Abstract
In an earlier paper Narayana and Markin suggested that the relationship between consumer behavior and product performance can be most effectively explained by classifying existing brands into awareness and un-awareness sets. This paper is a sequel to the earlier study. By using the same methodology and concentrating primarily on shopping and specialty goods, the authors have concluded that the Narayana-Markin model is applicable and conceptually sound.

Introduction
In a significant paper, Narayana and Markin have pointed out that the relationship between consumer behavior and product performance can be most effectively be explained by classifying existing brands into awareness and un-awareness sets. The awareness set represents those brands that the consumers are aware of and might consider for purchase. This set is further classified into three subsets: evoked set, inert set, and inert set (1). They define the evoked set as the group of a few select brands the consumers consider in their purchase choice. The inert set, on the other hand, consists of those brands for which the consumer has neither a positive nor a negative evaluation. Finally, the inert set implies those brands which are rejected by the consumer because of unpleasant experiences or negative feedback received from others (1).

Naturally, successful marketing implies first to have one's products included in the awareness set. Second, and more important, the product should be included in the evoked set rather than in the inert or inert sets. Narayana and Markin, in an attempt to test their model, have analyzed a group of convenience products and concluded that consumers, indeed, do attempt to simplify their decision-making process almost automatically by categorizing the existing brands. In this process they accept a few, reject a few, and appear to ignore the rest of the brands. Consumers typically have good rationales to categorize the products. Hence, Narayana and Markin confirmed the usefulness of their approach.

Since Narayana and Markin have used only convenience goods, at least two major questions arise. One, could this model be adopted for shopping and specialty goods? Two, would the model hold true in a similar manner if this adoption is possible? This paper attempts to answer these two questions by a sequel study.

Methodology
A convenience sample of four consumer behavior classes taught by one of the authors was selected as the study base. The sample size was 140 individuals. Without mentioning the conceptual frame of the study the students were asked to answer three key questions about seven product groups which are considered to be included in the shopping-specialty goods spectrum (2). The questions taken from Narayana and Markin were:

1. List the names of all brands that you are aware of.
2. (a) List the names of brands that you consider buying.
   (b) What are the reasons for this?
3. (a) List the names of all brands that you do not consider buying any time at all.
   (b) What are the reasons for this?

Two hypotheses were constructed:

H1: The Narayana-Markin model is also applicable to the shopping-specialty goods spectrum.

H2: There is a significant difference in the intensity of evoked, inert, and inert categories as the consumer moves from convenience goods to the shopping-specialty goods spectrum.

Results and Analysis
Table 1 illustrates the number of brands in the awareness, evoked, inert, and inert sets for the shopping-specialty spectrum and contrasts the results with those of Narayana and Markin for convenience goods. It appears that just as in the previous study there were substantially larger numbers of brands in the awareness set than in the evoked, inert, and inert sets for all of the seven product categories. However, unlike the Narayana-Markin study, in the shopping-specialty spectrum categories there were a substantially larger number of brands in the evoked set as opposed to the inert and inert sets.

Table 2 depicts the averages of individual brand statistics which were based on the lists generated by the response to questions mentioned earlier. For instance, in the Narayana-Markin Individual Brand Statistics Table the proportion of respondents listing each brand by awareness set and its subsets is reported. In this study both the Narayana-Markin and our findings were further averaged to determine the difference in response between the convenience goods and the shopping-specialty spectrum. As can be observed from Table 2, there were on the average fewer awareness brands in the shopping-specialty spectrum. A comparison between the evoked sets, however, showed the opposite. A substantially larger percentage of brands was included in the shopping-specialty spectrum as opposed to the convenience goods brands. Similarly, a significantly wide gap existed between the inert set of convenience goods and the inert set of shopping-specialty spectrum. There were many more inert brands among the convenience goods compared to the shopping-specialty spectrum.

By examining the data presented in Tables 1 and 2 it would be reasonable to maintain that the awareness set and the evoked, inert, and inert subset categorization is as applicable to shopping and specialty goods as it is to convenience goods. Thus, the first hypothesis is accepted.
Table 1 indicated that there were substantially larger numbers of evoked set brands in the shopping-specialty spectrum as opposed to the convenience goods. Furthermore, the difference between the number of brands in the awareness set and the evoked set for shopping and specialty goods was much narrower than that of the convenience goods. Naturally, this situation led to a substantially smaller number of brands in the inert set. Table 2 findings reinforced these results in that the percentages of the brands included in the evoked set for shopping and specialty products are considerably larger than those of convenience products. Similarly, the analysis of the inert sets indicated that there are many more inert convenience goods brands than those of shopping and specialty goods. Thus, there existed a much greater intensity in the shopping and specialty brands evoked sets than in the convenience brands evoked sets. Similarly, the same type of intensity differences was observed for the inert sets in the opposite direction, i.e., more inert convenience brands than specialty-shopping brands. As a result, the second hypothesis also is accepted. Figure 1 illustrates the revised version of the Narayana-Markin model. Since there are significant differences in the awareness sets of convenience goods and shopping and specialty goods, the model is revised to depict those differences.

Figure 1

Different Alternatives of Brand Performance

The implications are rather clear. When considering convenience goods, consumers simplified their lives by ignoring or eliminating many brands. For obvious reasons, there are no significant gains possible from switching brands. In regard to shopping and specialty goods, simplifying life was replaced by economic benefit and psychological satisfaction. The consumers gathered relatively more information so that they had a large evoked set. This provided them the choice which would, in turn, lead to greater benefits than in the case of convenience goods. Just as Narayana and Markin stated, this behavior pattern appears to have a solid rational base.