plan and the convergence of the planned strategies over time. The decision plan at an attribute level, as is used in this study, is identified in a decision plan net, developed as a tool to aid the decision maker in either clarifying or establishing his/her strategy toward a future decision task. The decision maker constructs a net by first naming a list a sequential attributes he would consider in evaluating a home (as operationalized in this study). Secondly, what would the decision maker do if the attribute listed was not satisfactory (i.e. reject or accept). Finally, under which conditions would the decision maker accept the attribute even if it is not satisfactory.

The results suggest that each spouse follows his or her own choice strategy, without any significant convergence in later choice. There are not systematic pattern of influence by husbands over their wives or vice versa over the several decision stages. Also, dyad members' low similarity in their choice criteria suggests that they reached the decision mostly for different reasons.

Another interesting finding in terms of satisfaction was that the wives' satisfaction with the attributes on which she had a more influential role than her husband was significantly higher than the husbands' satisfaction But the opposite was not true. Also a wife's mean satisfaction on the dimensions on which she was more influential was significantly higher than the husband's satisfaction with the same dimension. But the same cannot be said about husbands. However, this might be due to the specific dimensions the husbands influence (i.e. price - if couple had to pay a higher price than that intended, husband will not feel satisfaction about that dimension).

The results also revealed a significantly higher level of agreement between spouses for the objective dimension type than for the subjective dimension type. The authors found that for dimensions with role differentiation, dyad members are aware of their mutual relative influence in making a choice decision and maintain a complementary relationship that facilitates their joint decision. It is only in such role-differentiated cases that both spouses are able to recognize their mutual relative influence.

Finally, with respect to the number of dimensions that a spouse defined and that the other spouse did not mention in his/her decision plan net, the results indicate that a husband and wife are relatively poor in understanding each other's decision strategies and identifying their mutual relative influence.

Kim and Khoury (1987) conducted a study that provided evidence that the spousal decision making process is contingent upon the task complexity, just as the individual decision making process. Contingent information processing deals with people's need to simplify the evaluation task that results from their limited information capacity. Through protocol analysis, the respondents had to choose between different alternatives and attributes. In terms of choice strategy, the authors found that choice strategy is contingent upon task complexity. Also, with respect to the proportion of available information, the quantitative results indicated that the number of alternatives and the number of attributes had a significant effect on the proportion of available information searched by the couples. Looking now at the proportion of available attributes, it was found that couples exposed to a high number of attributes showed a differential weighing of the attributes and excluded some attributes completely in the evaluation. Lastly, the results showed that as either the number of alternatives or attributes increased, the time spent by unit of available information showed a strong decrease. This further supports the claim that a couple will use a simplifying strategy as the task gets more complex.

Evoked sets

There is little research done on evoked set in a family setting. Woodside and Sherrel (1977) pointed out that a traveler does not necessarily have an evoked set with positive evaluations and an inept set with negative evaluations of potential destinations. One spouse may want to visit one destination and the other spouse does not in which case the attitudes would be different from those expected. The authors noted also that the available set is easier to study than the awareness set because it includes destinations that the traveler can visit during a certain period of time versus the infinite. Unfortunately, it is not always adequate methodologically because it may leave out certain destinations that the respondent cannot remember. The authors found that the average evoked set size is 3.38 +/- 1.75 which is very different from Millers 7 +/- 2. The results are consistent with Laroche (1985) and Church, Laroche and Rosenblatt (1985).

Curry and Menasco (1979) reported some theoretical findings of husband-wife decision process where each spouse is assumed to use the weighted linear multi-attribute model of preference (WLM) to evaluate the alternatives from a reduced choice set where no one alternative dominates the other. The authors intend to show that a compensatory model like WLM is most natural.

In the pre-choice stage, the focus is one the degree of agreement between the husband and wife with respect to all of the brands, prior to the elimination of dominated brands. The couple's level of agreement is a function of three variables: the husband's scalar weight for each attribute, the wife's scalar weight for each attribute and the inter-attribute correlation that characterizes the task environment faced by the couple. This variable is out of the couple's control but the authors found it to have significant effect on their level of agreement.

The authors found that maximum agreement is achieved when the husband and wife agree on the weights assigned to each attribute. Also, if the husband and wife agree on the rank order of attribute importance, then their respective overall utilities are perfectly correlated. However, if they disagree on rank importance, they find themselves in total disagreement about overall utilities.

The previous index is useful to measure agreement prior to choice. It does not represent the effect on either or both parties of a particular product choice. Spouses might use suboptimal weights because they have to either compromise or capitulate to the other's point of view. In this respect, the authors examined choice set and its properties and some mechanism whereby the separate information processing rules of the husband and wife are combined.

The spouses will not focus on all alternatives of the choice set but only on those that are not strictly dominated. Members of the reduced set of non-dominated alternatives form a Pareto optimal set, and their line graph forms a Pareto boundary. The choice among the brands along the boundary represents

tradeoffs between the attributes. Any brand not on the frontier can be eliminated. The index of agreement can change sharply as a function of whether the parties agree on the rank importance of the attributes. The number of brands on the frontier will contribute to create an unstable environment for the couple. The authors found that the spouses might have been in nearly perfect agreement in the initial phase despite differing weights, because of the benign task environment. However, at this later stage, the task environment has shifted and accentuated their differences and they will be in disagreement over their respective utilities of the Pareto optimal brands. Therefore, the authors concluded that disagreement about attribute weights can cause severe disagreement about product evaluations.

Kim, Laroche and Guttenberg (1988) researched the contents of husbands' and wives' evoked sets of vacation destinations. They found that the mean evoked set was very large for both spouses (6.85 and 6.53 for male and female respectively). The authors speculated that this might be due to a low level of familiarity since the respondents were evaluating various vacation destinations - not the familiar array of durable goods. Upon examination of the evoked sets however, the authors found that although their size was comparable, their content was quite different: the favored destinations were different for husbands and wives with only about half the destinations being common to both. The final choice is likely to be a compromise between the needs of both spouses.

Husbands and wives were in agreement with respect to most attribute evaluation. In terms of attribute importance, spouses had similar scores for five of the twelve attributes. In terms of ranking, they had large differences on two attributes. Finally, although the vacation decision is a joint one, the husband tended to consult more information sources to determine the destination than the wife.

Finally, Michie and Sullivan (1990) came up with an interesting framework to investigate the role of the international travel agent and their awareness of the travel behavior of their clients. They needed to understand a family's travel decision process. They therefore established a research framework which is based on the cognitive/affective/conative hierarchy of effects model for travel decisions. (The authors refer us to Krech, Crutchfield and Bellachey, 1962 and Second and Backman, 1964 for theoretical background; to Lavidge and Steiner, 1961, Palda 1966 and Lazer and Culley 1983 for marketing applications).
The authors qualify travel decisions as high involvement decisions that are activated by need recognition on the part of one or more family members. This need recognition will motivate them to start some search process.

Cognition. The family first conducts cognitive analysis to gather information on the travel decision. The consistency between the destination's perceived attribute set and the family's desired destination attribute set determine the

family's level of awareness for a particular destination. The more consistency there is between those two sets, the greater the chances that this particular destination will join the family's evoked set of potential travel destination. Cognition corresponds to awareness of a travel destination and is necessary for such a destination to be placed in the client's evoked set (Woodside and Lysonski, 1989).

Affect. Evaluation occurs at the affective level. The family selects a destination from the evoked set of potential destinations by comparing the benefits (attributes) of each destination in the set (Woodside and Lysonski, 1989). Each potential destination has specific characteristics. The destination can differ in two key ways: (1) destination attributes do not overlap and (2) some attributes are common to a number of destinations but differences are thought to exist among destinations. The one destination whose attributes are closest to the family's ideal destination is most likely to be selected.

Conation. This component is the action-tendency component. It differs from the previous two components in that it is overt. It this particular setting (family travel), it represents visiting the travel agent, purchasing tickets and the actual travel.

The authors go on to say that high involvement goods are complex and consumers seek simplification whenever possible (Stanton 1983). This is why they seek the services of a travel agent in the travel decision process.

2.3 Final decision

Sharp and Mott (1956) conducted a study to determine who in the family makes economic decisions. They interviewed wives with respect to several family decision areas. The authors found considerable variation among the various economic choices and in the relative influence of both spouses. Husbands select which car to buy but they do not make the final decision with respect to food. Purchase of a new home and selection of a vacation destination is largely consensual. The results indicated also that income differences between households were often to patterns of decision making.

Eighteen years later, Cunningham and Green (1974) followed up on the Sharp and Mott (1956) study in order to determine if purchasing roles had changed in the US family in the preceding decades. Even though there were some methodological differences, the data collected by the authors was comparable to that of Sharp and Mott. They found that some of the decisions had merged and some others had become more specialized. For instance, decisions about how much to spend on groceries were even more concentrated with the wife; life insurance decisions were even more concentrated with the husband; decisions about vacation and housing were found to be joint responsibilities by Sharp and Mott and there was a significant increase in the same direction in the results of the Cunningham and Green study; decisions about automobile purchases however were more syncratic (from 25% in 1955 to 52% in 1973). The authors

conclude by suggesting that it is impossible to generalize the effects of environmental change on purchasing decision roles since many trends may be at work. Increased specialization in purchasing roles might be the result of increasing complexities of modern life. Conversely, the tendency towards joint decision making may reflect increased egalitarianism. They suggest that product-specific information be required.

Based on interviews and re-interviews with husbands and wives over a period of two and a half years, Wolgast (1958) also investigated who makes the purchasing decision in the household. She found that most of the time, economic decisions are taken jointly. Together with this, the author observed an understood division of responsibility that grows with age and length of marriage.

Kenkel (1961) investigated the relationship between the behavior of spouses in a decision making session and the decision outcome. The decision was operationalized as the spending of a hypothetical gift of money and the spouses had varying opportunity to control the way in which this money was to be spent. The author found that the spouses had ideas and suggestions that did not reflect strongly on their choice of gift. Therefore, Kenkel concluded that the subtleties of spousal interaction in decision making required more attention.

As discussed earlier, Davis and Rigaux (1974) found that, looking simply at influence patterns, there was a significant change between the two first stages of

problem recognition and information search and the last stage - final decision: the final decisions are more syncratic. There is also a movement towards less specialization. Relative influence does not change very much between the three stages.

Jenkins (1978) in his previously mentioned study on family vacation decision-making, examined various sub-decisions and concluded that the dominance of either spouse in vacation decision making depends entirely on the particular decision being taken. Wives and husbands perceive husbands to be dominant in decisions concerning information collection, length of vacation, actual date of vacation, and amount of money to be spent. Neither husbands nor wives perceive the wife as being the dominant influence in any vacation decision. But the spouses perceive themselves as having equal influence in decisions such as whether to take the children, mode of transportation, selection of lodging and destination points. The author also points out the considerable amount of variability in roles for individual decisions.

Qualls (1984) examined spousal sex roles and final joint home purchase decision. The housing profiles were dominated by traditionally male-dominated features and the other half were dominated by female-dominated features. The author found no discernible difference when looking at the distribution of the sex role orientation and the housing choice. Qualls concludes that the final outcome

of a decision process is the result of variables that are related and interact throughout the process.

Fodness (1992) in his study on travel decision making investigated which family member made the final decision with respect to travel destination. The author used secondary data where respondents traveling to Florida were asked who in their family had made the decision to visit that State. This approach presented limitations in that only one adult in the family was asked the question and therefore a "joint" response could indicate a variety of combination from a 90/10 to a 50/50 split which might result in an artificially high percentage of joint decision responses. Fodness admits that this method is not as sophisticated as that of Filiatrault and Ritchie that uses a measure of influence which is clearly more nuanced.

The results indicate that the family vacation decision is definitely a joint process which confirms earlier research.

2.4 Conflict resolution

Davis (1976) remarked that respective roles in the family structure are probably good predictors of who the decision taker will be in traditional, stable societies. However, in Western societies, shared interest, give and take and

companionship are common and make it more difficult to predict decision outcomes.

Decision making can be consensual (unanimity) or accommodative (bargaining, coercion and other). Based on organization theory, Thompson and Tuden (1959) suggest there are two ideal representations of a group making a purchase decision. The first is consensual, implying that there is unanimity about what value is relevant in the decision. The group will engage in problem solving and will search for alternatives until one is found that satisfies the minimum level of expectations of all members. The second is accommodative which implies that there are irreconcilable priorities. Bargaining, coercion and other means may be used to reach an acceptable solution. Research evidence is limited but some authors agree that groups and particularly families often bargain, compromise and coerce rather than problem-solve in arriving at decisions. Davis' analysis suggests these two representations of group decision making: consensus and accommodation.

There are other models of conflict resolution: Granbois' model (1971) suggests family conflict may be an important determinant of the substantial proportion of major purchase plans that are postponed or dropped. It proposes concession, sequential compromise, halfway compromise, creative compromise and arbitrary criteria as possible modes of conflict resolution. Sheth (1974) uses March and

Simon's conceptual framework of inter-person conflict to examine potential conflict during family decision making. Sheth's model suggests that exogenous influences affects family members differently and that information from word-of-mouth and/or mass media are not equally available to those members. Sheth proposes problem solving, persuasion, bargaining and politicking as conflict resolution modes. Both Granbois and Sheth maintain that some form of consensus must be reached to implement joint decision making. Burns and Granbois (1977) propose another, more comprehensive model that includes the variable of involvement, empathy and recognized authority. These variables act as potential modifiers of the direct relationship proposed by Granbois and Sheth. Indeed, the findings indicate that when a decision will fall within one spouse's sphere of authority, the spouses agree on who should take the decision and conflict resolution will not be observed. If they fail to agree on this then the results show that spouses are at different levels of involvement and empathy. Therefore, these variables should be included in a conflict resolution model.

Sheth and Cosmas (1975) empirically verified Sheth's decision strategies for automobile, vacation and furniture decisions. They found that persuasion was the dominant tactic used by spouses. This was followed by problem solving. Bargaining and politicking were rarely mentioned as conflict resolution modes, maybe, the authors speculate, because of the negative connotation associated to them.

Belch, Belch and Sciglimpaglia (1980) investigated conflict in family decision making by presenting respondents with seven modes of conflict resolution for six different products and their potential areas of conflict (when, where, how much, style, etc.). The seven modes were based on Sheth's (1974) and Davis' (1976) models: problem solving, bargaining and persuasion strategies. They found that generally, little differences exist in respect to the amount of perceived conflict both across product categories and within decision areas. The strategy most often utilized was problem solving. Bargaining and persuasion were less often considered. These results contradict those of Sheth and Cosmas (1975).

Scanzoni (1977) discusses the potential conflicts that emerge from changing sex roles. The long-standing consensus' are less spontaneous and less common. Bargaining becomes necessary to organize the couple's rights and duties. For instance, gender modern women will bargain their husband into increasing their participation in childcare and household duties. In the area of consumption, there are now two incomes to allocate. Leisure time activities also have to be redistributed to account for the wives' interaction with her work peers.

The author concludes that as women shift their interests to include extra-familial goals, they are likely to alter their decision making processes. They are likely to replace their traditional passivity with more assertive and individualistic negotiation.

Spiro (1983) examines the strategies used by individual spouses in making accommodative joint decisions for major durable purchases. It identifies the combinations of influence strategies used by individuals and evaluates the impact of certain socioeconomic and situational characteristics on the use of such strategies. It also examines whether or not certain husband/wife influence patterns are more prevalent than others, whether or not spouses' perceptions of each other's influence attempts agree and finally whether or not individuals, using certain combinations of strategies, evaluate their influence attempts as successful.

This study focuses on six influence strategies: expert (enumeration of specific information to show knowledge of product); legitimate (draws upon role expectations); bargaining (get favor in return for consent); reward/referent (conforming to expected ideal role of husband/wife in order to influence spouse); emotional (display of emotions - often nonverbal); impression management (attribute the influence attempt to external pressures). These different strategies can be combined to form a strategy mix.

A cluster analysis uncovered a six-group taxonomy of influence strategy mixes: non-influencers (22%); light influencers (35.9% the largest); subtle influencers (18.8%) reward/referent); emotional influencers (6.6%); combination influencers

(9.9%) (moderate use of all strategies); heavy influencers (6.6%) (use all strategies much more than other groups).

The researchers found that in general, people who are more traditional in their life styles and attitudes are more likely to use persuasive influence. A notable exception is the young, married individual with pre-school children. Those who are further along in the life cycle also tend to use less of the various types of influence. The study identifies two major dimensions that affect influence choice: traditional life style and life cycle. These findings empirically support Sheth's (1974) life style and life cycle components in his theory of family buying decisions.

Also, the researchers found that: in some cases, neither spouse makes much use of the influence strategies; husbands' and wives' perceptions of each other's influence attempts do not agree; no strategy mix was perceived more successful than any other.

Qualls (1984) examined sex roles and husband-wife concession and negotiative modes (based on Sheth's conceptualization). He hypothesized that sex role modern couples would employ negotiation to a greater extent and that sex role traditional couples would employ concession to a greater extent.

These hypotheses were confirmed and the author concludes that the sex role traditional spouses have more defined roles and therefore the use of concession is acceptable.

Corfman and Lehmann (1987) conducted a research in order to present a conceptual framework for conflict resolutions and relative influence in cooperative groups; specify models that examine some of the basic implications of the framework; perform an exploratory test of these models on existing cooperative groups (families) making realistic consumption decisions as an initial indication of the framework's ability to represent group decisions.

This article incorporates the effects of past decisions on subsequent decisions into both the conceptual framework and the tested models.

The focus of the conceptual framework is on cooperative groups in conflict situations resolved by use of power. The framework suggests that the outcome of a group decision is a weighted function of the group member's individual preferences. The weights are determined by the relative influence of the members - each individual's influence over the other.

In his influence attempt, member A is seeking the greatest expected return. He will therefore perform a cost versus benefit analysis of the three following factors: (1) the potential effectiveness of attempted use of various power sources he feels are at his disposal; (2) the costs associated with their use and (3) the value of successfully influencing B.

In addition to the resources member A is attempting to use, he may also have some passive resources that, in some situations, need only be possessed to have an effect (attractiveness, status and physical strength).

The final component of the framework is the effectiveness of the influence attempt and any passive resources. B's response to A's actively or passively used resources and their effectiveness will be determined by the expected value B estimates for compliance.

To summarize, the constructs that determine relative influence can be divided into two categories: power-related resources and power use-related goals. The first corresponds to passive influence and the part of A's influence attempt in which he estimates power use effectiveness (expertise, referent status, and bargaining skill). The second corresponds to the costs and benefits of exercising power and are either personal goals or task goals.

The authors conclude from the results of estimating these models that relative preference intensity and decision history dominate the conflict resolution process. Decision history ensures equity and is most important when preferences are equally intense. Expertise, sociability, desire to support the relationship and desire to win and control also contributed to the balance of influence in couples. The lack of significance of many other traits often cited as important to influence and the resolution of conflict emphasizes the domination of the process by the couples' highly cooperative concern for each other's preferences and for fairness.

This study has limitations. It examined only two-person groups and moderately priced durables and services. Also, even though this research moves in the direction of greater realism by testing with real couples and measuring (rather than manipulating) preferences and traits, the decision were not naturally occurring. Also, contrary to real life, the couples were always highly motivated to make decisions.

Qualls (1987) again at looked household sex orientation as the underlying force driving decision behavior within the household within a theoretical network. Household decision influence, the degree of preference agreement and the manner in which conflict is resolved are posited as essential variables mediating the impact of sex role orientation on household decision outcome.

The results support a multivariate model of household decision behavior based upon a paradigm oriented around family behaviors and sex roles. The relative importance of household sex role orientation in affecting family member influence and mode of conflict resolution provides partial support for the proposed framework. However, sex role orientation is not significantly related to household preference agreement; there is even a negative relationship with decision outcomes. One possible explanation of these results is that sex role orientation plays a major role in determining the household's decision responsibility and role structure, but has little direct impact upon the outcomes of the family decision making process. Once decision role responsibility has been

established, family decision making involves some system of exchanges between household members that ultimately result in a decision. A second explanation might be that the actual decision outcome or preference alternative chosen is automatically determined by the family member who has the most influence. Such an explanation would be consistent with previous research findings on "who decides" in family decision making. A third explanation may be that sex role orientation is a constant that affects other constants in household decision behavior. Household dimensions such as agreement on preferences and decision outcomes might be typically multi-alternative and thus change throughout the family decision making process. Most of the evidence suggests that sex role orientation plays a major role in the family decision making process, but there are some unanswered questions.

Curry and Menasco (1989) also investigated conflict resolution in an experiment designed to address certain hypotheses about husband-wife choice behavior in the context of the maximization of dyadic utility. They assessed deviations to an "ideal" dyadic utility function that combines individual utilities. One form (additive) suggests that spouses reach a compromise by averaging their respective attribute weight vectors, then maximizing this resulting function. The "ideal" form suggest that spouses find the alternative that is midway along their negotiation set; they maximize, then average. This form returns and equal proportion of utility to each spouse. The deviations to this ideal form might be

due to both internal and external forces hypothesized to affect joint decision making.

The internal forces are task specialization-role dominance, conflict and negotiation. Task specialization is redefined in this experiment as a cognitive construct captured by the attribute weights each spouse employs in his or her multi-attribute utility function. The two most extreme forms of conflict are termed simple and inverted; simple conflict occurs when spouses agree on the order of weights each places on attributes but disagree on the values of those weights. Inverted conflict occurs when the spouses disagree about both the relative importance of attributes and the value they assign to their respective weights.

Negotiation also has two extremes: capitulation and compromise. Compromise is a symmetric outcome that favors neither party; capitulation is asymmetric, favoring one spouse or the other.

The external forces are identified as persuasive messages. By supporting one spouse's position more than the other, the messages may exacerbate role dominance and mitigate the forces of compromise.

The results indicate that there is a tendency for balance and that it is difficult to move a couple away from perfect compromise (similar results to Corfman and Lehmann, 1987: effect of decision history is to equalize gains over time). Also, the gender of the dominant spouse does not influence the equity of outcomes. The balanced outcomes found in the present experiment are significant because neither spouse had explicit information about the other's utility function.

The forces that prompt equitable choices are grounded in principle, conflict avoidance and empathy.

The authors found that external messages interact with positions of cognitive dominance to influence choices.

Kirchler (1990) conducted a pilot study to explore whether the type of conflict determines the strategies the spouses use in purchase situations. More specifically, do wives use weak strategies more than husbands, happy spouses avoid heated disputes by using instrumental tactics and spouses in egalitarian relationships pursue their goals by using other strategies than spouses in patriarchal relationships. The author found that indeed sex and characteristic of the spousal relationship have some effect on whether certain strategies are likely to be employed to resolve conflicts. The most common tactics are reason and bargaining strategies. Also, spouses avoided numerous conflicts by relying on role segregation which is used more often by husband than wives.

The type of conflict was significantly related to the influence tactics the spouses rely upon but sex, marital quality and power pattern accounted for little variance. Wives relied on persuasive techniques as often as husbands. There was no sex difference in the use of weak and strong tactics.

Overall, the choice of a strategy depends on the type of conflict and this is the case for both spouses, in happy and unhappy couples as well as for egalitarian or patriarchal relationships. The author is of the opinion that research should

focus more on the type of conflict spouses need to settle rather than specific commodities.

Troutman and Shanteau (1992) researched husband-wife decision making in their search for healthcare services. A new methodology is used in three experiments studying couples' collective decisions in pregnancy related services. In terms of conflict resolution, the author disagrees with previous research which emphasizes a motivational approach to bargaining strategies. He suggests that Davis' (1976) categories are insufficient because they focus on the motivational sources of conflict. He suggests a cognitive approach to provide a more direct account of the decision process. In this study for instance, several couples used a "cognitive compromise" approach by finding middle values for attribute weights. He suggests that future research on conflict in families should investigate both motivational and cognitive resolution strategies.

2.5 Other variables influencing family decision making

Additional variables might come into play and impact on the whole decision making process. Hopper, Burns and Sherrell (1989) felt there was a need to develop standardized scales and response categories that can be replicated in the study of family decision making. The purpose of their study was to assess the reliability and validity of self-report measures of three different constructs across Davis' (1971) sub-decisions for each of Wilke's (1975) decision stages.

The MTMM methodology is applied to the measurement of the traits of influence, importance and participation in husband and wife decision making for purchase decisions on automobiles and furniture.

Most validation research has concentrated on the identification of spousal influence as the primary construct to explain decision processes for husbands and wives. Just as an individual's perceived importance of the decision and his/her level of involvement or participation in the decision have been examined in individual level consumer decisions, these same constructs should be studied in a multiple decision maker setting to assess their impact. Also, previous researchers have not been consistent in their treatment of the purchase decision process itself.

A total of eighteen traits were initially considered to construct the MTMM matrix: perceived influence, which has been widely used and permits comparison with other research; perceived importance (otherwise known as differential involvement - Burns and Granbois, 1979) which has been labeled worthy of further investigation and as part of the decision process; participation or the amount of time or effort spent making a decision; problem recognition; information search and the final purchase decision for the automobile and furniture purchase decision.

It is apparent that the constant sumscale of measuring husband-wife decision making is a reliable and potentially valid method. Factor analysis performed on the nine traits for each product revealed that the decision process for the

purchase of automobiles and family room furniture is characterized by two major types of decisions: resource decisions and variant selection decisions.

Of the three constructs tested, importance demonstrated the highest level of convergence between husbands' and wives' response. An interesting finding was the lack of divergence of the importance trait across the products as well as the decisions. Importance is probably a global rather than a decision-specific construct. The high degree of convergent validity indicates the respondents knew a great deal about what was important to their spouses. The constructs of influence and participation reflected high levels of correlations between the two constructs. The respondents may have felt they were the same in that a spouse's amount of persuasion is the same as the amount of time and effort s/he contributes to a decision. The authors conclude that these constructs are either conceptually redundant or causally related.

Overall, the construct of influence performed slightly better than participation. Although the constructs of importance and participation did not perform quite as well, the study has indicated that there are other dynamics at work in the decision making process.

Earlier, Burns (1975) had investigated spousal involvement and empathy in jointly-resolved and authoritatively-resolved purchase sub-decisions. This study focused on the final decision stage of the decision process. The author chose

these variables because they have been treated as determinants of husband and wife preference discrepancy resolution.

Involvement is identified as the importance of the sub-decision to the individual spouse. It is well established from a theoretical point of view: Morgan (1961) discusses this factor by looking at the strength of a spouse's preferences and the expected subjective utility of the anticipated outcome of the decision. Brown (1961), Heer (1963) and Granbois (1971) also suggested similar constructs. Pollay (1968) incorporates involvement in his model of family of decision making.

Empathy pertains to the importance to one spouse that the other spouse's preferences are taken into consideration in the final choice. This factor did not receive as extensive a theoretical review as involvement but it has been discussed by Morgan (1961), Clawson (1961) and Pollay (1968) in the context of family decision making.

Finally, the concept of recognized authority is defined as the mutually understood right of one spouse to resolve disagreements between the spouses' first choices.

The author found a high degree of compatibility exhibited by spousal involvement with and empathy for several product-feature areas. It seems that when one spouse manifests high involvement with respect to one sub-decision, the other one realizes this and shows greater willingness to allow the other spouse's preference to influence the final outcome. This way, serious conflicts

are avoided and the outcome is satisfactory to both spouses for different reasons. With respect to authoritatively-resolved purchase decisions, the results show that the legitimate decision-making authority of one spouse is recognized by the other and the decision is conceded to the authority spouse. The author concludes that involvement and empathy appear to be productive dimensions with which to describe spousal dispositions.

As was mentioned earlier, both the Granbois and the Sheth models of discrepant preferences and conflict resolution predict conflict resolution as a direct outcome of preference discrepancy without intervention of moderating variables. Several writers have suggested including the role of involvement, empathy and recognized authority as potential modifiers.

Burns and Granbois (1977) conducted a study to measure conflict operationally by comparing identical instruments completed by husbands and wives.
Preference measures for sub-decisions were gathered and measures of involvement, empathy and recognized authority were taken for each sub-decision to investigate the possible role of these variables in moderating the need for resolving discrepant preferences.
Three sets of relationships guided the design and analysis plan of the study: the degree and nature of agreement between husbands' and wives' preference ratings for several sub-decisions of the automobile purchase decision; the

degree of variation across sub-decisions found within husbands' and wives' responses to the involvement, empathy, and recognized authority measures; a comparison of husbands' and wives' response patterns of variation for the involvement, empathy and recognized authority measures.

If spouses indicate different levels of involvement and/or empathy on a given sub-decision or if they agree on a recognized authority pattern to resolve preference discrepancy, overt conflict resolving behavior is not likely to occur indicating that these moderating variables should be added to models of family decision making.

The findings indicate that spousal preference discrepancy is a less common phenomenon than is implied in the literature. The results also indicate that spouses' preferences undergo moderate divergence beyond first choice comparisons. The resolution of differences could entail a process wherein the spouses must communicate their respective preference configurations as well as the tenacity with which they will retain their first choices. So first choice discrepancy might engender serious negotiation.

But at least three factors operate within the process to facilitate resolution of the discrepancy. First, spouses generally have compatible expectations as to whether a decision should be resolved jointly or falls within one spouse's sphere of decision-making authority. Also, it is reasonable to expect to find the two spouses at different levels of involvement with the determination of the outcome of the product feature decisions. Also, the spouses will be differentially empathic

toward each other's preferences. Generally, the study showed that those sub-decisions in which the spouses have very dissimilar involvement and empathy attitudes are characterized by the presence of a mutually recognized authority spouse. Sub-decisions in which the spouses have similar positions tend to be mutually designated as jointly resolved.

Erich Kirchler (1988) studied diary reports (four weeks) of 21 couples with respect to the determinants of happy vs unhappy spouses influence and influence shifts. The author identifies the determinants of influence and speculates as follows:

Gender norms: one of the most important sources of influence. The author expects that the more masculine the item to be purchased, the more influence the husband will have. Also the higher the cost of the commodity, the more the influence will be balanced between the spouses.

Resource contributions: if the resource contribution theory (Blood and Wolfe, 1960) is valid, then the spouse that contributes the most resources should have the more say.

Involvement: Burns (1976) and Burns and Granbois (1977) found that if a spouse was highly involved in a sub-decision, the partner's willingness to please that spouse was high. So the higher the interest, the higher the influence.

Expertise: previous research (Corfman, 1987; Davis, 1972) has shown that the most expert spouse will dominate daily purchase decisions.

Utility debts: this concept deals with decision history. The author contends that this concept implies that the spouse who had less say in past decision purchases will dominate daily purchase decisions.

The results indicated that, as in previous studies, relative expertise dominates the purchasing decision process. Also, it was found that the decision history was a primary significance but over a greater than one-period history. Blood and Wolfe's theory of relative resource no longer explains differences in spousal influence because of society's transition from patriarchal to egalitarian relationships. There are still however, some traditional role segmentation's at work to explain differences of influence between husband and wives: women still had more say with respect to clothing and food and husbands had more power in decisions about cars and related items. The author concludes by pointing out the usefulness of the concept of utility debts to understand influence disporportionalities in purchase decisions. Purchase need to be studies as longitudinal events, in the context of family life.

Curry and Menasco (1989) also found the forces prompting equitable choice to be grounded in among others, empathy. Spouses alter their individual utility functions in the direction of those expresses by their husband or wife.

HYPOTHESES

Awareness sets

H1: The hypotheses with respect to the measures of attitude, intention and confidence in the Brisoux-Laroche model are supported

	EVOKED SET	HOLD SET	REJECT SET	FOGGY SET
ATTITUDE	highest	average	lowest	lower than average
INTENTION	highest	average to low	lowest	low
CONFIDENCE	highest	average to low	average	lowest

Perception of decision influence

H2: The perception of each spouses' decision influence is related to their sex role attitude

Influence sharing

H3: The amount of influence sharing by both spouses is related to their sex role attitude

H4: The discrepancy in husbands' and wives' attribute importance ratings is a function of the couples' sex role attitude

H5: Measures of size, attitude, intention and confidence in the awareness sets are related to sex role attitude measures

H6: The proportion of commonly evoked places by both spouses is related to the couples' sex role attitude

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Sample

The populations targeted for this survey consisted of English Canadian and Italian Canadian couples residing in the Greater Montreal area. In order to ensure a representative sample of each one of the ethnic groups, given the bicultural and multicultural character of the population of the city of Montreal, the data collection was done in the following manner:

English Canadian couples

The data collection for this ethnic group was confined to four municipalities in Montreal and surrounding area which, according to the 1991 Census of Canada, exhibited a large percentage of residents whose ethnic origin (single origins) was British.

Italian Canadian couples

The data collection for this ethnic group was confined to basically two municipalities in the greater Montreal area with the highest concentration of Italian Canadian residents, namely St. Leonard and Rivière des Prairies. Based on statistics from the 1991 Census of Canada, 17 census tracts exhibiting a large proportion of residents whose ethnic origin (single origins) was Italian

(proportions ranged from 16% to 66%) were chosen for sampling in these two municipalities.

The geographic areas chosen were residential districts with detached or semi-detached dwellings where the likelihood of finding married (or equivalent) couples is the highest.

A sample of at least 150 usable questionnaires from each ethnic group couples was deemed appropriate for this research.

2. Survey instrument

A structured non-disguised questionnaire was designed to gather the data required for this research. The questions were entirely closed-ended to promote a quick response. It contained 13 pages and was divided into five sections.

Section 1 gathered information on knowledge and selection of vacation destinations based on the Brisoux -Laroche model of brand categorization. The evoked set was measured by asking respondents their choice of vacation destinations: " If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations would you **seriously consider visiting**? ". A choice of 14 popular destinations was given to the respondent and the responses were coded as a series of 14 dummy variables (0,1). A fifteenth category " Other " was included to allow respondents other choices.

Likewise, the reject set was measured by asking respondents to indicate those destinations they " **would definitely not consider visiting** "; the foggy set, by asking respondents to indicate those destinations for which they " **have not yet formed an opinion of,** and therefore **cannot** say whether or not they would consider visiting them "; and the hold set, by asking respondents to indicate the destinations for which they " **have formed an opinion of,** but **cannot** say whether or not they would be willing to visit them ". For all sets, the same choice of 14 destinations, plus the "other" category, were given to the respondent and the responses were coded as dummy variables (0,1).

Respondents were also asked to give their opinion, using a seven-point semantic differential scale, where 1 indicated an extremely negative response and 7, an extremely positive response, on nine attributes for each of the 14 destinations selected for the survey. The importance respondents attached to each attribute was measured by asking respondents " how important you consider the following features when choosing a winter vacation destination ", using a similar seven-point scale anchored by *not important at all/extremely important.*

Respondents' attitudes were measured using two seven-point semantic differential scales anchored by *very poor destination/excellent destination* and *dislike very much/like very much*; confidence was measured with two seven-point

scales anchored by the statements *extremely uncertain/extremely certain* and *not at all confident/extremely confident.* Intention was similarly measured for each of the 14 destinations with a seven-point scale anchored by *would definitely not intend to visit/would definitely intend to visit.* Intention was furthermore measured by asking respondents how they would distribute 100 points among the 14 winter destinations.

Section 2 contained measures of spousal influence in seven typical vacation decisions. Respondents were asked who usually decided: **when, where, what features to look for, how much, how long, form of transportation and type of accommodation**. The 5 point-scale was labelled as follows: *husband, husband more than wife, equally, wife more than husband, and wife.*

Section 3 contained a sex role attitude (SRA) scale replicated from " Sex Roles, Life Styles, and Child bearing " by John H. Scanzoni. It lists 28 statements which deal with the social positions of the wife and husband, self-actualization of the husband and wife as well as the role of the mother in both the traditional and religious sense. Respondents answered on a seven-point scale anchored by *strongly disagree/strongly agree.*

Section 4 contained a series of questions measuring language usage frequency and some cultural aspects.

Section 5 contained usual demographic questions: education, age category, length of actual marital union, income category and gender.

The sets of questionnaires (one questionnaire to be completed by the wife and another one to be completed by the husband) were accompanied by a covering letter explaining the purpose and benefits of the study and it emphasized that participation was anonymous and voluntary. In the covering letter it was also indicated that each spouse should complete the questionnaire separately without consulting each other. The questionnaire and the covering letter was available in English and in Italian (see sample of questionnaires in Appendix I).

3. Data collection

Within each of the municipalities chosen, a number of streets were picked at random and efforts were made to survey as many households on these streets as possible until a quota of at least 150 usable sets of questionnaires were obtained for each target group.

The questionnaires were administered door to door to the English Canadian couples from January to April 1995 and to the Italian Canadian couples from February to August 1995. During this period, a total of 1,052 sets of questionnaires were distributed to consenting English Canadian respondents and 1,513 questionnaires to Italian Canadian couples. Data collection was done mostly on weekends and evenings when couples were more likely to be at home. After the initial introduction, a filter question was used in an effort to screen out respondents who did not belong to the target populations. Qualifying

respondents willing to participate in the survey were given a set of questionnaires (in the language of their choice to Italian Canadian couples), accompanied by a prepaid envelope addressed to Prof. Michel Laroche, to be filled in at their own convenience and mailed directly to Concordia University.

To be usable, questionnaires had to be properly filled in and respondents had to belong to the target population. To evaluate if this latter requirement was met, responses to the scaled questions of Section 4 " I consider myself to be English Canadian " and " My parents are English Canadian " were analyzed for the English Canadian couples. When low ratings on these two questions were encountered, the questionnaire was deemed not usable, and likewise for Italian Canadian couples' ratings to the statements " I consider myself to be Italian Canadian " and " My parents are Italian Canadian ". Also, questionnaires containing too many blank responses were not used.

A total of 151 usable sets of questionnaires were received from English Canadian couples for a net usable response rate of 14.4% and 143 usable sets from Italian Canadian couples for a net usable response rate of 9.5%. Table 1 below summarizes the geographic distribution of questionnaires and response rates.

Table 1

	Quest. distributed	Quest. Received	Quest. not usable	Usable quest.	Response rate (%)
Westmount	266	48	19	29	10.9
Montreal West	270	48	18	30	11.1
Beaconsfield	203	48	13	35	17.2
Pointe Claire	313	80	23	57	18.2
St-Léonard and Rivière des Prairies	1,513	187	35	143	9.5
Total	2,565	411	108	294	11.5

4. Respondent profile

Tables 2 to 6 outline the demographic profile of the sample. The respondents are quite well educated with at least 40% of men and women having a university degree. They are an older group of people with 45 percent of men and 35 percent of women over the age of 50. Also, most respondents have been married for quite a number of years: 53% of the couples have been married for over 20 years. At least 55 percent of the respondents estimated their total income to be over $60,000 which is above average compared to 1991 Census Metropolitan Area figures for Montreal where the average family income was calculated at $50,518.

The profile of the sample in terms of age, income and years of married life would indicate that these couples have had many experiences of joint decision making and most probably a few of them were vacation decisions.

Table 2

Level of education	Women	Men
High School	35%	32%
Cegep	24.1%	20.3%
University	40.9%	47.7%

Table 3

Age	Women	Men
20-29	9.6%	7.5%
30-39	23.9%	20.2%
40-49	32.1%	27.7%
50 and over	34.5%	44.5%

Table 4

# of years married	Women	Men
Under 3 years	7.6%	8.2%
3-5	6.9.%	6.2%
6-10	9.7%	9.3%
11-15	8.6%	9.6%
16-20	13.8%	14.4%
more than 20	53.4%	52.2%

Table 5

Total income	Women	Men
Under $20,000	2.5%	2.5%
$20,000 - $39,999	19.3%	14.4%
$40,000 - $59,999	23%	19.9%
$60,000 - $79,999	19.3%	19.9%
$80,000 and over	36.1%	43.2%

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

1. Analysis

The first step in the analysis consisted in transforming the data to prepare it for testing the hypotheses.

- All the fourteen measures for each set (evoked, hold foggy, reject) were used as a multiplicative dummy variable (0,1) to eliminate data about the other sets. The fifteenth category " Other " was not used in the analysis because responses were too widely scattered over a large number of other destinations.
- The two attitude scales had high internal consistency for each of the fourteen destinations (Cronbach's alphas ranging from .83 to .90) so their mean was used as the attitude score for each destination.
- The two confidence scales also had high internal consistency for each of the fourteen vacation destinations (Cronbach's alphas ranging from .81 to .90) so their mean was used as the confidence score for each destination.
- Each of the two intention measures were converted into a probabilistic measure ranging from 0 to 100. With the exception of one destination whose Cronbach's alpha was .26, all the other Cronbach's alphas for the two measures for each of the vacation destinations were higher, ranging from .49 to .65, so their mean was used as the intention score for all the fourteenth destinations.

For each set, the corresponding attitude, intention, confidence and attribute scores for each destination were calculated by multiplying each dummy variable by the corresponding destination measurement, and an overall average for all destinations was calculated for each one of the variables.

To test differences in agreement between spouses, the destinations in both the husband's and the wife's set (common elements), were treated as two independent samples and overall mean scores were calculated for each variable under study; in the same manner, the brands in the husbands' set but not in the wives', and the destinations in the wives' set but not in the husbands' (uncommon elements), were treated as two independent samples and overall mean scores were calculated for both conditions for each variable. Analyses of variance and Scheffé tests on these four groupings for each of the four sets (evoked, hold, foggy, reject) were then conducted.

The sex role attitude (SRA) scale lists 28 statements of attitude with respect to the role of husbands and wives within the family which are evaluated by the respondents on a seven-point scale anchored with *strongly disagree/strongly agree*. To achieve consistency in the meaning of the statements, a number of them had to be reversed at the analysis stage, namely statements: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28. Cronbach Alpha was calculated to be 0.9 therefore the SRA scale is reliable and the mean was used as the SRA score for

each respondent. The sex role attitude rating of each men (HSRA) and women (WSRA) was computed as an average of the 28 sex role attitude statements, ranging from 1 (traditional) to 7 (modern).

2. Results

2.1 Awareness sets

Table 6 shows the mean and standard deviation for size, attitude, intention and confidence for evoked, hold, foggy and rejects sets for both men and women.

2.1.1 Set size

Mean evoked set size

T-tests were conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between men and women on those various dimensions in each of the sets.

The largest mean set size for both men (3.89) and women (4.33) is the evoked set. Women's set size is significantly larger than men's (p=.04). These evoked sets are similar to those identified by Woodside and Sherrell (1977) where the leisure travelers' evoked set size was 3.38 +/- 1.75. However, they are quite smaller than those of the Kim, Laroche, Guttenberg (1988) study on vacation destinations, which were 6.85 for men and 6.53 for women. The main reason for this difference can be attributed to the fact that the respondents in the Kim et al (1988) study were presented with 17 destination choices, whereas there were only 14 choices in the current study thereby giving fewer options to these respondents.

The difference could also be the result of a possible relationship between the level of brand familiarity and/or loyalty and evoked set size (Ostlund 1973; Jarvis and Wilcox 1973): a very small evoked set may indicate a high degree of brand familiarity and/or loyalty. Inversely, if the evoked set is large, the level of familiarity may be lower. This was the most likely scenario in the Kim et al (1988) study where the larger than average evoked sets were explained by a lesser degree of familiarity with a city or country than with a brand of durable good. Also, the respondents were younger people having been married or living together for one to two years on average and therefore having had less exposure to this type of decision. In the present study however, the respondents are older, more than fifty percent of them having been married for more than 20 years. Therefore, the level of familiarity with some of the destinations is bound to be higher, the respondents most probably having been exposed to this type of decision in the past .

Another explanation for the larger than average set size in the Kim et al (1988) study was that this type of decision might represent a limited or extended problem solving situation. Maddox et al (1978) proposed that when this is the case, the evoked set tends to be larger because the efforts to acquire information tend to be more active. Indeed, younger people as those respondents in the Kim et al (1988) study are probably considering a large spectrum of destinations for their vacation requiring a more extensive information search before making a decision. However, the consumption pattern of people

varies with age: older people such as the respondents in the current study, might have a tendency to return to the same places they know well and for which they have already made an information search, thereby reducing the size of their evoked sets. This kind of situation could also explain the discrepancy in the evoked set sizes between the Kim et al (1988) study and the present one.

Finally, some or all of the destinations themselves proposed to the respondents might be more well known in general than those of the Kim et al (1988) study thereby not representing a problem solving situation for the respondents.

Comparing the evoked set sizes of husbands and wives, we found that the wives' were significantly higher. This finding differs from the Kim et al (1988) study where the mean set size of husbands' was higher, although not significantly so. This finding may reflect a lower level of familiarity on the part of the wives than on the part of the husbands in our study. It could also be that wives perceive the decision concerning a vacation destination more as a problem solving situation than their husbands. As we proposed above, this situation could also reflect the younger age distribution of women in this study (10% more men over the age of 50).

Mean reject set size

The second largest set for both men (3.69) and women (3.64) is the reject set. Again, these set sizes are somewhat smaller than those of the Guttenberg (1987) study on vacation destinations which were 4 for men and 4.8 for women

and smaller than that of the Laroche et al (1984) study for the choice of a university (5.4). However, these set sizes are higher than those for beer at 1.97 (Brisoux and Laroche, 1980) and color television at 3.02 (Church et al, 1985).

The main reason for the average set size being smaller than that of the Guttenberg (1987) study, is again the fact that a larger group of destinations was proposed to the respondents in the Guttenberg (1987) study therefore enabling them to reject a larger number of them.

There could also be other dimensions explaining the reject set size difference: the larger reject set sizes in the Guttenberg (1987) study were identified as the possible result of an extensive problem solving approach due to a higher involvement with the product: there are fewer acceptable substitutes for expensive or involving products/services (Guttenberg, 1987). In the present study, it is possible (as was the case for the evoked sets) that the respondents do not consider this decision a limited or extensive problem-solving one. Therefore, the reject sets would be smaller than those of the Guttenberg (1987) study.

The differences between men and women's reject set sizes are not significant.

Mean hold set size

There follows the hold set mean sizes (3.10 and 2.89) for men and women respectively. These set sizes are average compared to other studies. The Guttenberg (1987) study had hold set sizes of 2.95 for men and 3.28 for women.

The differences between men and women's hold set sizes are not significant.

Mean foggy set size

Finally the foggy set mean sizes were 2.74 and 2.42 for men and women respectively. These mean sizes are quite higher than those of the Guttenberg (1987) study which were 0.93 for men and 1.28 for women.

Possibly, this is again a reflection of our demographics: the older people in our study tend to have a more precise idea of where they want to go and undergo a limited information search whereas the younger people in the Guttenberg (1987) study probably learn more about other destinations in their more extensive information search.

The differences between men and women's foggy set sizes are not significant.

2.1.2 Attitude, intention and confidence scores

Average scores were computed for husbands and wives' attitude, intention and confidence in all four sets: evoked, reject, hold and foggy. Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were any differences among the scores on attitude, intention and confidence for the various awareness sets, for both men and women. A Scheffé test was conducted to determine which sets were different. Also, a T-test was conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences between husbands and wives' scores on each dimension measured for each awareness set. Results are shown in Table 6, 6A and 6B.

The Brisoux-Laroche (1983) model is partially supported on measures of attitude, intention and confidence.

As hypothesized, the **evoked set** mean measures of attitude, intention and confidence are all significantly higher than those in the other three sets for both husbands and wives ($p<.05$). Respondents' attitudes towards evoked set destinations are more positive than their attitudes towards destinations in other sets; the same conclusion applies to their intentions to visit the evoked set destinations as well as to their confidence in their evaluation of these destinations. In the Guttenberg (1987) study, although the pattern in the mean scores was the same, the differences were not significant.

Destinations in the **reject sets** received negative attitude and intention scores on average for both men and women. These mean scores were the lowest of all four sets ($p<.05$); however, the difference between husbands intentions scores for foggy and reject sets was not significant.

The confidence scores were lower than evoked and hold set scores but higher than foggy set scores when looking at men and women scores respectively; however, only two of these differences were significant ($p<.05$): those between reject and evoked mean confidence scores for both men and women.

Therefore, the hypothesis is only partially supported for the reject sets since, even though the mean scores are in line with those of the Brisoux-Laroche

model, the differences are not all significant. In the Guttenberg (1987) study, women's reject set scores supported the Brisoux-Laroche model but the men's reject confidence scores were higher than their hold set scores which was not consistent with the model.

The **hold set** average intention, attitude and confidence scores for both men and women were greater than the reject and foggy set average scores and lower than the evoked set average scores for men and women; however, there were a few differences which were not significant at p=.05: husbands' scores for intentions towards the foggy set were not significantly different from those of the hold set and husbands confidence scores for the reject set were not significantly different from those of the hold set. Also, women's attitude and intention scores for the foggy set were not significantly different from those of the hold set and their confidence scores for the reject set were not significantly different from those of the hold set.

Therefore, the hypothesis is only partially supported for the hold sets since, even though the mean scores are in line with the Brisoux-Laroche model, the differences are not all significant. In the Guttenberg (1987) study, only partial support was found for the hypothesis since the men's hold set score for confidence was lower than that of the reject set.

For the **foggy sets**, the confidence scores for men and women are the lowest of all four sets, although the differences between foggy confidence scores and reject set scores were not significantly different for both men and women. The intention and attitude scores are higher than those of the reject set but lower than those of the evoked and hold sets. However, there are a few differences which are not significant: husbands intentions scores are not significantly different between the reject and foggy sets as well as between the hold and foggy sets. Wives's scores are not significantly different between the foggy and hold sets for both attitude and intentions.

Therefore, the hypothesis is only partially supported for the foggy sets since, even though the mean scores are in line with the Brisoux-Laroche model, the differences are not all significant. In the Guttenberg (1987) study, the hypothesis was also only partially supported for the same reason.

Even though the patterns in the awareness sets are consistent for both men and women, there are some statistically significant differences in same set mean scores between both sexes. Men have a significantly more positive attitude towards destinations in the hold set than do women (p=.004) . Also, men have significantly more positive intentions towards destinations in the reject set than do women (p=.041). As for the confidence scores, men have consistently significantly higher scores in all four sets than do women (evoked p=.066; hold p=.000; foggy p=.011; reject p=.003). Although no statistical tests were

conducted to identify differences between husbands and wives' scores in the Guttenberg (1987) study, all of these trends are also present.

2.1.3 Overall importance rating of attributes

Table 7 lists means and standard deviations of husbands' and wives' overall importance ratings as well as their perceived presence of the attributes in each set. T-tests were conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between husbands and wives ratings.

Looking at the mean scores for overall importance of the attributes , the five most important attributes for both husbands and wives were the same with men preferring first *nice and warm climate*, then *quality accommodations* , *beautiful beaches* , *excellent cuisine* and *low cost*. Women chose the same but rated *beautiful beaches* ahead of *quality accommodations.*

Men then preferred *excellent sporting facilities, excellent shopping facilities, chance to meet people* and *exciting night life.* Women had similar preferences but ranked *shopping* ahead of *sports.*

In the Guttenberg (1987) study, three of the attributes identified as most important by men and women in a vacation destination, were: *beautiful beaches, warm climate* and *quality accommodations.* Therefore, these three attributes would seem to be still the most important traits for both men and women in choosing a vacation destination.

Even though the **ranking** of the attributes in order of overall importance is somewhat similar for men and women, there are several significant differences between men and women in the actual mean **importance** rating of six attributes out of nine. *Excellent quality accommodations* (p=.022), *beautiful beaches* (p=.001), *nice and warm climate* (p=.019), *low cost* (p=.077), *excellent cuisine* (p=.010) *and excellent shopping facilities* (p=.000) were rated significantly higher by women. So men and women perceived the attributes to be more or less in the same order of importance but women perceived all of the attributes higher up on the ranking scale to be more important than men did. In the Kim et al (1988) study, there were only two attributes out of 12 where the scores differed significantly between men and women: *excellent shopping facilities* and *excellent sports facilities*, where women's scores were higher in both cases.

2.1.4 Evaluation ratings of attributes within sets

Evoked sets

Evoked sets of both men and women destinations rated highest on perceived presence of all attributes except *low cost* (Table 7). This is a logical finding since *low cost* may have an inverse relation with all the others: generally speaking, the more *beautiful beaches*, *quality accommodations*, *excellent cuisine*..., the higher the *cost.*

These results concur with the Guttenberg (1987) study where men's evoked set ratings were also highest for all the same attributes except *low cost.* Women's evoked set ratings were highest for all the same attributes except *excellent shopping.*

The presence of each attribute in each destination was evaluated by respondents. In the destinations chosen by women to be placed in their evoked sets, the attributes ranked as follows in terms of their perceived presence: *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations, exciting night life, excellent sport facilities, excellent cuisine/restaurant, chance to meet people, excellent shopping facilities* and finally, *low price/cost of trip.* The destinations chosen by men ranked the same first three attributes the same, *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations,* as well as the last three attributes: *chance to meet people, excellent shopping facilities* and finally, *low price/cost of trip.* The three middle attributes were the same as women's but in a different order for men: *excellent cuisine/restaurant, exciting night life* and *excellent sport facilities.* Men and women both seem to value *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches* and *excellent quality accommodations* as the three most important attributes in determining whether a destination is included in the evoked set. The same three attributes received the highest scores from both husbands and wives in the Guttenberg study (1987), indicating

that the same traits appear to be most important in determining whether a destination is included in the evoked set.

As we saw above, these attributes were also rated as the most important overall. However, although *low cost* was ranked as fifth most important attribute overall by both men and women, it appears as the last one in perceived importance for the destinations included in the evoked sets. The reverse is true for the attribute *exciting night life*: it is ranked as the least important of the attributes overall when selecting a destination but it is ranked fourth and fifth by wives and husbands respectively in perceived importance for the destinations in the evoked sets.

We conducted a T-test to determine if there were any significant differences between men and women's scores for perceived presence of the attributes and we found that there was only one evoked set attribute which was perceived as being more present by men and less so by women: *excellent cuisine* ($p=.07$). Men chose destinations for their evoked sets where they perceived there would be more *excellent cuisine and restaurants* than did women. Considering that this attribute was rated significantly higher by women than men in terms of overall importance in a vacation destination, we can speculate as to the reason for its significantly higher presence in the evoked sets of men than in those of women. There is a possibility that this attribute co-exists in certain destinations

with another one that is more important for men. Therefore, these destinations would be in the evoked set because of the other attribute but would also rank high on perceived presence of *excellent cuisine*.

All other attributes were seen as being present to the same extent in all of the destinations chosen by both men and women to be placed in their evoked sets.

Determinant attribute

Fishbein and Rosenberg have developed models that sum the combined importance and brand evaluation means so as to allow weaknesses to be compensated by strengths.

In an attempt to determine which attributes have the most impact on the selection decision, we have used a variation of the Fishbein and Rosenberg multi-attribute models used in the Laroche, Taylor (1987) study on major segmentation issues in retail banking.

The rationale behind this model is:

- Importance ratings are not sufficient in identifying the determinant criteria because if all destinations are perceived as offering one of the attributes, then this attribute will not have much impact on the selection decision.

- The destinations that a spouse is most likely to choose from are found in the evoked set; therefore, the amount of variance in the ratings of the evoked set destinations will provide a measure of differentiation of those destinations.
- The standard deviation is the consistent measure of variance chosen because it provides a standardized measure of dispersion around the mean.
- The standard deviation is multiplied by the importance ratings so that mean evaluations with small standard deviations will weight the importance rating downward, while as standard deviations pass 1.0, they will weight mean evaluations upwards.

Table 8

Determinant Attribute Ratings for Vacation Destinations - Wives

Evaluation Criteria	Wives Mean Importance Ratings	Rank	Standard Deviation of Evoked Brand Ratings	Determinant Attribute Rating	Rank
Exciting night life	2.97	9	1.05	3.12	9
Chance to meet people	3.64	8	1.15	4.19	7
Excellent quality accommodations	6.13	3	0.90	5.52	5
Beautiful beaches	6.23	2	0.92	5.73	3
Nice and warm climate	6.41	1	0.83	5.32	6
Excellent sport facilities	3.77	7	1.09	4.11	8
Low price/cost of trip	5.57	5	1.41	7.85	1
Excellent cuisine/restaurants	5.95	4	1.10	6.55	2
Excellent shopping facilities	4.72	6	1.20	5.66	4

Determinant Attribute Ratings for Vacation Destinations - Husbands

Evaluation Criteria	Husbands Mean Importance Ratings	Rank	Standard Deviation of Evoked Brand Ratings	Determinant Attribute Rating	Rank
Exciting night life	3.00	9	1.23	3.69	9
Chance to meet people	3.53	8	1.28	4.52	8
Excellent quality accommodations	5.89	2	0.93	5.48	5
Beautiful beaches	5.87	3	0.97	5.69	3
Nice and warm climate	6.18	1	0.89	5.50	4
Excellent sport facilities	4.00	6	1.17	4.68	7
Low price/cost of trip	5.35	5	1.41	7.54	1
Excellent cuisine/restaurants	5.69	4	1.05	5.97	2
Excellent shopping facilities	3.86	7	1.29	4.98	6

As can be seen from Table 8, the results indicate that, according to the determinant attribute analysis, the three most important attributes in selecting a vacation destination are now *low cost*, *excellent cuisine* and *beautiful beaches*, in that order, for both men and women. This is quite a change from the original importance rating where *nice and warm climate* was the most important criteria for both men and women. These findings support the rationale behind this analysis which states that if all destinations are viewed as being the same in one criteria, then it will have a low impact on the selection decision. Since most destinations proposed do offer *nice and warm climate*, this attribute has been displaced to fourth and sixth place for men and women respectively because it does not provide differentiation. It has been replaced with the attribute *low cost* which is considered to be the attribute determinant in the selection of a vacation destination, for both men and women. This result confirms the findings of a study on customer retention for Air Canada vacations where it was determined that price was a critical factor when selecting a holiday package as well as the one reason why a consumer would buy a vacation package from the same supplier in the future (Leblanc, 1997).

Also, it is interesting to note that, *exciting night life*, the attribute that was considered least important by both men and women, remains the least important in selecting a vacation destination.

Reject set

Reject set destinations rated lower than evoked sets destinations on perceived presence of all attributes except for a slight difference in the attribute *low cost* (4.17 vs 4.16).

In the destinations chosen by women to be placed in their reject sets, the attributes ranked as follows in terms of their perceived presence (Table 7): *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations, exciting night life, excellent cuisine, excellent shopping facilities, excellent sport facilities, low price* and *chance to meet people.* In the destinations chosen by men, the attributes ranked as follows: *nice and warm climate, excellent quality accommodations, beautiful beaches, excellent cuisine, excellent shopping facilities, exciting night life, excellent sports facilities, low price* and *chance to meet people.*

Again, the first three attributes are the same for men and women: *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations* (men inverting the rank of *beautiful beaches* and *excellent quality accommodations*), and the three last attributes are the same: *excellent sports facilities, low price* and *chance to meet people.* The three middle attributes are also similar but in a different order.

It is interesting to note that the first three attributes that contribute to a destination being put in the reject of men and women are the same as those of

the evoked sets. This might be because these attributes are salient in a lot of the destinations of the awareness sets; therefore, the destinations could have been put in the reject set because of the presence of other attributes but rated high nonetheless on *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations.* The Guttenberg (1987) study found also that one of these attributes, *excellent quality accommodations*, had the highest attribute mean for reject sets destinations for both husbands and wives.

We conducted a T-test to determine if there were any significant differences between men and women's scores and *excellent cuisine* was perceived as being significantly more present (p=.064) in the destinations chosen by men to be included in the reject set than those chosen by women. This finding is more in line with the overall importance ratings than those of the evoked set.

Also, another attribute was seen as more present in husbands' rejected destinations: *excellent shopping facilities* (p=.087). *Excellent cuisine* and *excellent shopping facilities* are possibly attributes on which men reject a destination. Indeed, looking at the overall perceived presence of each attribute in each destination, we see that *excellent cuisine* is perceived as being very present in France (highest mean of all destinations) and the same observation applies to *excellent shopping facilities.* This destination is also the only one husbands placed in their reject set significantly more often than wives.

Hold set

As in the two previous sets, the three attributes perceived as most present in both men and women's hold set destinations are *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations.* The Guttenberg (1987) study found also that one of these attributes, *excellent quality accommodations*, had the highest attribute mean for hold sets destinations for both husbands and wives.

The attributes perceived as least present are *excellent shopping facilities and low price.* This ordering is identical as the one of the evoked sets. The means scores for the perceived presence of each attribute are lower than those of the evoked sets and higher than those of the reject sets and foggy sets, except for two small differences: *low cost* (hold set wives - 4.16 - slightly lower than reject set wives - 4.17) and *excellent shopping facilities* (hold set wives - 4.39 slightly lower than foggy set wives - 4.41). In the Guttenberg (1987) study, only five out of twelve attribute means were higher than those of the reject and foggy sets.

Again T-tests enabled us to determine that, in the hold sets, *excellent cuisine* is an attribute which is perceived to be more present in the destinations identified by men to be placed in that set than those identified by women (p=.016). Perhaps this is an attribute that causes men to place a destination in the hold set.

The attribute *beautiful beaches* (p=.087) is also an attribute which is perceived to be more present in the destinations identified by men to be placed in the hold sets than those identified by women. Knowing that this attribute ranks high in importance and is perceived as present to a large extent in the destinations placed in husbands and wives' evoked set, we can assume that husbands place some destinations in the hold set that they perceive as having *beautiful beaches* but also some other attribute that they are less keen about than their wives, i.e. *excellent cuisine,* or another attribute not evaluated in the present survey.

Foggy sets

Again, the first three attributes for both men and women are *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches, excellent quality accommodations,* which reinforces our earlier explanation with respect to their salience. Indeed, even though these destinations typically cannot be evaluated in terms of the salient evaluative criteria of the product class, we still find these three attributes ranking highest with respect to their perceived presence in these destinations. The lowest rated attributes are *low price* and *chance to meet people.* In the Guttenberg (1987) study, the attributes *beautiful beaches* and *warm climate* had equally high mean scores for men.

In the foggy sets, there were no significant differences between the perceived presence of any of the attributes in the destinations chosen by men and women.

It is interesting to note that this is the only set where there is complete agreement between spouses as to the mean perceived presence of attributes and yet this is the set where the least information processing has occurred. All scores were quite similar for all attributes for men and women (around 4.5).

2.1.5 Frequency of destinations in each set

Table 9 lists the mean frequencies and standard deviations indicating the number of times husbands and wives chose each destination for their awareness sets. We conducted a T-test to determine whether there were any significant differences between husbands and wives as to the mean number of times the destinations were chosen to be put in their respective awareness sets.

In the **evoked sets**, the first nine destinations for both men and women are the same with just a few differences in rank order. Men chose: Hawaii, Florida, Bahamas, Barbados and Mexico, California, Bermuda, Italy, Jamaica, Dominican Republic, Britain, Cuba and France, and finally Puerto Rico. Women chose: Hawaii, Bahamas, Barbados, Florida and Mexico, California, Bermuda and Jamaica, Italy, France, Britain, and finally Cuba, Puerto Rico as well as Dominican Republic all came in last.

Hawaii was agreed on as the first choice and Puerto Rico was the least often chosen destination by both men and women. These results suggest a high level of agreement with respect to the selection of a vacation destination.

In the Guttenberg (1987) study, there was less of a consensus: spouses did not agree on the first choice, men choosing California (75%) and women choosing Hawaii (55%). The ranking of the other destinations in the evoked set was also less consistent between husbands and wives.

We find a pattern of agreement similar to that of the evoked set in the **reject** set where men and women chose the five same destinations first to be put in this set. Men chose first in that order: Britain, Cuba, France and Puerto Rico as well as Dominican Republic. Women chose Cuba, Britain, Dominican Republic, France and Puerto Rico.

In the **hold set**, for both men and women the destination that was identified most often was Puerto Rico, tied with Dominican Republic for women. The destination identified least often was Florida for both men and women, tied with France for men.

In the **foggy set**, the destinations identified most often were Cuba for men and Dominican Republic for women. Those destinations would be the ones men and women know the least about. The destination chosen least often by both men and women was Hawaii, tied with Florida for men.

Looking at the actual frequency of destinations in each set for men and women, we see that there were just a few significant differences between spouses in each of the sets: in the evoked sets, of the fourteen destinations available, women chose Bermuda (p=.072), Hawaii (p=.057) and Jamaica (p=.023) significantly more often than did men. Although no statistical tests were conducted in the Guttenberg (1987) study as to the differences between men and women's mean choices, we can see large differences between the averages for some of the most often chosen destinations: California, 75% vs 48% for men and women respectively, Barbados 53% vs 63%, Bermuda 45% vs 53%, Florida 48% vs 33%.

In the reject sets, Cuba (p=.049) and Dominican Republic (p=.090) were chosen significantly more often by women and France (p=.090) was the only destination chosen significantly more often by men.

In the hold sets, the only differences were Bermuda (p=.030) and Jamaica (p=.033) being chosen by men significantly more often than by women. This finding is similar to that of the evoked set where the same destinations were chosen significantly more often by women.

In the foggy sets, Cuba (p=.066) and Florida (p=.020) were chosen significantly more often by men and these are the destinations they chose respectively most and least often for that set.

The intention ratings overall for each destination for men and women (Table 10) were compared to the frequency of destinations in the evoked set. The general pattern is the same: the destinations for which the intentions are among the highest for men and women are also the ones that are mentioned most often as part of the evoked sets. For men, intentions are highest for Florida, Hawaii, California and Bahamas. Hawaii, Florida and Bahamas were the destinations chosen most often by men for the evoked set. For women, intentions are highest for Florida, Hawaii, Bahamas and California. Hawaii, Bahamas, Barbados and Florida were the destinations chosen often by women for the evoked set.

The pattern was the same for intentions and the reject sets. For men, intentions are lowest for Britain, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico and Cuba. Britain, Cuba, France, Puerto Rico as well as Dominican Republic were the destinations rejected most often by men. For women, intentions are lowest for Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Britain. Cuba, Britain, Dominican Republic, France as well as Puerto Rico were the destinations rejected most often by women.

There were no significant differences between men and women's intentions for any of the destinations proposed. This result indicates a high level of agreement in terms of intentions towards specific destinations.

To summarize, even though the vacation decision is a joint one, the results indicate important differences between men and women when it comes to making a vacation decision. Women have a larger evoked set size. Men have more positive intentions towards the rejected destinations, better intentions towards the destinations in the hold set and finally, men have a consistently higher level of confidence in their evaluations than do women. Although attributes are ranked quite similarly in terms of importance by both men and women, six out of nine attributes are rated more highly by the wives.

There is also evidence of consensus though when we look at the perceived presence of the attributes in the awareness sets: it is ranked quite similarly with one or two differences in scores in some of the awareness sets. The importance ratings of attributes are quite similar and there is also evidence of agreement in terms of determinant attribute. There seemed also to be quite a bit of consensus in terms of the actual choice of destinations in each of the awareness sets, more so than in the Guttenberg (1987) study which may be due to the demographics of our sample reflecting many years of joint decision making. There were no differences between husband and wife intentions towards all vacation destinations.

2.1.6 Common/uncommon sets

The extent of agreement between couples on the presence of attributes in each of the sets were analyzed as well as size, attitude, intention and confidence for

these sets. The extent of agreement is the similarity in mean score ratings for common set elements. We look at each set and the destinations common to both spouses in each set. We then compare the scores the spouses give to each destinations on a number of criteria.

For each dimension analyzed, we conducted an analysis of variance to determine whether there were any significant differences among the means. When differences were found, we then conducted a Scheffé test to determine which pairs of means were significantly different.

Evoked set size

Table 11 lists the means and standard deviations for common and uncommon evoked sets for husbands and wives as well as F values and significant pairs of sets.

The mean number of elements common to both husbands and wives for the evoked set was 2.56. This number is quite large, more than 50% of the evoked set sizes of 3.89 and 4.33 for men and women respectively. Analysis of variance enabled us to determine that there was a significant difference (p=.03) among the set sizes. Through a Scheffé test, we found more specifically that the uncommon set score of wives was significantly larger than that of husbands. Husbands and wives have of course the same number of destinations in their common sets but the wives uncommon evoked set contains more destinations than that of husbands. This finding is logical and consistent in view of the fact

that women had a significantly larger evoked set size than men at the outset. In the Guttenberg (1987) study, the common evoked set size was also more than 50% of the respective evoked set sizes of husbands and wives. There were no statistical tests conducted in that study among the common/uncommon scores.

Evoked set attitude, intention and confidence

For attitude, intention and confidence common set scores in the evoked set, there are no significant differences between husbands and wives' scores. Both spouses have similar positive attitudes, intentions and confidence towards their common evoked set destinations.

However, when comparing the common set scores of husbands with their uncommon set scores for attitude and intentions, we find that the common scores are significantly higher ($p=0.00$) than the uncommon ones. The same pattern exists for wives' scores ($p=0.00$). These results indicate that the common evoked set destinations are truly the ones regrouping the most positive attitude and intention scores of all evoked set destinations identified by both spouses, thereby suggesting a high level of agreement.

In support of the above results, it was found also that husbands have significantly more positive attitudes and intentions toward common destinations than wives have toward their own uncommon destinations. The reverse is also true: wives' attitudes and intentions towards common destinations are

significantly more positive than husbands' attitudes and intentions towards their own uncommon destinations.

Looking now at the confidence scores, we mentioned earlier that men and women have a similar confidence level in the evaluations they gave to their common evoked set destinations. Men seem to benefit from a consistently higher level of confidence and therefore no difference was found between the confidence levels of their common and uncommon destinations. There was however, a significant difference between the common and uncommon confidence scores of women ($p=0.00$). There was also a significant difference between the husbands' confidence scores for the common destination and the wives' scores for the uncommon destination ($p=0.00$).

These results for the confidence scores are consistent with the overall confidence scores where men were significantly more confident than women about their evaluation of their evoked set destinations. Indeed, both spouses are equally confident about their evaluation of the destinations they commonly chose and the destinations women are less confident about are all regrouped in their uncommon evoked set.

Evoked set attributes

All of the attributes are perceived to be equally present in the evoked set destinations common to both spouses: there were no significant differences

found between men and women's perceived presence rating for any attribute for the common set. This again reflects a high level of agreement where both spouses perceive that all attributes are present to the same extent in the destinations on which they agree.

However, looking at the three highest rated attributes in terms of their perceived presence in the overall evoked set destinations of husbands and wives, we observe the following:

- The attribute *beautiful beaches* is perceived as significantly less present by the husbands in the destinations chosen by them only than in those common to both spouses (p=0.00). The same finding applies to destinations chosen by the wives only (p=0.00). Both husbands and wives perceive the attribute *beautiful beaches* to be more present in the commonly evoked destinations than in their respective uncommon destinations. Also, this same attribute is perceived as significantly more present by the wives in the common destinations than by the husbands in their uncommon destinations (p=0.00). Therefore, we can say that both husbands and wives chose common destinations that they perceive as offering very *beautiful beaches* (very high scores 6.11 and 6.16) but they both also chose other destinations (uncommon) where this attribute is somewhat less present. Husbands more specifically chose destinations that could be said to have a lower score for *beautiful beaches* since their perception of the beaches in their uncommon

destinations is also lower than that of the wives' perception of the common destinations.

- The attribute *nice and warm climate* is perceived as significantly less present by the wives in the destinations chosen by them alone than in those common to both spouses (p=0.00). Also, this same attribute is perceived as significantly more present by the wives in the common destinations than by the husbands in their uncommon destinations (p=0.00). Therefore, we can say that both husbands and wives chose common destinations that they perceive as offering very *nice and warm climate* (very high scores 6.15 and 6.25) but wives do not perceive the other destinations that are in their own uncommon set to have as *nice and warm a climate*. Husbands perceive all the destinations they placed in the evoked set to have an equally *nice and warm climate* but their perception of the climate of their uncommon destinations is lower than that of the wives' perception of the common destinations.
- The attribute *excellent quality accommodations* is perceived as significantly more present by the wives in the common destinations than by the husbands in their uncommon destinations (p=0.02). Therefore, we can say that both husbands and wives chose common destinations that they perceive as offering *excellent quality accommodations*. Also, both perceive all the destinations they respectively placed in the evoked set to have equally

excellent quality accommodations but the husbands' perception of the accommodations of their uncommon destinations is lower than that of the wives' perception of that attribute in the common destinations.

These findings indicate a high level of agreement in both spouses' attitudes and intentions towards the evoked set common destinations as well as with respect to the presence of all of the various attributes in these destinations. Possible sources of conflict could occur with respect to *excellent quality accommodations, beautiful beaches* and *nice and warm climate* only if the vacation destination was not commonly chosen for the evoked set.

In six attributes out of nine, there is also agreement as to the presence of the attributes in the uncommon destinations. So even though spouses do not agree on certain actual destinations, they are nevertheless not in total disagreement as to the profile of an evoked set destination.

Reject set size

Table 12 lists the means and standard deviations for common and uncommon reject sets for husbands and wives as well as F values and significant pairs of sets.

The size of the common reject set is 2.50, compared to overall reject sizes of 3.69 and 3.64 for husbands and wives respectively. There are no significant differences among the common and uncommon set sizes.

Reject set attitude, intention and confidence

For attitude, intention and confidence common set scores in the reject set, there are no significant differences between husbands and wives' scores. Both spouses have similar attitudes, intentions and confidence towards their common reject set destinations.

However, it was found that husbands gave significantly higher attitude ($p=0.01$) and intention ($p=0.00$) scores to their uncommon destinations than wives gave to common destinations. Husbands probably are more positive towards the destinations that only they rejected than wives are towards the destinations they commonly rejected. This pattern with respect to intention scores at least, is consistent with the overall results where husbands had significantly more positive intention towards the rejected destinations than wives did: the destinations the husbands were most positive about are probably in the uncommon set.

Looking now at the confidence ratings, we find no differences for the scores relating to the destinations commonly rejected by the spouses nor for the destinations rejected by them individually. They are equally confident about their ratings. The higher confidence level of men identified in the overall reject set results is diluted among all destinations.

Reject set attributes

All of the attributes are perceived to be equally present in the reject set destinations common to both spouses: there were no significant differences found between men and women's perceived presence rating for any attribute for the common set. This again reflects a high level of agreement where both spouses perceive that all attributes are present to the same extent in the destinations they reject.

The attribute *exciting night life* is perceived as significantly more present by the husbands in the destinations rejected by them only than in those commonly rejected by the spouses (p=0.02).

The same findings apply to the attribute *excellent cuisine* (p=0.00). The destinations rejected by men only were perceived by them as having more *excellent cuisine* than the destinations them and their wives agreed to reject. Also, husbands perceived their uncommon destinations to have significantly more *excellent cuisine* (p=0.00) than wives did in their common destinations. These findings are consistent with the overall results that indicated *excellent cuisine* to be perceived as significantly more present in the destinations rejected by the husbands than those rejected by the wives. The rejected destinations where *excellent cuisine* is perceived as being most present by the husbands are probably concentrated in their uncommon reject sets.

Again, in the reject set we find a high level of agreement as to the spouses' attitudes, intentions and confidence towards the commonly rejected destinations

as well as with respect to the presence of all of the various attributes in these destinations.

Hold set size

Table 13 lists the means and standard deviations for common and uncommon hold sets for husbands and wives as well as F values and significant pairs of sets.

The results indicate that the size of the common set is significantly smaller (p=0.00) than the uncommon ones. Husbands and wives had few common destinations to place in this set (1.74).

Hold set attitude, intention and confidence

For attitude, intention and confidence common set scores in the hold set, there are no significant differences between husbands and wives' scores. Both spouses have similar attitudes, intentions and confidence towards their common hold set destinations.

However, husbands' attitude scores towards destinations in their uncommon set were significantly higher (p=0.00) than the wives' attitude scores in their own uncommon set. These findings are consistent with the overall attitude ratings for the hold set where husbands had significantly more positive attitudes than their wives towards the destinations in their hold set.

Husbands' confidence scores towards destinations in their uncommon set were significantly lower (p=0.00) than all other common/uncommon sets: lower than their own scores for the common set, lower than their wives' confidence scores in their own uncommon set and finally lower than their wives common destinations. These findings combined with the fact that the overall scores (Table 7) indicated that husbands were significantly more confident than their wives of the evaluations in the hold set, indicate that men exhibit the lowest level of confidence towards the destination in their uncommon set relative to all other hold common or uncommon sets evaluated by themselves and their wives.

Hold set attributes

All of the attributes are perceived to be equally present in the hold set destinations common to both spouses: there were no significant differences found between men and women's perceived presence rating for any attribute for the common set. Nor were there any differences between the ratings for the uncommon sets as well as among the common and uncommon sets. This again reflects a high level of agreement where both spouses perceive that all attributes are present to the same extent in the destinations they chose to put in the hold set.

Foggy set size

Table 14 lists the means and standard deviations for common and uncommon foggy sets for husbands and wives as well as F values and significant pairs of sets.

The results indicate that there is no significant difference among the sizes of the common set and the uncommon sets for both husbands and wives.

Foggy set attitude, intention and confidence

The results indicate that husbands and wives have a similar attitude towards and are equally confident about their evaluation of the destinations in the foggy set. With respect to intentions, there are no significant differences between husbands and wives' intentions towards the destinations in the common foggy sets, but husbands' intentions are significantly ($p=0.00$) more positive towards the destinations in their uncommon foggy set than in their common foggy set as well as the wives' common foggy sets. So both husbands and wives have less positive intentions towards their common destinations in the foggy set than the husbands' have towards the destinations in their uncommon foggy sets.

Foggy set attributes

Husbands and wives agree about the presence of all attributes in the destinations common to both in the foggy set. Also, there were no differences found among their respective common sets and uncommon sets. At attribute

level, the ratings are similar for all destinations in all foggy sets, except for *beautiful beaches*, where wives' scores are significantly less positive for the destinations in their common foggy set than husbands' scores for the destinations in their own uncommon foggy set.

Husbands perceive the destinations in their uncommon sets to have more *beautiful beaches* than wives' perceive the destinations in their common set to have. This pattern is similar to that of the intentions towards these same destinations. Therefore, husbands intentions towards their uncommon destinations might be higher than wives' towards their common destinations because of their higher perceived presence of the attribute *beautiful beaches.*

The lack of variance in these results is surprising because these destinations cannot be evaluated on salient criteria for lack of information. One possible explanation is that the respondents used the middle of the scale to indicate neutrality.

To summarize, it is interesting to note that there is no significant difference between husbands and wives' common set scores for either attitude, intention, confidence or the perceived presence of any of the attributes in the common destinations in any of the sets, evoked, reject, foggy or hold. Therefore, the destinations that couples agree on in any of the sets are perceived similarily on the attributes evaluated and both spouses have the same intentions, attitudes

towards these destinations as well as the same confidence level in their evaluations. The common sets always represent more than half the destinations in the total set.

In addition, we see a high level of agreement with respect to the uncommon sets and the differences identified were mostly consistent with the overall ratings. Interestingly, men's higher intentions towards destinations in the overall reject set were singled out to be only relevant to the destinations that were not common to both spouses. The same finding applies to men's more positive attitude in the hold set; it was pertinent only to those destinations chosen by them alone.

Even when spouses do not necessarily agree on the destination to be placed in one set or the other, they seem to agree on the overall profile (attributes) of this destination. This again indicates a high level of agreement on the criteria and overall perceptions vis-à-vis the choice of a vacation destination.

The largest number of differences were identified between spouses' common and uncommon evoked sets. This is a logical finding since this set was the largest of the four. Also, it is probably the set that regroups the destination that respondents know most about, thereby allowing for very precise evaluations.

2.2 Sex role attitude

Sharp and Mott conducted a study on family vacation decisions in 1956 and found that the final decision was consensual. Cunningham and Green replicated

the Sharp and Mott study in 1974 and found this type of decision to be even more consensual. Cunningham and Green explained the results of their comparative study by suggesting that many trends may be at work in purchasing decision roles.

In 1977, Scanzoni investigated sex role attitudes and discussed potential conflicts that emerge from changing sex roles. He concluded at that time that women were likely to alter their decision making process as they shift their interests to include extra-familial goals. Spiro in his 1983 study on strategies used by spouses in making joint decisions, concluded that sex role traditional spouses have more defined roles and hence the use of concession is acceptable. Finally, in 1987, Qualls looked at household sex orientation as the underlying force driving decision behavior within the household. Most of the evidence this author gathered suggested that sex role orientation plays an important role in the decision making process. However, Qualls pointed out that there were still some unanswered questions.

Therefore, we isolated respondents' sex role attitudes and we will attempt to determine whether it is a variable that can affect couples' decision making pattern in a vacation decision context.

2.2.1 Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis was conducted to regroup the couples according to their SRA scores. Ward's method was used to calculate the distance among the clusters. Table 15 shows a summary of the results for the two, three, four and five cluster solutions. In all these solutions, there is a significant difference among the groups on both HSRA (husband sex role attitude) and WSRA (wife sex role attitude) variables. In order to determine the optimal number of clusters with respect to SRA, we examined the changes in the average F-ratio (average between-group variance divided by average within-group variance) from one solution to the next (Kim, Laroche and Lee, 1990). As can be seen from table 15, the drop in F ratio from the two group solution to the three group solution is substantial whereas the drop from the two group to the four and five group solutions is much less important. This trend indicates that as the number of clusters increases beyond three, considerably smaller amounts of between-group variance relative to within-group variance are explained. The four and five cluster solutions therefore include clusters that are much less distinct than those in the three-group solution. The clusters in the three-group solution all contain at least 10% of the sample. The three-group solution was therefore identified as the most representative of husband and wife sex role attitude: traditional, average and modern, based on their average SRA scores.

Table 15

No of clusters	2	3	4	5
Cluster size	177, 115	49, 128, 115	49, 128, 54, 61	49, 46, 82, 54, 61
Univariate F ratios*				
HSRA	458.86	421.02	287.63	348.72
WSRA	222.49	165.98	226.07	309.06
Average F ratios	328.41	254.47	256.79	273.72

**All F ratios are significant (p=.000)*

To test for differences among the clusters on various measures of the evoked, reject, foggy and hold sets for men and women (hypothesis 5), we used a factorial ANOVA design that identified whether there was a significant difference among the group means. We also conducted Chi Square tests in order to identify possible covariates. Variables education, age, income and culture were defined as covariates. Analysis of covariance was used to test hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 6 , with the same covariates.

The first cluster comprises couples where both spouses have the most *modern* attitude in terms of sex roles within the family. The third cluster comprises couples who have the opposite attitude: they are the most *traditional* in their attitudes towards the spouses' roles. In the middle we have another cluster which regroups couples who are on the fence: they do not have a clear

orientation that is totally modern or traditional. They might be one or the other on certain issues and totally in the middle for other issues. Furthermore, we could find in this cluster some couples where one spouse will be generally a little more traditional and the other will tend to be more modern. The three clusters were therefore identified as follows: *modern, average and traditional.*

2.2.2 Perception of decision influence

Davis (1970) in his study on husband and wife role in purchasing decisions found that one of the bases of role differentiation was the nature of the decision. Jenkins (1978) came to the same conclusion when he investigated family vacation decision making and found that the dominance of either spouse depended on the sub-decision. We will now consider the pattern of husband-wife influence across several sub-decisions, taking into account spouses' sex role attitudes.

We hypothesized that perceptions of decision influence are related to sex role attitudes and that, based on Spiro's conclusion, whether the couples have a more traditional or modern sex role attitude will reflect on their perceptions of whether the decision is made by 1) *the husband*, 2) *the husband more than the wife*, 3) *equally*, 4) *the wife more than the husband* or 5) *the wife.*

We analyzed the results of the perception of decision influence question by comparing the clusters first on husbands' perception of each decision and then on wives' perception. Each spouse had to indicate whom they felt decided on

seven vacation decisions. The decisions were: *when, where, what features to look for, how much to spend, how long to go for, form of transportation* and *type of accommodation.* We used an analysis of covariance to test for differences among the means.

Husbands perceptions

Table 16 indicates the means, standard deviation and F values for each of the decisions as perceived by the husband. All means revolve around 3 (2.68 to 3.22); there are no indications of extremes where some decisions would be perceived to be made totally by one spouse or the other.

All means in all clusters are lower than or just slightly higher than three, the highest ones being 3.22 (*where to go*, average cluster) as well as 3.19 and 3.16 (*when to go* and *type of accommodation*, modern cluster). This trend would indicate that most decisions are perceived by the husbands to be made more by themselves or equally by both spouses. This trend is more evident in the traditional cluster which has the lowest means on five out of the seven decisions, except for *where to go* and *how much to spend.*

The only two significant differences among the clusters are first for the decision of *when to go* on vacation, the means increasing as the clusters go from traditional to modern. Husbands perceive the decision influence to be moving away from them towards the wife as the couples become more modern in their sex role attitude. There is also a significant difference among the three clusters

for the decision *what features to look for.* The highest mean is calculated for the average husbands, followed by the modern then the traditional husbands. The traditional husbands feel the decision is influenced more by themselves than by their wives when it comes to identifying *what features to look for* in a vacation destination.

Wives perceptions

Looking at the same decisions in the same couples as perceived by the wives (Table 17), we see that the mean scores revolve around three (2.77 to 3.19) as was the case for the husbands. We observe the same trends and the highest means are 3.19 (*what features to look for*, average cluster) as well as 3.19 and 3.17 (*type of accommodation,* modern and average clusters).

There is only one significant difference among the clusters and that is for the decision *when to go*, the highest score being in the modern cluster and the lowest in the average cluster. Wives perceive the decision influence to be equal in the couples with more modern sex role attitude.

Overall, we observe that, in the traditional cluster, wives' mean scores are higher than those of the husbands meaning perhaps that traditional wives perceive they have more influence than is perceived by their husbands.

Most decisions are perceived by both husbands and wives as being either slightly more influenced by the husband or equally influenced by both and that is the case for all sex role attitudes. Indeed, looking at frequencies of husbands' and wives' perception of influence on each decision, we find than in all cases at least 50% of spouses perceived the decisions as being equally influenced by both of them in all three clusters. These results partially confirm those of the Jenkins (1978) study where neither husbands nor wives perceived the wife as being the dominant influence in any vacation decision. However, in that same study, husbands and wives perceived they had equal influence in deciding the mode of transportation and selecting the lodging whereas in the current study selection of transportation is a decision perceived to be made more by the husbands (all mean scores below 3) and selection of accommodations is perceived as a more egalitarian decision. Also, the respondents in the Jenkins study perceived the husband to be dominant in decisions about the length of vacation and the date of the vacation. No such " dominance " has been identified in the present study.

Looking at the results per cluster, we do observe however differences for two decisions among the traditional, average and modern spouses: husbands and wives both perceive the decision of *when to go* to be under a different influence depending on the sex role attitude. But the trend is not the same: husbands perception of decision influence for this decision is that the more modern the couple, the more the decision is influenced by the wives. The wives perception

however is that modern and traditional couples influence the decision equally and the average couple is influenced more by the husband.

The other decision exhibiting a difference among the different sex role attitudes is *what features to look for* where the husbands' perception is that modern and traditional couples influence the decision equally and the average couple is influenced slightly more by the wife.

This hypotheses is supported. It would seem that sex role attitudes do have a relationship with perceptions of decision influence although the trend is not clear.

2.2.3 Influence sharing

Cunningham and Green in their 1974 study on purchasing roles found that some decisions had merged and some had become specialized (more concentrated with the wife or with the husband). They speculated that the increased specialization in purchasing roles might be the result of increasing complexities of modern life and that conversely, the tendency towards joint decision making may reflect increased egalitarianism. Also, we refer again to Spiro's (1983) conclusions that sex role traditional spouses have more defined roles.

By grouping together decisions more concentrated with either of the spouses, we will attempt to identify whether spouses perceive there is role specialization with either husband or wife, or influence sharing across the various sex role attitudes.

Our third hypotheses was that perceptions of influence sharing are related to sex role attitudes. Whether the couples have a more traditional or modern sex role attitude will reflect on their perceptions of whether the decision is made by only one of the spouses or both equally. To test the influence sharing hypotheses, we recoded the spousal influence scale in section 2 of the questionnaire as follows: *husband* (1) and *wife* (5) anchors of the scale were recoded *as "one spouse dominant"*, *husband more than wife* (2) and *wife more than husband* (4) were recoded as "*a little influence sharing*" and *equally* (3) was simply renamed "*egalitarian*". We looked at the same seven decisions(*when, where, what features to look for, how much to spend, how long to go for, form of transportation* and *type of accommodation),* and using analysis of covariance, we attempted to determine whether husbands' and wives' perception of influence sharing was different according to their sex role attitude.

Husbands' perceptions

In Table 18, husbands' means scores, standard deviations and F values are indicated per cluster.

The means of all decisions are between 2.35 and 2.88: husbands perception of influence sharing are well away from being one spouse dominant in all three clusters. They vary between a little influence sharing and egalitarianism.

We found that for four decisions, *when, where, what features* and *how long,* there is a significant difference among the clusters ($p<.05$). In all four cases, the

husbands' perception of influence sharing is closer to egalitarian as the couples go from traditional to modern. The trend is the same for the means of the other decisions but without any significant differences.

Wives perceptions

In Table 19, wives' means scores, standard deviations and F values are indicated per cluster.

All means are between 2.36 and 2.89: wives perception of influence sharing are also not at all one spouse dominant in any cluster. They also vary between a little influence sharing and egalitarianism.

Four decisions show significant differences among the clusters. The four decisions are *where* ($p<.001$), *what features* ($p<.10$), *how much to spend* ($p<.10$) and *type of accommodation* ($p<.05$). In all four cases, there are small differences between the average and traditional clusters, but the modern cluster exhibits the most difference, always indicating a more egalitarian approach to those decisions. The same trend is apparent in the three other decisions but not significantly so.

Influence sharing is perceived by both spouses, in general to vary between a little influence sharing and egalitarianism. There is a trend indicating that influence is perceived as more egalitarian by the more modern couples generally in all decisions with significant differences for six decisions out of seven.

However, it is interesting to note that the decisions where the wives perceive a difference based on sex role attitudes are not all the same as the ones where the husbands perceive a difference: both spouses share the same perceptions of decision influence only for *where to go* and *what features to look for* in the three clusters.

The decision as to *what form of transportation to use* seems to transcend both spouses perceptions and all clusters, as it is the only one where neither husbands nor wives answers indicate differences based on sex role attitudes. Perhaps this is because there are less alternatives involved in this type of decision and it is also somewhat a function of the destination. Therefore, decision making is probably less influenced by other factors.

As it would seem that there is a relationship between perceived influence sharing and sex role attitudes, this hypothesis is supported. The results would seem to indicate that as couples' sex role attitudes go from traditional to modern, decision making moves from being somewhat specialized to egalitarian. These findings support Qualls' (1987) conclusions that sex role attitudes play a major role in family decision making and Spiro's (1983) conclusions that spouses with traditional sex role attitudes have more defined roles .

2.2.3.1 Influence sharing perceptions within clusters

In an attempt to explore further the relationship between sex role attitudes and decision making, we looked at the clusters individually and analyzed each of the

seven decisions as a function of sex role attitudes of husbands and wives. We conducted a multiple regression analysis with the perception of influence sharing of husbands and wives on each decision as the dependent variable and their sex role attitudes as independent variables. We included the variable culture as another independent variable because of its possible impact on the results of the regression (covariate).

Modern cluster - wives' perception of influence sharing

The results for the analysis of the wives' perception of influence sharing in the modern cluster show that there is only one significant relationship and that is between the decision *when to go* and sex role attitude. The F value is significant ($p<.10$) and the coefficient of determination is .07. The beta coefficient of wives' sex role attitude in the equation is also significant ($p<.05$) and positive.

Therefore, in the modern cluster, the more wives' sex role attitudes are modern, the more they perceive the influence sharing in deciding *when to go* to be egalitarian. This is an interesting result as there were no differences among the clusters for sex role attitudes for this specific decision as perceived by women. Wives, in general, perceive this decision to be somewhere between a little shared influence and egalitarian, but modern wives themselves perceive this decision as more egalitarian, as they become more modern.

Modern cluster - husbands' perception of influence sharing

There were no significant regression results for the husbands' perception of influence sharing in the modern cluster.

Average cluster - wives' perception of influence sharing

We found no significant relationships with wives' perception of influence sharing as the dependent variable in the average cluster.

Average cluster -husbands' perception of influence sharing

There were two significant relationships observed in this cluster: *where to go* and *how much to spend.* The results indicate a relationship between the husbands' perception of influence sharing for the decision *where to go* and sex role attitudes. The F values is significant ($p<.01$) and the coefficient of determination is .08. The beta coefficient for wives' sex role attitude is significant ($p<.001$) and negative, indicating an inverse relationship with husbands' perception of influence sharing on this decision.

Therefore, in the average cluster, the more wives' sex role attitudes tend to be traditional, the more husbands perceive the influence sharing in *deciding where to go* to be egalitarian and vice versa. This is not an unusual finding in this particular cluster since it will tend to regroup couples who are more on the fence as to their sex roles attitudes compared to the couples in the other clusters who

will be more at the extremes, modern or traditional. It is even possible to find a couple where both spouses will have different sex role attitudes.

The results also indicate a relationship between the husbands' perception of influence sharing for the decision *how much to spend* and sex role attitudes. The F values is significant ($p<.10$) and the coefficient of determination is .03. The beta coefficient for husbands' sex role attitude is significant ($p<.05$) and positive. Therefore, in the average cluster, the more husband's sex role attitudes are modern, the more they perceive the influence sharing in deciding *how much to spend* to be egalitarian. Again, there were no differences across the clusters for sex role attitudes for this specific decision as perceived by men. Husbands, in general, perceive this decision to be somewhere between a little shared influence and egalitarian, but husbands with average sex role attitudes themselves perceive this decision as more egalitarian, as they become more modern.

Traditional cluster - wives' perception of influence sharing

The results indicate two significant relationships for the following decisions: *how long to go for* and *type of accommodation.* For the decision *how long to go for,* the significance of the F value is $p<.001$. The coefficient of determination is 0.18. Both beta coefficients are significant and positive: wives' sex role attitude ($p<.01$) and husbands' sex role attitude ($p<.05$).

Therefore, in the traditional cluster, the less wives and husband's sex role attitudes are traditional, the more wives perceive the influence sharing in deciding *how long to go for* to be egalitarian. There were no significant differences among the clusters identified for this decision as perceived by the wives.

For the decision *type of accommodation,* the significance of the F value is $p<.05$. The coefficient of determination is 0.05. Husbands' sex role attitude beta coefficient is significant and positive ($p<.10$). Therefore, in the traditional cluster, the less wives' sex role attitudes are traditional, the more they perceive the influence sharing in deciding *type of accommodation* to be egalitarian. There were significant differences among the clusters on this decision, the modern cluster being the one where this decision was perceived as most egalitarian by the wives, with the traditional cluster in second place.

Traditional cluster - husbands' perception of influence sharing

The results indicate only one significant relationship between the husbands' perception of influence sharing for the decision *how much to spend* and sex role attitudes. The F value is significant ($p<.05$) and the coefficient of determination is .06. The beta coefficient for husbands' sex role attitude is significant ($p<.01$) and positive. Therefore, in the traditional cluster, the less husband's sex role attitudes are traditional, the more they perceive the influence sharing in deciding

how much to spend to be egalitarian. There were no significant differences among the clusters identified for this decision as perceived by the husbands.

We have established that there are relationships between sex role attitudes and perceptions of influence sharing within the clusters on certain decisions even when there were no significant differences among the clusters on those same decisions. With the exception of the sub-decision *where to go* as perceived by husbands in the average cluster, all relationships indicate a trend to more egalitarian decision making as couples' sex role attitudes become more modern. It should be noted however that in the cases where relationships do exist within the clusters, sex role attitudes are not the only explanatory factors of perceptions of influence sharing and they explain only a very small part of the variance.

2.2.4 Discrepancy in husband and wife attribute importance rating per cluster

Scanzoni (1977) summarizes and discusses the issue that changing sex roles are impacting family decision making. He points out for instance, that gender modern women are including extra familial goals in their priorities. There are fewer spontaneous consensus, reflecting women's individual new set of concerns and issues. The importance given by gender modern spouses to

various attributes in a given decision context might reflect more individual priorities.

Therefore, we hypothesize that there is a relationship between husbands' and wives' attribute importance ratings and couples' sex role attitude. As spouses become more modern, the importance ratings given to the various vacation destination attributes should differ more between spouses than in more traditional couples.

We first attempted to determine whether there was a difference among the clusters as to the level of agreement between spouses on the importance of certain criteria of selection for a vacation destination. We computed the absolute difference between husbands and wives in the importance ratings of the nine criteria used to evaluate the vacation destinations. We then compared the mean differences among the clusters by way of analysis of covariance.

The means, standard deviations and F values are shown per cluster in Table 20. The means varied between 0.62 and 1.87 computed from differences between scores on a scale of 1 to 7. Looking at the frequencies of all absolute differences in the ratings of the importance attributes by husbands and wives, we find that for all attributes, at least 50 percent of the spouses either totally agree or only have a difference of 1 in their evaluations. We found no significant differences among the clusters. Traditional and modern couples equally agree or disagree on the importance of certain vacation criteria.

2.2.4.1 Discrepancy in husband and wife attribute importance rating within clusters

We also did a regression analysis to determine if within the clusters, there was a relationship between the absolute difference in importance ratings of spouses and their sex role attitudes.

The dependent variable was the absolute difference in importance ratings of spouses and the independent variables were husbands' and wives' sex role attitudes and culture.

Modern cluster

We found one significant relationship between the absolute difference in importance ratings for the criteria *chance to meet people* and spouses sex role attitudes. The F value is significant at $p<.01$ and the coefficient of determination is 0.18. The beta coefficient for the variable husbands' sex role attitude is significant at $p<.001$ and positive whereas the beta coefficient for the variable wives' sex role attitude is not significant.

Therefore, in the modern cluster, the larger the difference in importance rating of the attribute *chance to meet people*, the more the husband is modern.

We also found one significant relationship between the absolute difference in importance ratings for the criteria *excellent quality accommodations* and spouses

sex role attitudes. The F value is significant at $p<.05$ and the coefficient of determination is 0.14. The beta coefficient for the variable husbands' sex role attitude is significant at $p<.05$ and positive. Therefore, the larger the difference in importance rating of the attribute *excellent quality accommodations*, the more the husband is modern.

Average cluster

We found no significant relationships between the absolute difference in importance ratings and spouses sex role attitudes.

Traditional cluster

We found one significant relationship between the absolute difference in importance ratings for the criteria *exciting night life* and spouses sex role attitudes. The F value is significant at $p<.05$ and the coefficient of determination is 0.067. The beta coefficient for the variable wives' sex role attitude is significant at $p<.01$ and positive.

Therefore, in the traditional cluster, the smaller the difference in importance rating of the attribute *exciting night life,* the more traditional the wives are.

Although we found no significant difference between the different levels of importance spouses give to various vacation attributes among the clusters, we did find some relationships within the modern and traditional clusters that

indicate sex role attitudes do have some impact on the level of importance given to certain vacation attributes. This hypothesis is supported.

It is interesting that the differences are found not between couples who have different sex role attitudes, but rather between spouses who have somewhat different sex role attitudes (but are grouped under the same cluster, i.e. modern or traditional). This would indicate first that spouses who have similar sex role attitudes (whether it is traditional or modern) tend to equally agree or disagree on the importance of attributes. Second, differences in importance ratings in a specific cluster are related to a difference in sex role attitudes, one spouse tending to be more modern than the other.

2.2.5 Mean size, attitude, intention and confidence scores per cluster

Each individual's attitudes, intentions and confidence level are different towards each awareness set of brands (Laroche, 1985). In the context of a family decision such as a travel destination, Woodside and Sherrell (1977) noted that attitudes might differ from the expected awareness set pattern because of spousal interaction. One spouse might want to visit one destination and be overruled by the other who does not .

Scanzoni (1977) discussed the relationship between sex role attitudes and family decision making. Spousal interactions are changing and many decision making areas are impacted, among other consumption and leisure time activities. Women's priorities are more present in these decisions and gender modern

spouses might have a different approach to certain family decisions thereby impacting the awareness set profile.

Therefore, we hypothesize that there will be a difference in the overall profile of the awareness sets (attitude, intention, confidence and size) between couples with different sex role attitudes, reflecting a change in spousal interaction.

Evoked sets

Table 21 lists the means and standard deviations for evoked set size, attitude, intention and confidence for both spouses in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

Looking at the mean size, attitude, intention and confidence towards the destinations in the evoked sets for husbands and wives by cluster, we find one significant difference **among the clusters** for evoked set size ($p<.01$). The traditional cluster shows the smallest mean evoked set size for both husbands and wives, followed by those of the modern and average clusters respectively.

There are also two significant differences **between spouses**: size ($p<.05$) and confidence ($p<.05$). Consistently with the overall results (Table 6), wives have a significantly larger evoked set size than their husbands, the largest mean difference being in the traditional cluster. Again consistently with the overall

results (Table 6), husbands have a significantly larger mean confidence score than their wives, the largest difference being in the modern cluster.

Reject sets

Table 22 lists the means and standard deviations for reject set size, attitude, intention and confidence for both spouses in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

There are no significant differences **among clusters or between spouses** for reject set measures of size, attitude or intentions. Intention ratings in the modern cluster are somewhat lower for both spouses than in other clusters but not significantly so.

There is a significant difference **among the clusters** ($p<.10$) for the mean confidence scores of the reject sets. The modern cluster shows the highest mean confidence for the husbands and for the wives and the traditional cluster shows the lowest means for both spouses respectively.

Looking now at the differences **between the spouses**, the results indicate that there is also a significant difference between the spouses' s confidence scores ($p<.01$). These findings are consistent with the overall results (Table 6). The modern cluster shows the highest difference between husbands and wives'

mean scores. Modern spouses are more confident than traditional ones about their evaluation of the rejected destinations. Also, husbands are more confident than wives about these same evaluations.

Hold sets

Table 23 lists the means and standard deviations for hold set size, attitude, intention and confidence for both spouses in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

There is a significant difference in the size of the hold sets **among clusters** ($p<.10$). The larger mean sets are found in the modern cluster and the smallest are in the traditional one. The more modern the couples, the larger the number of destinations they do not consider as immediate vacation alternatives. Since attitudes are similar among clusters, the increase in set size as the couples go from traditional to modern may be attributable to other causes such as lack of information on salient attributes. Perhaps modern couples have a higher need for information and will more readily put aside a destination pending the right information.

The other difference **among the clusters** is in the mean confidence scores ($p<.01$). The modern cluster has a higher mean than the other two clusters which have similar mean confidence scores.

Looking now at the differences **between the spouses**, the results indicate that they differ in their mean attitude towards the destination in the hold set ($p<.05$), husband having a more positive attitude than their wives consistently with the overall results. The largest difference is in the modern cluster.

So spouses who have a more modern sex role attitude have a larger hold set and are more confident about their evaluation of the destinations in the hold set. Also, husbands have a more positive attitude about the destinations in that set than do the wives.

Foggy sets

Table 24 lists the means and standard deviations for foggy set size, attitude, intention and confidence for both spouses in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

The only significant difference found at the level of the foggy set is again for the confidence scores **between the spouses** ($p<.05$), consistently with the overall results. Husbands are more confident about their evaluation of the destinations they know very little about than their wives.

The hypothesis is partially supported: there is a relationship between sex role attitudes and measures of size and confidence. The more modern couples have more confidence in their evaluations of the reject and hold sets and have a larger hold set size. The traditional couples have a smaller evoked set size than average and modern couples. No differences were found among sex role attitudes in the foggy sets.

2.2.6 Evaluation of attributes per cluster

We also attempted to identify whether there was a relationship between sex role attitudes and the profile of the destinations couples put in their awareness sets.

Evoked sets

Table 25 lists the means and standard deviations for both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their evoked set in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

The results show that **among the clusters**, there are five attributes which spouses see as being significantly more or less present in the destinations they chose for their evoked sets. In other words, whether the couple is modern or

traditional will have some impact of the profile of the destinations they select for a vacation destination.

The more modern the couple is, the more *exciting night life* ($p<.05$) and *excellent quality accommodations* ($p<.10$) are perceived to be present in their chosen destinations. Inversely, the more traditional the spouses, the more present is the attribute *low cost* ($p<.001$). The attribute *excellent cuisine* has the highest mean presence in the modern cluster, followed by the traditional cluster and finally the average cluster ($p<.05$). The attribute *excellent shopping facilities* ($p<.05$) was given the highest mean score by the modern couples. The two other clusters gave it almost the same lower mean score.

Modern couples therefore chose destinations where they perceived more *exciting night life, excellent quality accommodations, excellent cuisine* and *excellent shopping facilities* while attributing less importance to the *cost* of the trip.

The only difference **between the spouses** within the clusters is consistent with the results of the overall scores: *excellent cuisine* is perceived as being more present by husbands than wives in the chosen destinations ($p<.05$). The largest mean difference is between the ratings of the spouses of the traditional cluster.

Reject sets

Table 26 lists the means and standard deviations for both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their reject set in each of the three clusters. Also it

lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

The only significant difference **among the clusters** was for the attribute *chance to meet people* which is perceived as significantly more present ($p<.10$) in the destinations rejected by modern spouses than traditional ones. Modern spouses are less interested in meeting people on vacation than are more traditional couples.

Consistently with the overall results, there were two attributes which showed a significant difference **between spouses**: *excellent cuisine* ($p<.10$) and *excellent shopping facilities* ($p<.05$). In both cases, spouses in the modern clusters exhibit the largest mean differences.

Hold sets

Table 27 lists the means and standard deviations for both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their hold set in each of the three clusters. Also it lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

The only difference **among the clusters** for the hold sets was for the attribute *beautiful beaches* which is perceived as significantly more present ($p<.05$) in the destinations identified by modern spouses than traditional ones. And

consistently with the overall results, this attribute showed a significant difference **between spouses** ($p<.10$). The husbands scored this attribute higher than their wives. The largest mean difference is between the spouses of the modern cluster.

As mentioned earlier, modern couples probably place some destinations in the hold set that they perceive as having *beautiful beaches* but also some other attribute that they are less keen about or not measured in the present survey. In line with the previous findings about the hold set size, it is possible that modern couples are more discriminatory about a destination that has *beautiful beaches* than more traditional couples. Therefore, they might require more information on this destination before putting it in the evoked set.

The attribute *excellent cuisine* attribute showed a significant difference **between spouses** ($p<.05$). The wives scored this attribute higher than their husbands in the average and traditional clusters but lower than their husbands in the modern cluster. The overall results also indicated a significant difference between spouses, wives scoring *excellent cuisine* lower than their husbands.

Foggy sets

Table 28 lists the means and standard deviations for both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their foggy set in each of the three clusters. Also it

lists F values for both factors, cluster and spouse. There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and spouses, were independent from one another.

We find three attributes on which the **clusters** differ: *exciting night life* ($p<.10$), *excellent quality accommodations* ($p<.10$) and *excellent sports facilities* ($p<.10$). The highest means for all three attributes are found in the modern cluster. So the more modern spouses perceive the destinations they know little about to have more of the above attributes than spouses from the other clusters. Since very little brand comprehension exists in this set by definition, it is possible that the perception of the presence of these attributes might be the result of a simple association with known and desirable destinations in the evoked set since we find significant differences on two of the same attributes in the evoked set modern cluster as well.

There were no significant differences **between the spouses** on their perception of the presence of these attributes in the foggy sets.

There is a relationship between sex role attitudes and the profile of the destinations couples put in their awareness sets: modern couples chose vacation destinations where they perceived more *exciting night life, excellent quality accommodations, excellent cuisine* and *excellent shopping facilities* while

attributing less importance to the *cost* of the trip; also, modern spouses seem to be less interested in meeting people on vacation than more traditional couples.

2.2.7 Common sets per cluster

We investigated earlier the level of agreement between spouses by looking at common and uncommon overall sets and found a high level of agreement in common sets and even in uncommon ones (Tables 11 to 14). We also found relationships between sex role attitudes and spouses' effects attributable to sex role attitudes and measures of size and confidence as well as destination profile (Tables 21 to 28).

We will now examine the results of a covariance analysis that takes into account both the common and uncommon sets and the sex role attitude of the spouses. We will attempt to determine whether there is any interaction between the effects of the sex role attitudes and the groups of awareness sets.

1. Evoked sets

Tables 29 A and B list, per cluster, the means and standard deviations for size, attitude, intention and confidence as well as both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their common and uncommon evoked set. Also, they list F values for both factors, cluster and common/uncommon sets.

There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and groups, were independent from one another.

There is a significant difference in common/uncommon set sizes **among the clusters** (sex role attitudes) with the lowest mean score in the traditional cluster ($p<.05$).

The results also indicate significant differences at attribute level **among the clusters**:

- *exciting night life* ($p<.01$), *excellent quality accommodations* ($p<.05$), *excellent cuisine* ($p<.01$), *excellent shopping facilities* ($p<.01$); these attributes are all perceived as more present in the modern cluster than in the other two, consistently with the results of the analysis at attribute level per cluster in Table 25.
- *low cost* ($p<.05$) has higher mean scores in the traditional cluster and is perceived as more present in the destinations chosen by the traditional couples than the others, consistently with the results of the analysis in Table 25.
- *chance to meet people* ($p<.01$) has the highest mean score in the average and modern clusters and the lowest mean score in the traditional cluster. This attribute is perceived as being least present in the destinations chosen by the traditional couples.

These differences at common/uncommon sets level can all be attributed to sex role attitudes.

Also, the results indicate a significant difference for set sizes **among the groups** (common and uncommon) similarly to the results of the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 11) with the uncommon husband scores exhibiting the lowest mean. The results indicate significant differences in attitude ($p<.01$), intention ($p<.01$) and confidence ($p<.01$) **among the groups**, the common sets exhibiting higher mean scores than the uncommon sets. This pattern is similar to that found in the results of the analysis per set (Table 11).

The results indicate significant differences at attribute level **among the groups** for *excellent quality accommodations* ($p<.1$), *beautiful beaches* ($p<.01$) and *nice and warm climate* ($p<.01$) . These results are similar to those found in the results of the analysis per set (Table 11), the common sets consistently exhibiting higher mean scores than the uncommon sets.

2. Reject sets

Tables 30 A and B list, per cluster, the means and standard deviations for size, attitude, intention and confidence as well as both spouses' perceived presence

of the attributes in their common and uncommon reject set. Also, they list F values for both factors, cluster and common/uncommon sets.

There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and groups, were independent from one another.

There is a significant difference in common/uncommon confidence mean scores **among the clusters** with the highest mean scores in the modern cluster ($p<.05$), consistently with the results of the analysis per cluster in Table 22.

There was only one significant difference **among clusters** at attribute level: *chance to meet people* ($p<.1$), where the traditional couples exhibited the lowest mean scores. This attribute is perceived as least present in the destinations rejected by the traditional people, consistently with the results of the analysis at attribute level per cluster in Table 26.

This difference at common/uncommon sets level can be attributed to sex role attitudes. Interestingly, this attribute is least present in destinations chosen by the traditional couples and least present also in the destinations they rejected. This would possibly indicate a lack of interest for this attribute altogether which reflects itself in the destinations that they are most familiar with and where they do want to go or do not want to go. Another explanation might be that the

traditional couples simply do not perceive this attribute to be present in any of the destinations suggested in this study.

The results also indicate a significant difference for confidence scores **among the groups** ($p<.1$) which had not been identified in the results of the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 12). This discrepancy is probably due to the fact that the analysis per cluster controlled demographic variables such as age, income, education.

The results indicate significant differences in attitude ($p<.05$) and intention ($p<.05$) **among the groups**, the common sets consistently exhibiting lower mean scores than the uncommon sets. These results are consistent with those found in the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 12).

The results indicate significant differences at attribute level **among the groups** for *exciting night life* ($p<.1$) and *excellent cuisine* ($p<.01$). These results are consistent with those found in the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 12).

The results also indicate significant differences at attribute level **among the groups** for *excellent quality accommodations* ($p<.05$) and *excellent shopping facilities* ($p<.10$) which had not been identified in the analysis of

common/uncommon scores per set (Table 12). This discrepancy is probably due again to the fact that the analysis per cluster controlled demographic variables.

3. Hold sets

Tables 31 A and B list, per cluster, the means and standard deviations for size, attitude, intention and confidence as well as both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their common and uncommon hold set. Also, they list F values for both factors, cluster and common/uncommon sets.

There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and groups, were independent from one another.

There is only one difference **among the clusters:** intention scores ($p<.05$) indicate traditional couples have more positive intentions towards the destinations in the hold set. This difference at common/uncommon sets level can be attributed to sex role attitudes.

The results also indicate significant differences **among the groups** for size ($p<.01$), attitude ($p<.01$) and confidence ($p<.01$). These results are consistent with those found in the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 13).

The results also indicate significant differences at attribute level **among the groups** for *beautiful beaches* ($p<.1$) and *excellent cuisine* ($p<.05$) which had not been identified in the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set. This discrepancy could again be the result of controlling for covariates in the cluster analysis.

4. Foggy sets

Tables 32 A and B list, per cluster, the means and standard deviations for size, attitude, intention and confidence as well as both spouses' perceived presence of the attributes in their common and uncommon foggy set. Also, they list F values for both factors, cluster and common/uncommon sets.

There were no significant interactions: the main effects, clusters and groups, were independent from one another.

There are two differences **among clusters** at attribute level: one is for the attribute *exciting night life* ($p<.05$) and the other is for *excellent sport facilities* ($p<.05$). The modern couples gave higher scores to both these attributes. This difference at common/uncommon sets level can be attributed to sex role attitudes, consistently with the results of the analysis at attribute level per cluster in Table 28.

The only difference **among the groups** is for intention ($p<.05$), consistently with the analysis of common/uncommon scores per set (Table 13). Uncommon scores are larger than common scores for all clusters.

2.2.8 Proportion of commonly evoked destinations per cluster

Again based on Scanzoni's (1977) discussion of changing sex role attitudes and the fewer consensus that exist in family decision making, we hypothesized that sex role attitudes would be related to the number of commonly evoked set destinations. Both spouses' individual wishes might be better reflected in the evoked sets of more modern couples thereby lowering the proportion of commonly evoked destinations relatively to that of traditional couples.

For both husbands and wives, we determined the percentage of all destinations in their evoked sets that was common to their spouse. We compared these percentages across the clusters with an analysis of covariance. Table 33 presents the proportion of commonly evoked destinations, standard deviations and F values per cluster for husbands and for wives.

The results indicated no differences among the clusters based on sex role attitudes. The percentages were between 52% and 61% for the husbands and 48% and 56% for the wives. For both spouses, the proportion of commonly evoked places revolves around half, independently of the sex role attitude. This hypothesis is not supported.

A regression analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship within each cluster between the proportion of commonly evoked places for husbands and wives and sex role attitudes. The dependent variable was the proportion and the independent variables were husbands' and wives' sex role attitudes and culture. We found no significant relationships for spouses sex role attitudes.

This hypothesis is not supported.

CONCLUSION

Brisoux-Laroche model

The results of this study first enabled us to partially confirm the first hypothesis concerning the Brisoux-Laroche model with respect to awareness set measures of attitude, intention and confidence. All mean scores for both husbands and wives were in line with the model but some differences were not significant. The only awareness set where all measures were significantly different from those of the other three sets was the evoked set.

The set sizes were slightly smaller than those of a previous study by Kim, Laroche, Guttenberg (1988) but this is possibly due to the fact that the respondents in the latter study were offered a larger number of potential destinations to choose from, thereby resulting in larger sets. The foggy set however, was larger in the current study and this result might reflect the different demographics, the sample respondents in the current study being older, possibly more experienced and having a more precise and definite opinion of potential vacation destinations.

The contents of the awareness sets of men and women revealed differences between men and women in terms of size, intentions and mostly confidence, men being systematically more confident than women in their evaluations. Women also rated six out of nine attributes as significantly more important than their husbands in selecting a vacation destination.

However, there are also similarities in terms of overall importance ranking of attributes as well as the identification of the determinant attributes in selecting a vacation destination. More specifically, the destinations placed in the evoked sets had similar profiles for both men and women in terms of the three most present attributes: *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches* and *excellent quality accommodations.* As well, the attributes perceived as least present were also the same for both men and women: *chance to meet people, excellent shopping facilities* and *low cost.* These results indicate that the same traits appear to be important for men and women to place a destination in the evoked sets.

The same findings apply to the reject sets where the attributes perceived as most present in the destinations rejected by both men and women were: *nice and warm climate, beautiful beaches* and *excellent quality accommodations.* These attributes are the same as those identified in the evoked set destinations and this finding is attributed to their salience in most destinations proposed to respondents in the current study. Although this finding does little in helping us identify the attributes that contribute to putting a destination in the reject set, it does however indicate similar perceptions on the part of men and women in terms of the vacation destinations they reject. The attributes perceived as least present in the rejected destinations were also the same for both men and women: *excellent sports facilities, low cost* and *chance to meet people.*

In an attempt to determine which criteria would have the most impact on the selection decision, we conducted a determinant criteria analysis which revealed that the attributes that provided the most differentiation among the destinations and that were most likely to be determinant were, for both men and women: *low cost, excellent cuisine* and *beautiful beaches.* These findings are quite different from those of the stated importance ratings where men and women ranked *low cost* in fifth place and *excellent cuisine* in fourth place. *Exciting night life* which had been considered least important by both spouses, remained the least important in the determinant attribute analysis.

In terms of frequency of destination in the awareness sets, we again find similarities in men and women's choices suggesting a high level of agreement in the selection of a vacation destination: men and women both chose Hawaii and Puerto Rico most and least often respectively as evoked set destinations. There were very few differences between spouses in the rank order of the other destinations. Similar patterns were observed in the other awareness sets, especially the reject set.

We compared overall measures of intentions for both men and women with the frequency of destinations in the evoked and reject sets. The pattern was that the highest intentions scores corresponded to the destinations most often placed in the evoked sets and vice versa for the reject set destinations. There were no significant differences between men and women on intentions towards any of the destinations, indicating again a high level of agreement.

We also analyzed the results of each awareness set, grouping together destinations common to both spouses. There were no significant differences between husbands and wives on any of the measures of size, attitude, intention and confidence in any of the common sets. The same findings apply to all awareness sets at attribute level, indicating that spouses agree on the profile of a high percentage of the destinations to be placed in the awareness sets. Indeed, all common awareness sets always represented more than half the total destinations.

The results also indicate some level of consensus in the profile of the uncommon awareness sets. In the evoked set, there was agreement as to the presence of the attributes in the uncommon destinations for six attributes out of nine. Possible sources of conflict could occur with respect to the attributes *excellent quality accommodations*, *beautiful beaches* and *nice and warm climate* only if the vacation destination was not commonly chosen for the evoked set.

Decision influence, influence sharing and sex role attitudes

Vacation decision making has been traditionally consensual but the literature discusses the impact of sex role attitudes on spousal decision making. The results of the cluster analysis indicated that there were three clusters defined by sex role attitudes: traditional, average and modern. We first analyzed the pattern of spousal influence (*husband, husband more than wife, equally, wife more than husband and wife*) across several sub-decisions, taking into account

sex role attitudes. The results indicate that the majority of decisions are perceived by both spouses as being either slightly more influenced by the husband or equally by both, independently of sex role attitude. Some differences were found for two sub-decisions: *when to go* and *what features to look for* which were perceived to be under different influences depending on the sex role attitude of the spouse. Husbands and wives both perceive the decision *when to go* to be under a different influence depending on the sex role attitude. But the trend is not the same: husbands perception of decision influence for this decision is that the more modern the couple, the more the decision is influenced by the wives. For the wives perception however, we found that modern and traditional couples influence the decision equally and the average couple is influenced more by the husband.

The other decision exhibiting a difference among the different sex role attitudes is *what features to look for.* For the husbands' perception of this decision, we found that modern and traditional couples influence the decision equally and the average couple is influenced slightly more by the wife. The second hypothesis is supported.

In a further attempt to determine the impact of sex role attitudes on spousal decision making, we investigated whether husbands and wives perceived there was spousal role specialization or egalitarian decision making. The spousal influence scale was recoded as follows: *one spouse dominant, a little influence*

sharing and egalitarian, and the same sub-decisions were analyzed. The trend is more clear in this analysis: the decisions tend to vary between a little influence sharing and egalitarian but as couples' sex role attitude goes from traditional to modern, six decisions out of seven become more egalitarian according to at least one of the spouses. Both spouses agree on their perceptions of egalitarian decision influence in modern couples only for the decisions *where to go* and *what features to look for.* The only decision where neither spouse perceived differences based on sex role attitude is *what form of transportation to use.* This is a logical finding as there are less alternatives in this decision and it is also somewhat function of the destination itself.

An analysis of the relationship between sex role attitude and influence sharing within clusters revealed that, with the exception of the decision *where to go,* there is a trend to more egalitarian decision making as sex role attitudes become more modern. The third hypothesis is supported.

The confirmation of the hypotheses related to decision influence and influence sharing confirm the tendencies referred to by Qualls (1983) to the effect that sex role orientation plays an important role in family decision making process and we now know that this is true for vacation decision making, modern couples tending to have a more egalitarian approach.

We then attempted to determine whether the more modern couples had more discrepancy in the importance ratings they gave the various attributes than the

traditional couples. No significant differences were found among the clusters but some were identified within the traditional and modern clusters, where the more the size of the difference in importance ratings increased, the more the spouse had a modern attitude. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is supported. The difference is found not between the sex role attitudes of the couples in different clusters, but rather between spouses of a same cluster where one spouse has a more modern sex role attitude than the other.

We further analyzed the awareness sets per cluster to determine whether sex role attitudes did have an impact on spouses' attitude, intention, confidence, set size as well as their choice and profile (features) of the destinations to be included in the various awareness sets. Differences between spouses were also examined.

Although no differences among sex role attitudes were found for the foggy sets, modern couples were found to have more confidence in their evaluations of the reject and hold sets and they also have a larger hold set size. Traditional couples were found to have a smaller evoked set than their modern and average counterparts. The fifth hypothesis is partially confirmed. Other differences related to sex role attitudes were identified in terms of the attributes in all awareness sets, modern couples choosing vacation destinations where they perceived more *exciting night life, excellent quality accommodations, excellent*

cuisine and *excellent shopping facilities* while attributing less importance to the *cost* of the trip; also, modern spouses seem to be less interested in *meeting people* on vacation than more traditional couples.

We then analyzed the results of common/uncommon awareness sets per cluster. We wanted to determine whether there was a relationship between common/uncommon awareness sets and sex role attitudes. The results indicated that the effects of the sex role attitudes and of the spouses themselves were independent.

Finally, we hypothesized that there would be a relationship between the number of commonly evoked destinations and sex role attitudes, the more modern couples having a smaller proportion of destinations in common, the evoked sets reflecting more each individual's wishes than in traditional couples. The sixth hypothesis was rejected: no differences were found among nor within the clusters. For both spouses, the proportion of commonly evoked places revolved around 50%, independently of sex role attitude.

LIMITATIONS

A few methodological concerns should be taken into consideration when reading through this study.

First, the sample was skewed towards older, wealthier people who had been married for quite a number of years. A more representative sample would be appropriate.

Second, the questionnaire was explained to the respondents but it was self-administered. There is a risk that the responses are not necessarily the spontaneous answers of each spouse individually. The respondents might have consulted each other. Also, the questionnaire was long and respondent fatigue might have accounted for some missing values and/or for a series of questions being answered the same.

Third, the choice of vacation destinations is a limited one. There might be other destinations that respondents really want to go to but are not listed in the current choice.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

A further study on the same topic could include measures of information search which might also be influenced by sex role attitudes: in the current study, there were indications that the more modern couples might conduct more intensive information search.

It would be interesting to investigate whether the decision making patterns identified in the current study exist in the context of family decisions other than vacation. We have seen that vacation decision making has more or less always been a joint decision. We have now found a relationship with sex role attitudes. Are other family decisions which are perceived as less consensual also influenced by sex role attitudes?

Finally, respondents should be asked how often they have actually taken trips. It would be interesting to analyze whether people who travel frequently have the same perceptions, attitudes, intentions and confidence in their evaluations as those who travel less frequently.

TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE 6

MEAN SIZE, ATTITUDE, INTENTION AND CONFIDENCE OF THE BRANDS IN THE EVOKED, REJECT, HOLD AND FOGGY SETS

MEAN RATINGS

	EVOKED		REJECT		HOLD		FOGGY	
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*
SIZE	3.89**	4.33**	3.69	3.64	3.10	2.89	2.74	2.42
	(2.40)	(2.65)	(2.52)	(2.34)	(2.10)	(2.00)	(2.43)	(1.97)
ATTITUDE	5.98	6.06	3.41	3.22	4.84***	4.49***	4.31	4.32
	(0.83)	(0.77)	(1.43)	(1.33)	(1.29)	(1.42)	(1.46)	(1.45)
INTENTION	10.68	10.36	2.60**	2.02**	4.91	4.47	3.61	3.31
	(6.28)	(6.08)	(4.19)	(2.00)	(4.76)	(5.57)	(4.50)	(2.77)
CONFIDENCE	5.82*	5.64*	4.84***	4.42***	5.07***	4.59***	4.58**	4.17**
	(1.06)	(1.21)	(1.56)	(1.59)	(1.40)	(1.48)	(1.59)	(1.57)

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 6A

Husbands Mean Attitude, Intention and Confidence for Brands in the Evoked, Reject, Hold and Foggy Sets

MEAN RATINGS

	EVOKED (1)	REJECT (2)	HOLD (3)	FOGGY (4)	F ratio	Scheffé Test (a)
ATTITUDE	5.98 (0.83)	3.41 (1.43)	4.84 (1.29)	4.31 (1.46)	198.86***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(2,3) (2,4)(3,4)
INTENTION	10.68 (6.28)	2.60 (4.19)	4.91 (4.76)	3.61 (4.50)	140.91***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(2,3)
CONFIDENCE	5.82 (1.06)	4.84 (1.56)	5.07 (1.40)	4.58 (1.59)	36.17***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(3,4)

TABLE 6B

Wives Mean Attitude, Intention and Confidence for Brands in the Evoked, Reject, Hold and Foggy Sets

MEAN RATINGS

	EVOKED (1)	REJECT (2)	HOLD (3)	FOGGY (4)	F Ratio	Scheffé Test (a)
ATTITUDE	6.06 (0.77)	3.22 (1.33)	4.49 (1.42)	4.32 (1.45)	241.63***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(2,3)(3,4)
INTENTION	10.36 (6.08)	2.02 (2.00)	4.47 (5.57)	3.31 (2.77)	181.80***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(2,3)(2,4)
CONFIDENCE	5.64 (1.21)	4.42 (1.59)	4.59 (1.48)	4.17 (1.57)	51.31***	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4)(3,4)

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

(a) pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level

TABLE 7

PRESENCE OF ATTRIBUTES IN EACH SET AND OVERALL IMPORTANCE RATINGS

MEAN RATINGS

ATTRIBUTES	EVOKED		REJECT		HOLD		FOGGY		OVERALL	
	wives	husbands	wives	husbands	wives	husbands	wives	husbands	wives	husbands
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.30 (1.05)	5.24 (1.23)	4.36 (1.36)	4.35 (1.45)	4.75 (1.40)	4.87 (1.35)	4.56 (1.39)	4.52 (1.37)	2.97 (1.79)	3.00 (1.82)
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	5.04 (1.15)	5.06 (1.28)	4.15 (1.23)	4.11 (1.48)	4.53 (1.30)	4.68 (1.38)	4.22 (1.27)	4.19 (1.52)	3.64 (1.65)	3.53 (1.72)
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.89 (0.90)	5.83 (0.93)	4.73 (1.33)	4.88 (1.36)	5.23 (1.22)	5.26 (1.23)	4.87 (1.26)	4.84 (1.36)	6.13** (1.22)	5.89** (1.31)
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	6.04 (0.92)	5.97 (0.97)	4.87 (1.30)	4.82 (1.35)	5.46* (1.17)	5.63* (1.13)	5.25 (1.37)	5.45 (1.31)	6.23*** (1.17)	5.87*** (1.41)
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	6.13 (0.83)	6.05 (0.89)	5.21 (1.36)	5.08 (1.43)	5.82 (1.05)	5.72 (1.13)	5.69 (1.27)	5.64 (1.29)	6.41** (1.06)	6.18** (1.22)
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	5.12 (1.09)	5.14 (1.17)	4.18 (1.26)	4.29 (1.27)	4.54 (1.24)	4.65 (1.24)	4.43 (1.31)	4.58 (1.37)	3.77 (1.91)	4.00 (1.84)
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.16 (1.41)	4.20 (1.41)	4.17 (1.39)	4.24 (1.34)	4.16 (1.45)	4.19 (1.31)	4.13 (1.49)	4.39 (1.45)	5.57* (1.42)	5.35* (1.52)
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	5.11* (1.10)	5.27* (1.05)	4.28* (1.37)	4.52* (1.48)	4.52** (1.31)	4.81** (1.32)	4.44 (1.27)	4.57 (1.50)	5.95** (1.16)	5.69** (1.23)
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.99 (1.20)	4.96 (1.29)	4.22* (1.45)	4.45* (1.56)	4.39 (1.46)	4.56 (1.43)	4.41 (1.37)	4.42 (1.57)	4.72*** (1.78)	3.86*** (1.86)

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF TIMES HUSBANDS AND WIVES CHOSE DESTINATIONS FOR AWARENESS SETS

MEAN RATINGS

Destinations	*EVOKED*		*REJECT*		*HOLD*		*FOGGY*	
	WIFE	HUSBAND	WIFE	HUSBAND	WIFE	HUSBAND	WIFE	HUSBAND
BAHAMAS	0.42 (0.49)	0.36 (0.48)	0.11 (0.31)	0.1 (0.30)	0.21 (0.41)	0.23 (0.42)	0.16 (0.37)	0.16 (0.37)
BARBADOS	0.41 (0.49)	0.34 (0.34)	0.11 (0.31)	0.11 (0.31)	0.21 (0.41)	0.23 (0.42)	0.14 (0.35)	0.17 (0.38)
BERMUDA	0.33* (0.33)	0.27* (0.27)	0.1 (0.30)	0.13 (0.33)	0.18** (0.38)	0.26** (0.44)	0.2 (0.40)	0.22 (0.42)
BRITAIN	0.18 (0.39)	0.18 (0.38)	0.4 (0.49)	0.48 (0.50)	0.18 (0.38)	0.18 (0.39)	0.2 (0.40)	0.24 (0.43)
CALIFORNIA	0.34 (0.47)	0.29 (0.46)	0.19 (0.39)	0.17 (0.38)	0.23 (0.42)	0.24 (0.43)	0.12 (0.33)	0.15 (0.36)
CUBA	0.16 (0.37)	0.17 (0.37)	0.53** (0.50)	0.44** (0.50)	0.25 (0.44)	0.26 (0.44)	0.19* (0.40)	0.27* (0.45)
DOM REP	0.16 (0.37)	0.2 (0.40)	0.39* (0.49)	0.32* (0.47)	0.27 (0.45)	0.24 (0.43)	0.26 (0.44)	0.2 (0.40)
FLORIDA	0.4 (0.49)	0.39 (0.49)	0.18 (0.39)	0.2 (0.40)	0.15 (0.35)	0.17 (0.37)	0.05** (0.23)	0.12** (0.32)
FRANCE	0.22 (0.42)	0.17 (0.38)	0.35* (0.48)	0.42* (0.49)	0.21 (0.41)	0.17 (0.37)	0.16 (0.37)	0.21 (0.41)
HAWAII	0.59* (0.49)	0.51* (0.50)	0.13 (0.33)	0.14 (0.35)	0.17 (0.38)	0.18 (0.39)	0.1 (0.30)	0.12 (0.32)
ITALY	0.27 (0.44)	0.26 (0.44)	0.29 (0.45)	0.3 (0.46)	0.19 (0.39)	0.21 (0.41)	0.14 (0.35)	0.14 (0.35)
JAMAICA	0.33** (0.47)	0.25** (0.43)	0.23 (0.42)	0.28 (0.45)	0.16** (0.37)	0.23** (0.42)	0.14 (0.35)	0.19 (0.39)
MEXICO	0.35 (0.48)	0.34 (0.48)	0.28 (0.45)	0.25 (0.44)	0.24 (0.43)	0.23 (0.42)	0.17 (0.38)	0.18 (0.39)
PUERTO RICO	0.16 (0.37)	0.13 (0.34)	0.33 (0.47)	0.32 (0.47)	0.27 (0.44)	0.27 (0.45)	0.34 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)
Other	0.21* (0.41)	0.14* (0.35)	0.06 (0.24)	0.04 (0.20)	0.04** (0.19)	0.01** (0.09)	0.02 (0.15)	0.03 (0.17)

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 10

INTENTIONS TO VISIT
VACATION DESTINATIONS

Destinations	WIFE	HUSBAND
BAHAMAS	8.07 (7.67)	7.69 (8.24)
BARBADOS	7.38 (6.16)	7.18 (6.21)
BERMUDA	6.94 (6.05)	6.75 (6.46)
BRITAIN	5.08 (8.37)	4.33 (6.53)
CALIFORNIA	7.93 (9.65)	8.92 (10.88)
CUBA	4.31 (5.89)	4.72 (5.71)
DOM REP	4.53 (5.31)	4.47 (4.50)
FLORIDA	12.31 (14.82)	13.85 (15.49)
FRANCE	5.86 (7.96)	5.57 (7.36)
HAWAII	12.02 (9.93)	10.97 (9.38)
ITALY	6.80 (8.34)	7.28 (9.21)
JAMAICA	7.06 (6.28)	6.39 (6.48)
MEXICO	7.59 (9.78)	7.37 (8.76)
PUERTO RICO	4.12 (4.62)	4.50 (4.97)

( ) standard deviation
* significance p<.10
** significance p<.05
*** significance p<.01

TABLE 11

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
EVOKED SET
MEAN RATINGS

	common hus (1)	common wife (2)	uncom hus (3)	uncom wife (4)	F PROB	SCHEFFÉ TEST*
SIZE	2.56 (1.62)	2.56 (1.62)	2.25 (1.55)	2.72 (1.93)	0.03	(4,3)
ATTITUDE	6.14 (0.81)	6.21 (0.77)	5.69 (1.02)	5.83 (0.97)	0.00	(1,3)(1,4)(2,3)(2,4)
INTENTION	10.84 (7.15)	10.75 (7.48)	8.27 (6.62)	7.69 (5.47)	0.00	(2,4)(2,3)(1,4)(1,3)
CONFIDENCE	5.92 (1.08)	5.86 (1.15)	5.63 (1.17)	5.49 (1.32)	0.00	(2,4)(1,4)
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.27 (1.27)	5.42 (1.14)	5.13 (1.44)	5.25 (1.11)	0.11	
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	5.05 (1.36)	5.03 (1.26)	4.94 (1.40)	4.99 (1.16)	0.84	
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.90 (0.98)	5.99 (0.90)	5.72 (1.08)	5.78 (0.98)	0.02	(2,3)
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	6.11 (0.99)	6.16 (0.92)	5.80 (1.19)	5.86 (1.14)	0.00	(1,3)(2,3)(2,4)
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	6.15 (0.88)	6.25 (0.89)	5.89 (1.24)	5.92 (1.08)	0.00	(2,3)(2,4)
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	5.20 (1.23)	5.21 (1.12)	4.96 (1.29)	5.03 (1.26)	0.10	
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.19 (1.48)	4.07 (1.54)	4.15 (1.54)	4.22 (1.48)	0.73	
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	5.24 (1.17)	5.12 (1.12)	5.11 (1.24)	5.06 (1.26)	0.41	
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.96 (1.34)	5.03 (1.34)	4.83 (1.56)	4.95 (1.32)	0.52	

( ) standard deviation

* pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level

TABLE 12

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
REJECT SET
MEAN RATINGS

	common hus (1)	common wife (2)	uncom hus (3)	uncom wife (4)	F PROB	SCHEFFÉ TEST*
SIZE	2.50 (1.79)	2.50 (1.79)	2.27 (1.64)	2.26 (1.51)	0.24	
ATTITUDE	3.19 (1.51)	3.08 (1.39)	3.48 (1.46)	3.45 (1.47)	0.01	(3,2)
INTENTION	1.91 (1.94)	1.66 (1.86)	2.71 (4.82)	2.20 (2.34)	0.00	(3,2)
CONFIDENCE	4.81 (1.72)	4.48 (1.68)	4.77 (1.66)	4.55 (1.67)	0.13	
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.07 (1.59)	4.37 (1.53)	4.56 (1.55)	4.36 (1.32)	0.02	(1,3)
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	3.97 (1.63)	4.09 (1.34)	4.15 (1.52)	4.16 (1.30)	0.53	
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	4.63 (1.58)	4.73 (1.44)	5 (1.32)	4.85 (1.35)	0.06	
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	4.82 (1.56)	4.85 (1.44)	4.9 (1.46)	4.90 (1.51)	0.94	
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.18 (1.66)	5.17 (1.56)	5.09 (1.55)	5.25 (1.44)	0.81	
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.18 (1.38)	4.12 (1.37)	4.37 (1.37)	4.21 (1.34)	0.32	
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.32 (1.51)	4.18 (1.57)	4.1 (1.38)	4.06 (1.46)	0.31	
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.25 (1.66)	4.21 (1.56)	4.69 (1.53)	4.37 (1.35)	0.00	(3,2)(3,1)
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.16 (1.79)	4.23 (1.71)	4.55 (1.64)	4.25 (1.48)	0.10	

( ) standard deviation

* pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level

TABLE 13

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
HOLD SET
MEAN RATINGS

	common hus (1)	common wife (2)	uncom hus (3)	uncom wife (4)	F PROB	SCHEFFÉ TEST*
SIZE	1.74 (1.52)	1.74 (1.52)	2.41 (1.37)	2.27 (1.53)	0.00	(4,1)(4,2)(3,1)(3,2)
ATTITUDE	4.62 (1.51)	4.54 (1.56)	4.95 (1.25)	4.46 (1.44)	0.00	(3,4)
INTENTION	4.46 (6.30)	4.56 (7.29)	4.71 (4.12)	4.08 (3.33)	0.63	
CONFIDENCE	4.73 (1.51)	4.54 (1.68)	4.22 (1.37)	4.66 (1.47)	0.00	(3,2)(3,4)(3,1)
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.77 (1.61)	4.76 (1.62)	4.94 (1.32)	4.76 (1.37)	0.55	
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.48 (1.59)	4.46 (1.40)	4.71 (1.40)	4.54 (1.30)	0.33	
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.19 (1.45)	5.18 (1.36)	5.3 (1.22)	5.22 (1.19)	0.82	
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.65 (1.22)	5.55 (1.37)	5.63 (1.22)	5.33 (1.24)	0.06	
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.85 (1.11)	5.8 (1.23)	5.71 (1.22)	5.78 (1.15)	0.74	
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.51 (1.46)	4.52 (1.36)	4.69 (1.26)	4.56 (1.26)	0.58	
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.29 (1.45)	4.14 (1.61)	4.1 (1.34)	4.07 (1.45)	0.57	
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.64 (1.58)	4.49 (1.48)	4.85 (1.27)	4.49 (1.31)	0.04	
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.32 (1.70)	4.36 (1.67)	4.62 (1.45)	4.32 (1.51)	0.19	

( ) standard deviation

* pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level

TABLE 14

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
FOGGY SET
MEAN RATINGS

	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F PROB	SCHEFFÉ TEST*
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
SIZE	1.81 (1.98)	1.81 (1.98)	2.00 (1.55)	2.08 (1.43)	0.58	
ATTITUDE	3.98 (1.70)	4.24 (1.64)	4.47 (1.51)	4.49 (1.37)	0.10	
INTENTION	2.56 (2.60)	2.36 (2.35)	4.06 (5.38)	3.71 (2.96)	0.00	(3,2)(3,1)
CONFIDENCE	4.39 (1.67)	4.18 (1.77)	4.79 (1.39)	4.36 (1.57)	0.05	
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.4 (1.53)	4.61 (1.59)	4.58 (1.39)	4.63 (1.42)	0.74	
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.08 (1.59)	4.17 (1.40)	4.37 (1.59)	4.30 (1.18)	0.53	
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	4.66 (1.43)	4.75 (1.38)	4.92 (1.42)	4.96 (1.25)	0.43	
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.25 (1.57)	4.90 (1.63)	5.52 (1.35)	5.38 (1.28)	0.03	(3,2)
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.5 (1.51)	5.51 (1.47)	5.68 (1.34)	5.75 (1.30)	0.56	
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.36 (1.51)	4.28 (1.51)	4.64 (1.46)	4.52 (1.33)	0.33	
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.21 (1.45)	4.13 (1.71)	4.45 (1.50)	4.01 (1.44)	0.17	
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.15 (1.60)	4.33 (1.34)	4.66 (1.58)	4.41 (1.29)	0.13	
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.22 (1.66)	4.30 (1.56)	4.47 (1.61)	4.46 (1.32)	0.64	

( ) standard deviation

* pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level

TABLE 16

HUSBAND PERCEPTION OF DECISION INFLUENCE PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

DECISION	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
WHEN TO GO	3.19 (0.60)	3.02 (0.82)	2.82 (0.93)	2.84*
WHERE TO GO	3.03 (0.46)	3.21 (0.65)	3.05 (0.78)	1.99
WHAT FEATURES TO LOOK FOR	3.09 (0.37)	3.22 (0.64)	3.02 (0.78)	2.41*
HOW MUCH TO SPEND	2.82 (0.71)	2.74 (0.90)	2.84 (0.96)	0.34
HOW LONG TO GO FOR	2.98 (0.54)	2.88 (0.72)	2.71 (0.86)	1.98
FORM OF TRANSPORTATION	2.92 (0.64)	2.85 (0.78)	2.68 (0.88)	1.46
TYPE OF ACCOMODATION	3.16 (0.65)	3.09 (0.71)	2.93 (0.81)	1.71

Scale: 1=husband; 2=husband more than wife; 3=equally; 4=wife more than husband; 5=wife

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10
** significance p<.05
*** significance p<.01

TABLE 17

WIFE PERCEPTION OF DECISION INFLUENCE PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

DECISION	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
WHEN TO GO	3.02 (0.61)	2.78 (0.80)	2.96 (0.84)	2.41*
WHERE TO GO	3.04 (0.38)	3.07 (0.68)	3.15 (0.72)	0.48
WHAT FEATURES TO LOOK FOR	3.05 (0.40)	3.19 (0.70)	3.14 (0.63)	0.86
HOW MUCH TO SPEND	2.98 (0.72)	2.80 (0.90)	3.02 (0.89)	2.03
HOW LONG TO GO FOR	2.87 (0.74)	2.87 (0.81)	2.96 (0.76)	0.78
FORM OF TRANSPORTATION	2.96 (0.43)	2.85 (0.63)	2.77 (0.74)	1.02
TYPE OF ACCOMODATION	3.19 (0.41)	3.17 (0.78)	3.04 (0.74)	1.11

Scale: 1=husband; 2=husband more than wife; 3=equally; 4=wife more than husband; 5=wife

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10
** significance p<.05
*** significance p<.01

TABLE 18

HUSBAND PERCEPTION OF INFLUENCE SHARING PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

DECISION	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
WHEN TO GO	2.75 (0.54)	2.54 (0.67)	2.38 (0.74)	3.89**
WHERE TO GO	2.87 (0.43)	2.64 (0.59)	2.54 (0.64)	4.26**
WHAT FEATURES TO LOOK FOR	2.88 (0.37)	2.63 (0.57)	2.57 (0.63)	4.23**
HOW MUCH TO SPEND	2.52 (0.58)	2.37 (0.70)	2.35 (0.75)	0.74
HOW LONG TO GO FOR	2.78 (0.48)	2.65 (0.64)	2.45 (0.73)	3.74**
FORM OF TRANSPORTATION	2.73 (0.58)	2.59 (0.68)	2.45 (0.76)	2.08
TYPE OF ACCOMODATION	2.70 (0.59)	2.61 (0.61)	2.58 (0.69)	0.56

Scale: 1=one spouse dominant; 2=a little influence sharing; 3=egalitarian

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 19

WIFE PERCEPTION OF INFLUENCE SHARING PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

DECISION	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
WHEN TO GO	2.69 (0.52)	2.50 (0.66)	2.53 (0.70)	1.42
WHERE TO GO	2.89 (0.35)	2.60 (0.56)	2.56 (0.61)	5.60***
WHAT FEATURES TO LOOK FOR	2.84 (0.37)	2.62 (0.62)	2.66 (0.53)	2.44*
HOW MUCH TO SPEND	2.61 (0.61)	2.36 (0.66)	2.40 (0.65)	2.41*
HOW LONG TO GO FOR	2.62 (0.64)	2.54 (0.69)	2.57 (0.63)	0.28
FORM OF TRANSPORTATION	2.81 (0.41)	2.71 (0.58)	2.64 (0.67)	1.08
TYPE OF ACCOMODATION	2.82 (0.41)	2.51 (0.63)	2.62 (0.64)	4.46**

Scale: 1=one spouse dominant; 2=a little influence sharing; 3=egalitarian

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 20

DISCREPANCY IN HUSBAND AND WIFE ATTRIBUTE IMPORTANCE RATING PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	1.24 (1.40)	1.18 (1.32)	0.98 (1.29)	0.69
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	1.14 (0.99)	1.35 (1.13)	1.37 (1.49)	0.49
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	0.62 (0.79)	0.86 (1.10)	1.07 (1.28)	2.15
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	0.76 (1.02)	0.96 (1.22)	1.10 (1.41)	1.06
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	0.64 (0.99)	0.88 (1.05)	0.95 (1.29)	1.08
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	1.19 (1.38)	1.50 (1.33)	1.67 (1.38)	1.52
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	1.25 (0.98)	1.35 (1.16)	1.13 (1.29)	0.90
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	0.88 (0.78)	0.92 (0.99)	1.04 (1.06)	0.51
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	1.87 (1.38)	1.60 (1.26)	1.82 (1.48)	0.98

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 21

MEAN SIZE, ATTITUDE, INTENTION AND CONFIDENCE OF THE BRANDS IN THE EVOKED SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F CLUSTER	F SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
SIZE	4.12	4.46	4.42	4.68	3.50	3.89	6.55***	2.31**
	(2.35)	(2.97)	(2.41)	(2.46)	(2.23)	(2.49)		
ATTITUDE	6.10	6.21	6.01	6.03	5.87	6.03	1.86	1.68
	(0.68)	(0.76)	(0.77)	(0.68)	(0.94)	(0.86)		
INTENTION	10.50	11.24	11.04	10.24	10.31	10.19	0.32	0.01
	(5.96)	(7.34)	(5.34)	(4.09)	(7.26)	(7.27)		
CONFIDENCE	6.15	5.66	5.82	5.73	5.7	5.58	1.55	4.94**
	(0.83)	(1.36)	(1.09)	(1.01)	(1.10)	(1.34)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 22

MEAN SIZE, ATTITUDE, INTENTION AND CONFIDENCE OF THE BRANDS IN THE REJECT SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F CLUSTER	F SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
SIZE	3.56	3.48	3.84	3.72	3.78	3.77	0.41	0.10
	(2.00)	(2.00)	(2.17)	(2.15)	(3.04)	(2.66)		
ATTITUDE	3.21	3.28	3.38	3.22	3.47	3.09	0.06	1.44
	(1.57)	(1.17)	(1.15)	(1.30)	(1.64)	(1.44)		
INTENTION	1.94	1.84	2.71	2.07	2.64	2.09	0.76	1.97
	(1.70)	(1.61)	(3.67)	(1.71)	(5.30)	(2.40)		
CONFIDENCE	5.31	4.63	4.87	4.48	4.61	4.37	2.43*	9.17***
	(1.39)	(1.51)	(1.42)	(1.50)	(1.70)	(1.67)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 23

MEAN SIZE, ATTITUDE, INTENTION AND CONFIDENCE OF THE BRANDS IN THE HOLD SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F CLUSTER	F SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
SIZE	3.47	3.32	3.25	2.90	2.74	2.73	2.36*	1.00
	(2.29)	(1.97)	(2.08)	(1.71)	(2.04)	(2.28)		
ATTITUDE	4.98	4.34	4.73	4.4	4.87	4.60	0.75	9.57**
	(1.43)	(1.50)	(1.10)	(1.36)	(1.45)	(1.48)		
INTENTION	4.41	3.39	4.57	4.21	5.43	5.19	2.23	1.14
	(2.55)	(2.67)	(3.47)	(3.76)	(6.39)	(7.66)		
CONFIDENCE	5.18	4.59	5.09	4.60	5.05	4.62	12.74***	0.09
	(1.63)	(1.50)	(1.32)	(1.43)	(1.39)	(1.54)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 24

MEAN SIZE, ATTITUDE, INTENTION AND CONFIDENCE OF THE BRANDS IN THE FOGGY SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F CLUSTER	F SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
SIZE	2.37 (1.75)	2.15 (1.08)	2.45 (1.53)	2.33 (1.55)	3.07 (3.08)	2.47 (2.41)	1.39	1.44
ATTITUDE	4.68 (1.01)	4.41 (1.06)	4.33 (1.45)	4.42 (1.44)	4.10 (1.58)	4.16 (1.56)	1.57	0.05
INTENTION	3.06 (2.30)	2.86 (2.57)	3.7 (2.91)	3.45 (2.86)	3.65 (5.86)	3.25 (2.75)	0.49	0.41
CONFIDENCE	4.63 (1.72)	4.21 (1.62)	4.65 (1.53)	4.23 (1.51)	4.52 (1.61)	4.13 (1.63)	0.21	4.51**

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

TABLE 25

PRESENCE OF ATTRIBUTES IN EVOKED SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.65 (0.88)	5.47 (0.84)	5.16 (1.08)	5.30 (1.01)	5.08 (1.49)	5.17 (1.17)	3.81**	0.03
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	5.36 (1.02)	5.06 (0.99)	5.03 (1.11)	5.13 (1.11)	4.89 (1.56)	4.86 (1.27)	2.21	0.44
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	6.11 (0.68)	6.01 (0.79)	5.88 (0.83)	5.90 (0.80)	5.64 (1.08)	5.89 (1.04)	2.84*	0.42
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.98 (1.03)	6.01 (0.94)	6.04 (0.89)	5.99 (0.88)	5.84 (1.03)	6.08 (0.96)	0.19	0.67
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	6.09 (0.84)	6.00 (0.96)	6.08 (0.82)	6.15 (0.79)	5.97 (1.00)	6.10 (0.82)	0.54	0.24
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	5.13 (1.34)	5.13 (1.10)	5.23 (1.04)	5.08 (0.93)	5.06 (1.24)	5.18 (1.28)	0.05	0.00
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	3.88 (1.28)	4.06 (1.28)	4.12 (1.29)	3.92 (1.26)	4.36 (1.56)	4.49 (1.57)	4.75***	0.08
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	5.57 (1.04)	5.37 (1.16)	5.11 (0.90)	5.09 (1.01)	5.28 (1.18)	5.01 (1.17)	3.92**	2.78*
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	5.42 (1.16)	5.25 (1.24)	4.84 (1.22)	4.90 (1.14)	4.89 (1.40)	4.96 (1.26)	4.45**	0.01

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 26

PRESENCE OF ATTRIBUTES IN REJECT SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST SPOUSE
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*		
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.67 (1.48)	4.49 (1.24)	4.27 (1.39)	4.41 (1.30)	4.21 (1.51)	4.27 (1.45)	1.41	0.00
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.35 (1.44)	4.32 (1.24)	4.15 (1.34)	4.22 (1.13)	3.87 (1.66)	3.95 (1.34)	2.80*	0.09
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	4.98 (1.30)	4.73 (1.15)	4.85 (1.36)	4.82 (1.26)	4.82 (1.42)	4.69 (1.52)	0.22	1.14
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	4.92 (1.40)	5.04 (1.17)	4.81 (1.23)	4.78 (1.28)	4.69 (1.46)	4.95 (1.36)	0.61	0.94
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.03 (1.47)	5.21 (1.31)	5.14 (1.32)	5.00 (1.27)	5.22 (1.54)	5.73 (1.50)	0.14	1.43
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.20 (1.63)	4.26 (1.21)	4.34 (1.01)	4.12 (1.16)	4.21 (1.36)	4.22 (1.41)	0.01	0.17
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.26 (1.18)	4.18 (1.33)	4.17 (1.30)	4.16 (1.29)	4.3 (1.46)	4.19 (1.54)	0.15	0.22
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.48 (1.65)	4.12 (1.25)	4.51 (1.29)	4.33 (1.35)	4.48 (1.63)	4.30 (1.43)	21	3.12*
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.69 (1.78)	4.05 (1.35)	4.37 (1.45)	4.22 (1.39)	4.36 (1.59)	4.21 (1.56)	0.09	4.74**

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 27

PRESENCE OF ATTRIBUTES IN HOLD SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F TEST	F TEST
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	CLUSTER	SPOUSE
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.13 (1.26)	4.88 (1.33)	4.73 (1.32)	4.70 (1.33)	4.92 (1.42)	4.77 (1.51)	1.40	1.05
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.72 (1.48)	4.54 (1.32)	4.64 (1.28)	4.47 (1.56)	4.69 (1.47)	4.6 (1.46)	0.22	1.19
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.51 (1.11)	5.26 (1.11)	5.19 (1.16)	5.18 (1.17)	5.25 (1.35)	5.37 (1.31)	1.06	0.15
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	6.09 (0.95)	5.58 (1.00)	5.5 (1.08)	5.37 (1.19)	5.50 (1.22)	5.55 (1.22)	3.55**	3.16*
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.91 (1.15)	5.74 (0.93)	5.73 (1.07)	5.81 (1.12)	5.56 (1.19)	5.85 (1.02)	0.29	0.38
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.70 (1.45)	4.61 (1.37)	4.62 (1.09)	4.52 (1.14)	4.69 (1.35)	4.59 (1.32)	0.2	0.55
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.04 (1.45)	4.11 (1.13)	4.10 (1.26)	4.12 (1.40)	4.29 (1.32)	4.24 (1.62)	0.67	0.01
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.81 (1.32)	4.49 (1.36)	4.73 (1.21)	4.92 (1.20)	4.61 (1.44)	5.01 (1.42)	0.68	5.11**
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.66 (1.52)	4.45 (1.60)	4.43 (1.43)	4.23 (1.37)	4.70 (1.39)	4.52 (1.50)	1.99	1.83

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 28

PRESENCE OF ATTRIBUTES IN FOGGY SET PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN		AVERAGE		TRADITIONAL		F TEST	F TEST
	HUSBANDS	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	*HUSBANDS*	*WIVES*	CLUSTER	SPOUSE
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.10 (0.92)	4.80 (0.96)	4.48 (1.27)	4.39 (1.33)	4.33 (1.54)	4.66 (1.54)	2.47*	0.01
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.52 (1.44)	4.46 (1.29)	4.25 (1.41)	4.21 (1.18)	4.08 (1.65)	4.21 (1.37)	0.95	0.00
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.33 (1.22)	5.25 (1.22)	4.98 (1.20)	4.86 (1.22)	4.57 (1.46)	4.87 (1.30)	2.95*	0.06
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.61 (1.37)	5.48 (1.33)	5.30 (1.28)	5.23 (1.41)	5.49 (1.32)	5.25 (1.36)	0.84	0.58
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.81 (1.41)	5.60 (1.46)	5.59 (1.30)	5.77 (1.28)	5.62 (1.26)	5.73 (1.21)	0.01	0.03
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.91 (1.42)	5.02 (1.00)	4.69 (1.19)	4.31 (1.29)	4.34 (1.49)	4.39 (1.39)	2.84*	0.19
LOW PRICE/COST OF TRIP	4.4 (1.28)	4.49 (1.10)	4.43 (1.34)	3.88 (1.45)	4.32 (1.51)	4.37 (1.69)	0.81	0.39
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.75 (1.22)	4.61 (1.25)	4.61 (1.39)	4.39 (1.31)	4.51 (1.68)	4.45 (1.25)	0.34	0.63
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.87 (1.45)	4.40 (1.32)	4.38 (1.66)	4.28 (1.45)	4.32 (1.52)	4.47 (1.30)	0.74	0.6

( ) standard deviation * significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 29 A

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
EVOKED SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
SIZE	2.59	2.48	2.04	2.61	2.84	2.80	2.51	2.70	2.31	2.29	2.22	2.77	3.90**	2.45*
	(1.75)	(1.75)	(1.27)	(2.09)	(1.71)	(1.71)	(1.76)	(1.72)	(1.34)	(1.34)	(1.38)	(1.95)		
ATTITUDE	6.26	6.25	5.78	6.08	6.16	6.23	5.68	5.70	6.02	6.14	5.63	5.85	2.01	13.90***
	(0.73)	(0.81)	(0.99)	(0.87)	(0.75)	(0.65)	(1.04)	(0.94)	(0.93)	(0.91)	(1.03)	(1.03)		
INTENTION	10.60	10.81	7.59	7.86	11.06	11.11	8.46	7.64	10.54	10.38	8.50	7.69	0.35	11.45***
	(7.65)	(8.34)	(5.23)	(4.45)	(6.64)	(6.98)	(5.28)	(4.44)	(7.34)	(7.79)	(8.32)	(6.85)		
CONFIDENCE	6.13	5.65	6.02	5.68	5.95	5.97	5.61	5.51	5.76	5.86	5.50	5.44	1.88	4.31***
	(0.97)	(1.38)	(1.92)	(1.45)	(1.07)	(0.97)	(1.21)	(1.18)	(1.12)	(1.27)	(1.14)	(1.41)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 29 B

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
EVOKED SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
EVALUATION CRITERIA	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	5.59	5.38	5.71	5.55	5.17	5.44	5.20	5.18	5.16	5.37	4.71	5.13	6.31***	0.78
	(1.03)	(0.95)	(1.29)	(0.97)	(1.09)	(1.15)	(1.30)	(1.14)	(1.56)	(1.23)	(1.63)	(1.14)		
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	5.37	5.19	5.19	4.98	5.03	5.11	5.02	5.06	4.86	4.76	4.68	4.83	5.04***	0.43
	(1.08)	(1.09)	(1.24)	(1.02)	(1.20)	(1.19)	(1.28)	(1.23)	(1.68)	(1.45)	(1.61)	(1.15)		
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	6.17	6.03	6.01	5.96	5.89	6.00	5.78	5.74	5.74	5.98	5.50	5.81	3.86**	2.33*
	(0.76)	(0.91)	(1.06)	(0.86)	(0.84)	(0.86)	(1.06)	(0.90)	(1.22)	(0.96)	(1.07)	(1.11)		
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	6.12	6.14	5.97	5.89	6.10	6.16	5.86	5.73	6.09	6.14	5.59	5.98	0.29	4.98***
	(1.13)	(0.96)	(1.23)	(1.14)	(0.97)	(0.88)	(1.12)	(1.15)	(0.95)	(0.97)	(1.25)	(1.14)		
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	6.20	6.16	6.12	5.82	6.15	6.31	5.87	5.89	6.13	6.16	5.74	5.95	0.37	5.42***
	(0.88)	(1.01)	(1.15)	(1.07)	(0.85)	(0.78)	(1.26)	(1.11)	(0.94)	(0.96)	(1.27)	(1.05)		
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	5.23	5.18	4.88	5.22	5.26	5.18	5.09	4.92	5.09	5.26	4.87	5.13	0.05	1.73
	(1.25)	(1.19)	(1.59)	(1.25)	(1.11)	(0.98)	(1.20)	(1.22)	(1.39)	(1.29)	(1.24)	(1.32)		
LOW PRICE/ COST OF TRIP	3.99	3.92	3.64	4.33	4.08	3.91	4.16	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.33	3.49**	0.75
	(1.37)	(1.52)	(1.56)	(1.51)	(1.40)	(1.45)	(1.46)	(1.34)	(1.61)	(1.64)	(1.57)	(1.64)		
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	5.62	5.32	5.34	5.39	5.04	5.12	5.04	5.01	5.25	5.03	5.03	4.95	5.50***	1.01
	(1.12)	(1.18)	(1.40)	(1.29)	(1.00)	(1.02)	(1.14)	(1.29)	(1.35)	(1.22)	(1.28)	(1.22)		
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	5.35	5.17	5.42	5.37	4.87	4.99	4.72	4.82	4.84	4.94	4.67	4.88	7.18***	0.18
	(1.20)	(1.42)	(1.56)	(1.32)	(1.27)	(1.28)	(1.60)	(1.35)	(1.48)	(1.40)	(1.49)	(1.26)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 30 A

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
REJECT SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
SIZE	2.54 (1.48)	2.55 (1.48)	2.02 (1.11)	2.19 (1.28)	2.40 (1.55)	2.41 (1.55)	2.29 (1.46)	2.25 (1.43)	2.64 (2.18)	2.66 (2.18)	2.38 (2.05)	2.38 (1.66)	0.93	1.73
ATTITUDE	3.16 (1.78)	2.95 (1.39)	3.40 (1.62)	3.56 (1.26)	3.14 (1.31)	2.97 (1.24)	3.41 (1.32)	3.58 (1.59)	3.24 (1.64)	3.18 (1.56)	3.60 (1.54)	3.10 (1.42)	0.00	3.37**
INTENTION	1.60 (1.72)	1.40 (1.46)	2.09 (1.86)	1.85 (1.85)	2.01 (1.70)	1.59 (1.69)	2.97 (4.38)	2.36 (2.19)	1.88 (2.30)	1.83 (2.19)	2.65 (6.14)	2.13 (2.69)	1.39	3.44**
CONFIDENCE	5.42 (1.53)	4.64 (1.60)	5.13 (1.67)	4.70 (1.73)	4.73 (1.64)	4.49 (1.66)	4.93 (1.59)	4.76 (1.65)	4.71 (1.86)	4.44 (1.75)	4.40 (1.65)	4.34 (1.58)	3.73**	2.43*

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 30 B

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
REJECT SET - PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.31	4.57	4.74	4.55	4.00	4.22	4.54	4.55	4.03	4.47	4.37	4.10	1.52	2.35*
	(1.66)	(1.46)	(1.75)	(1.24)	(1.52)	(1.53)	(1.49)	(1.25)	(1.69)	(1.56)	(1.52)	(1.37)		
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	3.93	4.25	4.49	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.22	4.36	3.86	4.03	3.89	3.86	2.29*	0.89
	(1.60)	(1.48)	(1.51)	(1.43)	(1.54)	(1.35)	(1.39)	(1.17)	(1.77)	(1.28)	(1.67)	(1.37)		
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	4.52	4.61	5.32	4.86	4.70	4.78	4.95	4.98	4.59	4.76	4.85	4.78	0.38	2.93**
	(1.62)	(1.48)	(1.30)	(1.41)	(1.54)	(1.41)	(1.23)	(1.14)	(1.64)	(1.48)	(1.42)	(1.57)		
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.19	5.21	4.88	4.83	4.78	4.69	4.98	4.90	4.61	4.97	4.67	5.03	0.91	0.21
	(1.46)	(1.19)	(1.67)	(1.54)	(1.53)	(1.51)	(1.36)	(1.47)	(1.62)	(1.43)	(1.48)	(1.55)		
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.43	5.29	4.94	4.96	5.26	5.09	5.07	5.36	4.94	5.27	5.15	5.35	0.05	0.47
	(1.53)	(1.36)	(1.80)	(1.66)	(1.53)	(1.61)	(1.54)	(1.28)	(1.86)	(1.60)	(1.41)	(1.52)		
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	3.93	4.09	4.36	4.22	4.27	4.04	4.39	4.20	4.12	4.25	4.32	4.23	0.16	1.12
	(1.68)	(1.49)	(1.78)	(1.31)	(1.19)	(1.33)	(1.10)	(1.15)	(1.46)	(1.38)	(1.41)	(1.57)		
LOW PRICE/ COST OF TRIP	4.53	4.36	4.11	3.96	4.19	4.18	4.09	3.95	4.41	4.08	4.14	4.24	0.66	1.42
	(1.45)	(1.42)	(1.35)	(1.40)	(1.46)	(1.50)	(1.32)	(1.42)	(1.63)	(1.73)	(1.50)	(1.56)		
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.12	3.95	4.76	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.79	4.49	4.28	4.30	4.50	4.33	0.76	3.96***
	(1.75)	(1.53)	(1.83)	(1.34)	(1.54)	(1.55)	(1.28)	(1.34)	(1.79)	(1.61)	(1.66)	(1.34)		
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.26	4.03	4.86	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.60	4.38	4.24	4.39	4.27	4.14	0.02	2.40*
	(1.98)	(1.76)	(1.95)	(1.50)	(1.73)	(1.74)	(1.53)	(1.37)	(1.80)	(1.61)	(1.60)	(1.58)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 31 A

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
HOLD SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
SIZE	1.91	1.94	2.86	2.50	1.61	1.62	2.48	2.18	1.85	1.87	2.15	2.26	1.82	7.76***
	(1.79)	(1.79)	(1.25)	(1.42)	(1.11)	(1.11)	(1.39)	(1.37)	(1.86)	(1.86)	(1.35)	(1.73)		
ATTITUDE	4.42	4.65	5.20	4.30	4.77	4.38	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.66	5.04	4.52	0.18	4.93***
	(1.52)	(1.25)	(1.42)	(1.64)	(1.33)	(1.66)	(1.14)	(1.35)	(1.73)	(1.52)	(1.32)	(1.47)		
INTENTION	3.25	3.33	4.52	3.65	3.91	3.81	4.61	3.77	5.50	5.60	4.87	4.57	4.05**	0.49
	(3.05)	(2.54)	(2.56)	(2.86)	(3.49)	(4.55)	(4.49)	(3.08)	(9.20)	(10.56)	(4.15)	(3.75)		
CONFIDENCE	4.98	4.53	5.49	4.81	4.89	4.59	5.15	4.69	4.43	4.48	5.27	4.58	0.97	7.14***
	(1.57)	(1.63)	(1.54)	(1.32)	(1.43)	(1.81)	(1.33)	(1.48)	(1.55)	(1.55)	(1.33)	(1.52)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 31 B

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
HOLD SET - PER CLUSTER

ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL				F TEST	F TEST
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	CLUSTER	GROUPS
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.46	4.78	5.40	4.74	4.74	4.57	4.75	4.81	4.92	5.04	4.98	4.72	1.10	1.45
	(1.48)	(1.39)	(1.01)	(1.47)	(1.65)	(1.73)	(1.34)	(1.31)	(1.62)	(1.55)	(1.37)	(1.42)		
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.36	4.27	4.89	4.64	4.54	4.43	4.60	4.49	4.48	4.61	4.78	4.57	0.26	1.39
	(1.59)	(1.59)	(1.30)	(1.39)	(1.44)	(1.32)	(1.40)	(1.78)	(1.79)	(1.47)	(1.44)	(1.42)		
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	5.09	5.15	5.60	5.18	5.28	5.27	5.18	5.17	5.08	5.20	5.35	5.38	0.04	0.76
	(1.50)	(1.36)	(1.00)	(1.10)	(1.36)	(1.34)	(1.21)	(1.16)	(1.58)	(1.42)	(1.31)	(1.28)		
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.77	5.71	6.18	5.44	5.69	5.50	5.48	5.33	5.48	5.56	5.51	5.38	1.88	2.09*
	(1.43)	(1.45)	(0.91)	(1.20)	(1.07)	(1.31)	(1.28)	(1.25)	(1.33)	(1.44)	(1.22)	(1.29)		
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.78	5.72	6.08	5.70	5.91	5.85	5.68	5.77	5.73	5.74	5.54	5.85	0.35	0.03
	(1.47)	(1.22)	(1.04)	(1.18)	(0.96)	(1.32)	(1.24)	(1.22)	(1.17)	(1.11)	(1.26)	(1.05)		
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.00	4.79	4.73	4.55	4.63	4.51	4.64	4.47	4.59	4.48	4.75	4.72	0.23	0.99
	(1.60)	(1.27)	(1.47)	(1.49)	(1.43)	(1.38)	(1.16)	(1.22)	(1.44)	(1.39)	(1.31)	(1.23)		
LOW PRICE/ COST OF TRIP	4.19	4.08	3.72	3.97	4.23	4.16	4.05	4.04	4.36	4.12	4.26	4.16	0.72	0.61
	(1.57)	(1.37)	(1.34)	(1.11)	(1.48)	(1.66)	(1.31)	(1.43)	(1.37)	(1.70)	(1.35)	(1.62)		
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.23	4.38	4.88	4.26	4.79	4.46	4.68	4.45	4.62	4.58	5.06	4.66	1.28	2.85**
	(1.55)	(1.22)	(1.30)	(1.17)	(1.56)	(1.57)	(1.20)	(1.21)	(1.62)	(1.49)	(1.34)	(1.37)		
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.36	4.19	4.64	4.20	4.30	4.36	4.42	4.13	4.36	4.41	4.89	4.58	1.48	1.58
	(1.83)	(1.57)	(1.56)	(1.75)	(1.83)	(1.78)	(1.47)	(1.46)	(1.46)	(1.59)	(1.37)	(1.45)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 32 A

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
FOGGY SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL					
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	F TEST CLUSTER	F TEST GROUPS
SIZE	1.49	1.49	1.62	1.61	1.48	1.47	2.07	2.12	2.06	2.02	2.03	2.11	1.71	0.48
	(0.73)	(0.73)	(0.79)	(0.81)	(1.04)	(1.04)	(1.28)	(1.27)	(2.55)	(2.55)	(1.85)	(1.67)		
ATTITUDE	4.08	4.38	4.77	4.44	3.84	4.06	4.59	4.69	3.96	4.33	4.22	4.30	0.31	1.52
	(0.93)	(1.20)	(0.96)	(1.15)	(1.74)	(1.70)	(1.43)	(1.26)	(1.81)	(1.72)	(1.66)	(1.54)		
INTENTION	2.05	2.23	3.49	3.36	2.59	1.88	4.23	3.81	2.52	2.65	3.94	3.75	0.20	3.05**
	(1.65)	(3.02)	(2.73)	(1.84)	(2.27)	(1.99)	(3.16)	(3.11)	(2.99)	(2.45)	(6.97)	(3.04)		
CONFIDENCE	4.49	4.07	4.97	4.46	4.81	4.42	4.80	4.35	4.14	4.17	4.80	4.38	0.73	1.80
	(2.16)	(1.57)	(1.67)	(1.84)	(1.35)	(1.79)	(1.24)	(1.53)	(1.76)	(1.81)	(1.48)	(1.59)		

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 32 B

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES
FOGGY SET - PER CLUSTER
ADJUSTED MEAN RATINGS

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MODERN				AVERAGE				TRADITIONAL				F TEST	F TEST
	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	common hus	common wife	uncom hus	uncom wife	CLUSTER	GROUPS
EXCITING NIGHT LIFE	4.85 (1.13)	4.37 (1.38)	5.10 (0.55)	5.27 (0.82)	3.95 (1.23)	4.12 (1.53)	4.68 (1.30)	4.54 (1.40)	4.57 (1.78)	5.01 (1.60)	4.36 (1.57)	4.63 (1.52)	3.18**	0.77
CHANCE TO MEET PEOPLE	4.10 (1.54)	4.01 (1.64)	4.92 (1.05)	4.61 (0.95)	3.79 (1.51)	3.92 (1.08)	4.46 (1.46)	4.39 (1.20)	4.36 (1.68)	4.48 (1.58)	4.22 (1.79)	4.17 (1.21)	0.82	1.28
EXCELLENT QUALITY ACCOMODATIONS	4.75 (1.50)	5.04 (1.62)	5.54 (0.92)	5.40 (0.95)	4.53 (1.27)	4.43 (1.31)	5.14 (1.24)	5.01 (1.27)	4.74 (1.56)	5.03 (1.37)	4.61 (1.57)	4.83 (1.30)	1.34	1.25
BEAUTIFUL BEACHES	5.36 (1.62)	5.17 (1.83)	5.52 (1.63)	5.57 (1.17)	4.92 (1.57)	4.72 (1.78)	5.40 (1.27)	5.31 (1.33)	5.47 (1.56)	5.08 (1.49)	5.56 (1.38)	5.47 (1.29)	1.92	1.47
NICE AND WARM CLIMATE	5.64 (1.73)	5.22 (2.12)	5.95 (1.34)	6.12 (0.86)	5.39 (1.48)	5.46 (1.61)	5.65 (1.30)	5.74 (1.36)	5.58 (1.53)	5.70 (1.16)	5.59 (1.38)	5.72 (1.35)	0.29	0.95
EXCELLENT SPORT FACILITIES	4.68 (1.99)	5.12 (1.27)	5.14 (1.20)	5.51 (1.12)	4.30 (1.17)	3.83 (1.56)	4.78 (1.29)	4.46 (1.35)	4.29 (1.67)	4.42 (1.45)	4.39 (1.63)	4.41 (1.31)	4.12**	0.99
LOW PRICE/ COST OF TRIP	3.70 (1.25)	4.43 (1.53)	3.74 (0.97)	4.08 (1.40)	4.22 (1.34)	3.76 (1.54)	4.73 (1.43)	3.90 (1.36)	4.26 (1.58)	4.40 (1.87)	4.26 (1.60)	4.14 (1.55)	0.48	0.27
EXCELLENT CUISINE/ RESTAURANTS	4.05 (1.50)	4.33 (1.35)	4.58 (0.94)	4.63 (1.28)	3.93 (1.42)	3.98 (1.26)	4.84 (1.39)	4.48 (1.40)	4.39 (1.77)	4.66 (1.39)	4.55 (1.81)	4.29 (1.19)	0.46	1.23
EXCELLENT SHOPPING FACILITIES	4.56 (1.51)	4.04 (1.74)	4.94 (1.58)	4.19 (1.06)	4.22 (1.71)	3.91 (1.50)	4.62 (1.60)	4.67 (1.38)	4.10 (1.70)	4.62 (1.54)	4.25 (1.63)	4.27 (1.28)	0.09	0.81

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10 ** significance p<.05 *** significance p<.01

TABLE 33

PROPORTION OF COMMONLY EVOKED DESTINATIONS PER CLUSTER

	MODERN	AVERAGE	TRADITIONAL	F TEST
HUSBANDS	0.58 (0.28)	0.61 (0.32)	0.52 (0.37)	1.62
WIVES	0.55 (0.30)	0.56 (0.31)	0.48 (0.37)	1.54

( ) standard deviation

* significance p<.10

** significance p<.05

*** significance p<.01

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY THE *WIFE*

SECTION 1

This section contains questions pertaining to winter vacation destinations. We are interested in knowing how you feel about these destinations as candidates for your next winter vacation. Please read each question carefully before making your choice(s).

1. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations would you **seriously consider visiting**? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

2. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations would you **definitely not** consider visiting? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

3. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations do you **have** an opinion of, but **aren't sure** whether you would consider visiting them? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

4. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations do you **have no** opinion of and **aren't sure** whether you would consider visiting them? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

5. Please indicate how important you consider the following features when choosing a winter vacation destination:

	Not important at all						Extremely important
Exciting night life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent chance to meet people and socialize	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent quality accommodations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Beautiful beaches	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Nice and warm climate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent sports facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low price/cost of trip	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent cuisine/restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent shopping facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY THE *HUSBAND*

SECTION 1

This section contains questions pertaining to winter vacation destinations. We are interested in knowing how you feel about these destinations as candidates for your next winter vacation. Please read each question carefully before making your choice(s).

1. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations would you **seriously consider visiting**? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

2. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations would you **definitely not** consider visiting? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

3. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations do you **have** an opinion of, but **aren't sure** whether you would consider visiting them? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

4. If you had two weeks of vacation coming up next winter, which of the following destinations do you **have no** opinion of and **aren't sure** whether you would consider visiting them? (*Check* as many as apply).

__ Bahamas	__ Cuba	__ Italy
__ Barbados	__ Dominican Republic	__ Jamaica
__ Bermuda	__ Florida	__ Mexico
__ Britain	__ France	__ Puerto Rico
__ California	__ Hawaii	__ Other: _____

5. Please indicate how important you consider the following features when choosing a winter vacation destination:

	Not important at all						Extremely important
Exciting night life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent chance to meet people and socialize	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent quality accommodations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Beautiful beaches	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Nice and warm climate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent sports facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low price/cost of trip	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent cuisine/restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Excellent shopping facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Please indicate to what extent you think that the following features are present in each of the following winter vacation destinations:

a) Exciting night life

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

b) Excellent chance to meet people and socialize

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

c) **Excellent quality accommodations**

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

d) **Beautiful beaches**

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

e) Nice and warm climate

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

f) Excellent sports facilities

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

g) Low price/cost of trip

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

h) Excellent cuisine/restaurants

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

i) Excellent shopping facilities

	Not present at all						Present to a great extent
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, please indicate the degree to which you like each of these destinations for a winter vacation.

	Dislike very much						Like very much
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, please indicate your **opinion** about each of these destinations for a winter vacation.

	A very poor destination						An excellent destination
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, please indicate how **confident** you are about your evaluation of each of these destinations for a winter vacation.

	Not at all Confident						Extremely Confident
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, please indicate **how certain** you are about evaluating each of these destinations as a winter vacation.

	Extremely Uncertain						Extremely Certain
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, please indicate the strength of your **intention to visit** each one of them, if you were to make a selection for a winter vacation.

	Would definitely not intend to visit						Would definitely intend to visit
Bahamas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbados	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bermuda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Britain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
California	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuba	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominican Republic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Florida	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
France	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hawaii	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jamaica	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mexico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Puerto Rico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. Please think of the next winter vacation you might go on. With respect to the *following vacation destinations*, how would you distribute 100 points among the winter destinations listed below (The total must add up to 100, each indicating your probability of selection for your next winter vacation).

Destination	**Points (0-100)**
Bahamas	_____
Barbados	_____
Bermuda	_____
Britain	_____
California	_____
Cuba	_____
Dominican Republic	_____
Florida	_____
France	_____
Hawaii	_____
Italy	_____
Jamaica	_____
Mexico	_____
Puerto Rico	_____
Other: _____	_____
Total	100 points

SECTION 2

In this section we are interested in knowing who in the family makes various winter vacation decisions.

When you go on a winter vacation who usually decides?:

	Husband	Husband more than Wife	Equally	Wife more than Husband	Wife
when to go	1	2	3	4	5
where to go	1	2	3	4	5
what features to look for (e.g, night life, beaches, cuisine, socializing, sports facilities)	1	2	3	4	5
how much to spend	1	2	3	4	5
how long to go for	1	2	3	4	5
form of transportation	1	2	3	4	5
type of accommodation	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 3

For this question we are interested in knowing **your** attitudes and opinions on a variety of topics. Please indicate the degree to which you **personally** agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number:

Statements	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
- A married woman's *most* important task in life should be taking care of her husband and children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- The wife should realize that a woman's greatest reward and satisfaction come through her children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- Having a job herself should be just *as* important as encouraging her husband in his job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If the wife works, she should *not* try to get ahead in the same way that a man does.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- The wife should be able to make long-range plans for her occupation, in the same way that her husband does for his.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- The wife should *not* have equal authority with her husband in making decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If the wife has the same job as a man who has to support his family, she should *not* expect the same pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If being a wife and mother isn't satisfying enough, she should take a job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- There should be more day-care centres and nursery schools so that more young mothers could work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- A wife should realize that, just as a woman is not suited for heavy physical work, there are also other kinds of jobs she isn't suited for, because of her mental and emotional nature.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- A wife should give up her job whenever it inconveniences her husband and children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If a mother of young children works, it should be only while the family needs the money.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- A married man's chief responsibility should be his job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If *his* wife works, the husband should share equally in household chores such as cooking, cleaning, and washing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If his wife works, the husband should share *equally* in the responsibilities of child care.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If *her* job sometimes requires his wife to be away from home overnight, this should not bother the husband.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- If a child gets sick and his wife works, the husband should be just as willing as she is to stay home from work and take care of the child.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Statements	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
- If his wife makes more money than he does, this should not bother the husband.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- The husband should be the head of the family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- On the job, men should be willing to work for women supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- A married man should be willing to have a smaller family, so that his wife can work if she wants to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I believe that the institution of marriage and family was established by God.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I feel that being a mother is a special calling from God.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I think that a working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does *not* work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I feel that a parent gets more satisfaction when a son gets ahead in his occupation than when a daughter gets ahead in hers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I feel that a marriage is *in*complete without children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I think that young girls should be permitted as much independence as boys.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- I feel a preschool child is likely to suffer if the mother works.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION 4

The following section describes how you may feel about yourself and conduct daily activities in the multicultural environment of Canada. Please follow the instructions carefully. If at any point you do not know the answer, your best estimate will be fine.

1. Language Use: In this section, we would like to know the extent to which you use English, French, and Italian in your normal activities. Please give a distribution in percent of time from 0 (never) to 100 (all the time).

	English	*French*	*Italian*	*Total*
At home: with spouse	____	____	____	100%
At home: with children	____	____	____	100%
with relatives	____	____	____	100%
with close friends	____	____	____	100%
watching television	____	____	____	100%

2. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I consider myself to be English-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I consider myself to be Italian-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My parents are English-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My parents are Italian-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My closest friends are English-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My closest friends are Italian-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My spouse is English-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My spouse is Italian-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My neighbours are English-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My neighbours are Italian-Canadian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am very comfortable dealing with Italian-Canadians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italian-Canadians would benefit greatly if they adopted all aspects of the English culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Italian and English-Canadians should share each other's cultural heritage.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to go to places where I can be with English-Canadians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to go to places where I can be with Italian-Canadians.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I grew up in predominantly English-Canadian neighbourhoods.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I grew up in predominantly Italian-Canadian neighbourhoods.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All the newspapers/magazines I read are in the English language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All the newspapers/magazines I read are in the Italian language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All the movies/videotapes I see are in the English language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All the movies/videotapes I see are in the Italian language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I participate in all activities of the English-Canadian community or political organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I participate in all activities of the Italian-Canadian community or political organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am very attached to all aspects of the English culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am very attached to all aspects of the Italian culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION 5

This section contains a few demographic questions for classification purposes only. Please *check* the appropriate answer.

1. Please indicate the level of education that *you* have completed or are completing:

   __ high school
   __ CEGEP
   __ university

2. Please indicate to which age category *you* belong:

   __ Under 20
   __ 20 - 29
   __ 30 - 39
   __ 40 - 49
   __ 50 and over

3. How long have you been married to your current spouse?

   __ under 3 years
   __ 3 - 5 years
   __ 6 - 10 years
   __ 11 - 15 years
   __ 16 - 20 years
   __ more than 20 years

4. What is the annual income category:

   For yourself?

   __ under $10 000
   __ $10 000 - $29 999
   __ $30 000 - $49 999
   __ $50 000 - $69 999
   __ $70 000 and over

   For your family?

   __ under $20,000
   __ $20,000 - 39,999
   __ $40,000 - 59,999
   __ $60,000 - 79,999
   __ $80,000 and over

5. What is *your* gender?

   __ female
   __ male

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alba, Joseph W. and Chattopadhyay, Amitava, (1985) "Effects of Context and Post-Category Cues on Recall of Competing Brands," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 22 (August), 340-349.

Belch, M.A., Belch, G.E. and Sciglimpaglia, D., (1980) "Conflict in Family Decision-Making," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 7, 475-479.

Belonax, Joseph A. and Mittelstaedt, Robert A., (1978) "Evoked Set Size as a Function of Number of Choice Criterion and Information Variability," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 5, ed. H. Keith Hunt, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 48-51.

Blood, Robert O. and Wolfe, Donald M., (1960) Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Brim, O., Glass, D.C., Lavin, D.E. and Goodman, N., (1962) Personality and Decision Processes, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Brisoux, Jacques E. and Laroche, Michel, (1980) "A Proposed Consumer Strategy of Simplification for Categorizing Brands," eds. John H. Summey and Ronald D. Taylor, Evolving Marketing Thought for 1980, Carbondale, IL: Southern Marketing Association, 112-14.

Brown, George H., (1961) "The Automobile Buying Decision Within the Family," in Nelson N. Foote, ed., Household Decision-Making. New York: New York University Press, 193-9.

Burns, Alvin C., (1975) "Spousal Involvement and Empathy in Jointly-Resolved and Authoritatively-Resolved Purchase Subdivisions," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol.III, Cincinatti, Ohio: Association for Consumer Research.

Burns, Alvin C. and Granbois, Donald H., (1977) "Factors Moderating the Resolution of Preferred Conflict in Family Automobile Purchasing," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 8, 77-86.

Burns, Alvin C. and Granbois, Donald D., (1979) "Advancing the Study of Family Decision-Making," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 7, 221-25.

Burns, David J., (1992) "Husband-Wife Innovative Consumer Decision Making: Exploring the Effect of Family Power," Psychology & Marketing, Vol. 9, Issue 3 (May/June), 175-189.

Buss, Christian W. and Schaninger, Charles M., (1983) "The Influence of Sex Roles on Family Decision Processes and Outcomes," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10, ed. Richard Scanzoni and Alice Tybout, 439-444.

Church, N.J., Laroche, M. and Rosenblatt, J., (1985) "Consumer Strategies of Simplification for Products Involving Search Process: An Empirical Test and a Proposed Extension of the Brisoux-Laroche Paradigm," Working Paper #84-001, Concordia University, Montreal.

Clawson, Joseph C., (1961) "Family Composition, Motivation, and Buying Decisions," in Nelson N. Foote, Household Decision-Making, New York: New York University Press.

Corfman, Kim P. and Lehmann, Donald R., (1987) "Models of Cooperative Group Decision-Making and Relative Influence: An Experimental Investigation of Family Purchase Decisions," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 14 (June), 1-13.

Cunningham, Isabella C.M. and Green, Robert T., (1974) "Purchasing Roles in the US Family: 1955-73," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 38 (Oct), 61-64.

Curry, David J. and Menasco, Michael B., (1979) "Some Effects of Differing Information Processing Strategies on Husband-Wife Joint Decisions," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 6 (Sept.), 192-203.

Davis, Harry L., (1970) "Dimensions of Marital Roles in Consumer Decision-Making," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 7 (May), 168-77.

Davis, Harry L., (1971) "Measurement of Husband-Wife Influence in Consumer Purchase Decisions," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 8 (August), 305-12.

Davis, Harry L., (1972) "Determinants of Marital Roles in a Consumer Purchase Decision," unpublished paper, Brussels, European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management.

Davis, Harry L., (1976) "Decision Making within the Household," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 2 (March), 241-260.

Davis, Harry L. and Rigaux, B.P., (1974) "Perception of Marital Roles in Decision Processes," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 1 (June), 168-177.

Dewey, J., (1910) How We Think, New York: D.C. Heath and Co.

Engel, J.F., Kollat, D.T. and Blackwell, R.D., (1973) Consumer Behavior, 2nd ed., New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Ferber, Robert and Lee, L.C., (1974) "Husband-Wife Influence in Family Purchasing Behavior," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 1 (June) 43-50.

Filiatrault, Pierre and Ritchie, J.R. Brent, (1980) "Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 7 (September), 131-40.

Fodness, Dale, (1992) "The Impact of Family Life Cycle on the Vacation Decision-Making Process," Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 31, Issue 2 (Fall), 8-13.

Gedal, K., (1966) "Purchasing Behavior in Households", in M. Kjan-Hansur ed., Readings in Danish Theory of Marketing, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 84-100.

Grandbois, Donald H., (1963) "The Role of Communication in the Family Decision Making Process," in ed. Stephen A. Greyser, American Marketing Association Proceedings, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 57.

Grandbois, Donald H., (1971) "A Multi-Level Approach to Family Role Research," in Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the Association for Consumer Research, ed. Gardner, D.H., Association for Consumer Research, 99-106.

Guttenberg, E., (1987) "Family Decision Making in the Case of a Vacation Selection: A Test of The Brisoux-Laroche Paradigm," Business Research Project, MBA Program, Concordia University, Montreal.

Haley, Overholser and Associates, Inc., (1975) Purchase Decisions: Measurements of Husband/Wife Influence on Buying Decisions.

Hair, Joseph F. Jr., Anderson, Rolph E., Tatham, Ronald L. and Black, William C., (1992) Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings, Third edition, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hansen, John R. and Wernerfelt, Birger, (1990) "An Evaluation Cost Model of Consideration Sets," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 16 (March), 393-408.

Heer, David M., (1963) "The Measurement and Bases of Family Power: An Overview," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 25, 133-139.

Hempel, Donald, (1974) "Family Buying Decision: A Cross-Cultural Perspective," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 11 (August), 295-302.

Hempel, Donald, (1975) "Family Role Structure & Housing Decisions," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 2, ed. Mary J. Schlinger, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 70-80.

Hopper, J. S., Burns, A. C. and Sherrell, D.L., (1989) "An Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of Husband and Wife Self-Report Purchase Decision Making Measures," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 17, No. 3, 227-234.

Howard, John A. and Sheth, Jagdish N., (1969) Theory of Buyer Behavior, New York: Wiley.

Jaffe Associates, Inc., A Pilot Study of the Roles of Husband and Wives in Purchasing Decisions, n.d.

Jaffe, Laurence J. and Senft, Henry (1966) "The Roles of Husbands and Wives in Purchasing Decisions," Lee Adler and Irving Crespi, eds., Attitude Research at Sea, Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Jenkins, Roger L., (1978) "Family Vacation Decision-Making," Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 16 (Spring), 2-7.

Katona, G. and Mueller, E., (1954) "A Study of Purchase Decisions," in L.H. Clark, Consumer Behavior, Vol. 1, New York: New York University Press.

Kenkel, W.F., (1961) "Husband-Wife Interaction in Decision-Making and Decision Choices," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 54, 255-262.

Kim, Chankon and Khoury, Majeed, (1987) "Task Complexity and Contingent Information Processing in the Case of Couple's Decision Making," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 15, Issue 3 (Fall), 32-43.

Kim, Chankon C., Laroche, Michel and Gutttenberg, Elina, (1988) "A Study of the Contents of Husbands" and Wives' Evoked Sets of Vacation Destination," Working Paper #88-017, Department of Marketing, Concordia University, Montreal.

Kim, Chankon, Laroche, Michel, Rosenblatt, Jerry A. and Guttenberg, Elina, (1989) "A Study of the Contents of Husbands' and Wives' Evoked Sets of Vacation Destinations," in George J. Avlonitis, N.K. Papavasiliou and A.K. Kouremenos, eds., Proceedings of the XVIII th Annual Conference of the European Marketing Academy, Athens (Greece), Vol. I, 603-618.

Kim, Chankon, Laroche, Michel and Lee, Brenda, (1990) "A Taxonomy of French and English Canadians Based on Communication Patterns," Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, Vol. 7, Issue 2 (June), 6.

Kirchler, Erich, (1988) "Diary Reports on Daily Economic Decisions of Happy Versus Unhappy Couples," Journal of Economic Psychology, Vol. 9, Issue 3 (Sept), 327-357.

Kirchler, Erich, (1990) "Spouses Influence Strategies in Purchase Decisions as Dependent on Conflict Type and Relationship Characteristics," Journal of Economic Psychology, Vol. 11, Issue 1 (March), 101-118.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R.S. and Bellachey, E.L., (1962) Individual in Society, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lackman, Conway and Lanasa, John M., (1993) "Family Decision-Making Theory: An Overview and Assessment," Psychology & Marketing, Vol. 10, Issue 2 (March-April), 81-93.

Lam, P., (1968) "Experiences in the Use of Communication Methods in Promoting Family Planning in HongKong," in Report of the Working Group on communication Aspects of Family Planning Programmes and Selected Papers, Asian Population Studies, Series 3, Bangkok: ECAFE.

Laroche, M., (1985) "How Consumers Process Information When Faced With Many Alternatives," Working Paper #85-018, Concordia University, Montreal.

Laroche, M. and Taylor, T., (1987) "An Empirical Study of Major Segmentation Issues in Retail Banking," Working Paper #87-009, Concordia University, Montreal.

Lavidge, R.J. and Steiner, G.A., (1961) "A Model for Predictive Measurement of Advertising Effectiveness," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 25, No. 4 (October), 59-62.

Lazer, William and Culley, James D., (1983) Marketing Management, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Learner Marketing Research and Development, (1968) "New Brand Purchasing Dynamics: An In-Depth Examination of the Critical Incidents and Factors Involved in a New or Different Brand Coming into the Home," Life Magazine, (December).

Leblanc, M., (1997) "Customer Retention Study for Air Canada Vacations," Business Research Project, EMBA Program, Montreal, Concordia University.

Maddox, Neil R., Gronhaug, Kjell, Homans, Richard D. and May, Frederick E., (1978) "Correlates of Information Gathering and Evoked Set Size for New Automobile Purchases in Norway and the U.S.," in H. Keith Hunt, ed., Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 5, Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research, 167-170.

Male vs Female Influence in Buying and in Brand Selection, (1948), New York: Fawcett Publications.

Male vs Female Influence in Buying and in Brand Selection, (1950), Vol. II, New York: Fawcett Publications.

March James G., (1955) "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence," American Political Science Review, Vol. 49, (June), 431-451.

Menasco, Michael B. and Curry, David J., (1989) "Utility and Choice: An Empirical Study of Wife/Husband Decision Making", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 16 (June), 87-97.

Michie, Donald A. and Sullivan, Gary L., (1990) "The Role(s) of the International Travel Agent in the Travel Decision Process of Client Families", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 29, Issue 2 (Fall), 30-38.

Miller, George A., (1956) "The Magic Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information," The Psychological Review, Vol. 63 (March), 81-97.

Morgan, James N., (1961) "Household Decision-Making," in Nelson Foote, ed., Household Decision-Making, New York: New York University Press, 81-102.

Moschis, G.P. and Moore, R.L. (1979) "Family Communication and Consumer Socialization," In W.L. Wolkie (Ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, Vol. 6, 757-759.

Munsinger, Gary M., Weber, Jean E. and Hansen, Richard W., (1975) "Joint Home Purchasing Decision by Husbands and Wives", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 1, 60-66.

Nowland and Company, Inc., (1964) "Family Participation and Influence in Shopping and Brand Selection: Phase I," Life Magazine.

Nowland and Company, Inc., (1965) "Family Participation and Influence in Shopping and Brand Selection: Phase II," Life Magazine.

Palda, Kristan S., (1966) "The Hypothesis of a Hierarchy of Effects: A Partial Evaluation," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 3 (February), 13-24.

Palmore, J., (1967) "The Chicago Snowball: A Study of the Flow and Diffusion of Family Planning Information," in D.J. Bogue, ed., Sociological Contributions to Family Planning Research, Chicago: Community and Family Planning Center, University of Chicago, 272-363.

Park, C. Whan, (1982) "Joint Decisions in Home Purchasing: A Muddling-Through Process," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 9 (Sept), 151-162.

Parkinson, Thomas L. and Reilly, Michael, (1979) "An Information Processing Approach to Evoked Set Formation," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 6, ed. William L. Wilke, Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 227-231.

Pollay, R.W., (1968) "A Model of Family Decision Making," British Journal of Marketing, Vol. 2, 206-216.

Qualls, William J., (1984) "Sex Roles, Husband-Wife Influence and Family Decision Behavior," in Advances Consumer Research, Vol. 11, ed., Thomas C. Kinnear, Ann Orbor, MI: Association of Consumer Research, 270-275.

Qualls, Williams J., (1987) "Household Decision Behavior: The Impact of Husbands' and Wives' Sex Role Orientation," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 14 (Sept), 264-279.

Robertson, R.G., (1975) Travel: 1971 Study of American Markets, New York: U.S. News and World Report, Inc., 1-94.

Rosen, Dennis L. and Grandbois, Donald H., (1983) "Determinants of Role Structure in Family Financial Management", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 10, 253-258.

Scanzoni, John, (1977) "Changing Sex Roles and Directions in Family Decision Making," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 4 (Dec.), 185-188.

Secord, P.F. and Backman, C.W., (1964) Social Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sharp, H. and Mott, P., (1956) "Consumer Decisions in a Metropolitan Family," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 21 (October), 149-56.

Shepherd, C.D. and Woodruff, R.B., (1988) "A Muddling Through Model of Family Purchase Conflict Management," in Proceedings of the Society for Consumer Psychology: 73-86.

Sheth, J.N., (1974) "A Theory of Family Buying Decisions," in Models of Buyer Behavior: Conceptual, Quantitative and Empirical, New York: Harper and Row.

Sheth, J.N. and Cosmas, S., (1975) "Tactics of Conflict Resolution in Family Buying Behavior," Unpublished Working Paper, College of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Illinois.

Shuptrine, F.K. and Samuelson, G., (1976) "Dimensions of Marital Roles in Consumer Decision-Making: Revisited," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 13 (February), 87-91.

Spiro, Rosann L., (1983) "Persuasion in Family Decision-Making," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 9, 393-402.

Stanton, William J., (1983) Fundamentals of Marketing, New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., p.133.

Starch, Daniel and Staff, (1958) "Male vs Female Influence on the Purchase of Selected Products," True Magazine.

Statistics Canada, Profile of Census Tracts in Montreal, Part B., Ottawa: Industry, Science and Technology Canada, 1994. 1991 Census of Canada, Catalogue number 95-330.

Szybillo, G., Sosanie, A.K. and Tenebein, A., (1984) "Family Member Influence in Household Decision Making," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 6, 312-316.

Thompson, J.D. and Tuden, A., (1959) "Strategies, Structures, and Processes of Organizational Decision," in J. D. Thompson, P. B. Hammond, R. W. Hawkes, B. H. Junker and A. Truden, eds., Comparative Studies in Administration, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 195-216.

Travel Research International Inc., (1968) "A Study of the Role of Husband and Wife in Air Travel Decisions," Sports Illustrated, (September).

Ward, Scott and Wackman, Daniel B., (1972) "Children's Purchase Influence Attempts and Parental Yielding," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 9, 316-319.

Wilkes, Robert E., (1975) "Husband-Wife Influence in Purchase Decisions - A Confirmation and Extension," Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 12 (May), 224-7.

Wilkie, William L., (1994) Consumer Behavior, Third edition, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wolgast, Elizabeth H., (1958) "Do Husbands of Wives Make the Purchasing Decisions?," The Journal of Marketing, Vol. 23 (Oct.), 151-158.

Woodside, Arch G. and Sherrell, Dan, (1977) "Traveler Evoked, Inept, and Inert Sets of Vacation Destinations," Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 16, No. 1.

Woodside, Arch G. and Lysonski, Steven, (1989) "A General Model of Traveler Destination Choice," Journal of Travel Research, (Spring), 8-14.