

Full Length Research Paper

Construction of efficient conjoint experimental designs using MCON procedure

Marija Kuzmanovic*, Milan Martic, Mirko Vujosevic and Biljana Panic

Department of Operations Research and Statistics, Faculty of Organizational Sciences, University of Belgrade, Jove Ilica 154, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia.

Accepted 14 September, 2011

Conjoint analysis has been a widely used method for measuring customer preferences since 1970s. This method is based on the idea that customers' decisions depend on all tangible and intangible product features. One of the fundamental steps in performing conjoint analysis is the construction of experimental designs. These designs are expected to be orthogonal and balanced in an ideal case. In practice, it is hard to construct optimal designs and thus constructing of near optimal and efficient designs is carried out. There are several ways to quantify the relative efficiency of experimental designs. The choice of measure will determine which types of experimental designs are favoured as well as the algorithms for choosing efficient designs. In this paper, we propose a simultaneous algorithm which combines two optimality criteria: standard criterion named by A-efficiency, and non-standard criterion, P-value. The algorithm was implemented as the procedure in MCON software for traditional conjoint analysis. The computational experiments were made and results were compared with results of SPSS[®] procedure. It was shown that, unlike the SPSS[®] procedure, MCON procedure could construct designs that contain an arbitrary chosen number of profiles. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the designs constructed using MCON procedure are not just highly efficient but also better balanced than those constructed by SPSS[®].

Key words: Conjoint analysis, efficient experimental design, optimality criteria, approximate algorithm, MCON procedure.

INTRODUCTION

Attractiveness of the preference measuring techniques and its usage in practice has been rapidly increased in the last few years. The practical significance of these techniques derives from their widespread use for new product or concept development and valuation studies in such diverse areas as marketing, transport and financial services, etc (Gustafsson et al., 2003; Wittink and Cattin, 1989; Wittink et al., 1994). One method that has become particularly popular in this context is conjoint analysis (Kofteci et al., 2010; Kuzmanovic et al., 2011; Tawil et al., 2011).

Conjoint analysis is a decomposition method which

assumes that products/services can "break-down" into their attributive components and which implies the study of joint effects of products' variety attributes on their preference. In conjoint analysis, respondents have to evaluate a set of alternatives that are represented by factorial combinations of the levels of certain attributes. In traditional conjoint approach, the alternatives have to be rank ordered or rated on some graded scale. It is assumed that these preference judgments are based on the overall utility values of the considered profile's levels. These unknown parameters are then estimated from the data. If the data consists of ranking techniques from linear programming, non-metric versions of ANOVA can be used. Metric conjoint analysis comprises variants of conjoint analyses that use rating scales. Here, the utility values are usually estimated by the least squares procedures. Because of the metric response format and

*Corresponding author. E-mail: marija.kuzmanovic@fon.bg.ac.rs.
Tel: +381 698893206. Fax: +38111 113950868.

the linear relationship between preference judgments and attributes, it is especially this type of conjoint analysis that can be readily applied to the optimal design theory techniques.

The quality of statistical analysis heavily depends on the alternatives presented in the experimental design. An experimental design is a plan for running an experiment. Experiments are performed to study the effects of the factor levels on the dependent variable. The factors of an experimental design are variables that have two or more fixed values or levels of the factors. In conjoint analysis, the factors are the attributes of the hypothetical products or services, and the response is either preference or choice.

Using all combinations of attribute levels, that is, a full factorial design, the number of evaluations required from every respondent soon becomes prohibitively large along with the number of attributes and/or levels increased. To deal with this problem, the application of formal experimental designs was suggested. Green and Rao (1971) and Green and Wind (1973) proposed the use of orthogonal arrays, incomplete block designs and fractional factorial designs of different resolutions to reduce the number of evaluations to be performed. In this reduction process, the goodness of the reduced designs is especially important. This goodness is named efficiency.

There are several ways to quantify the relative efficiency of experimental designs. The choice of measure will determine which types of experimental designs are favoured as well as the techniques for choosing efficient designs. Two basic techniques for constructing efficient designs are manual, typically used in surveys with small number of attributes and levels, and computerized search which is based on approximate algorithms.

A number of recent papers have searched for, or derived, efficient experimental conjoint designs using approximate algorithms (Barone and Lombardo, 2005; Cook and Nachtsheim, 1980; Federov, 1972; Grossmann et al., 2002; Haines, 1996; Kessels et al., 2008; Kuhfeld, 1997; Kuzmanovic, 2005, 2006; Ma et al., 2000; Meyer and Nachtsheim, 1995; Nguyen, 1996; Steckel et al., 1991; Xu, 2002; Xu and Wan, 2011; Zwerina et al., 1996). The most commonly used design criterion in literature has been D-optimality, or the maximization of the determinant of the Fisher information matrix (Kessels et al., 2008; Kuhfeld, 1994, 1997; Mitchell, 1974; Mitchell and Miller, 1970; Zwerina et al., 1996). However, some authors propose use of some other standard (Grossmann et al., 2002; Huber and Zwerina, 1996; Nguyen, 1996) as well as non-standard criteria (Kuzmanovic, 2006; Ma et al., 2000; Steckel et al., 1991).

The purpose of this paper is to present a procedure for constructing efficient conjoint experimental designs, named MCON procedure. The procedure relies on a

simple and effective algorithm which combines two types of efficiency measures.

CONJOINT EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The designs of experiment are fundamental components of conjoint analysis. Experimental designs are used to construct the hypothetical products or services. A simple experimental design is the full-factorial design, which consists of all possible combinations of the factors levels. These combinations in conjoint analysis are referred as profiles or concepts. For example, with six factors, three at two levels and three at three levels (denoted as $2^3 3^3$), there are 216 possible combinations. In a full-factorial design, all main effects, two-way interactions, and higher-order interactions are estimable and uncorrelated. The problem with a full-factorial design is that it is, for more practical situations, too cost-prohibitive and tedious to have subjects rate in all possible combinations. For this reason, researchers often use fractional-factorial designs, which have fewer runs than full-factorial designs. The basic difficulty is how to construct such fractional-factorial design which can provide worth data. In order to obtain valuable and reliable data, two basic principles must be taken into account: orthogonality and balance.

A design is orthogonal if all effects can be estimated independently from all other effects, and it is balanced when each level occurs equally often within each factor, which means the intercept is orthogonal to each effect. In ideal case, experimental design is orthogonal and balanced, hence optimal. This is the case in full-factorial designs. However, orthogonal designs are available for only a relatively small number of very specific problems. They may not be available due to the following reasons (Kuhfeld, 1997):

1. When there are many attributes in the survey,
2. When the number of attribute levels is different for most of the factors,
3. When some combinations of factor levels are infeasible,
4. When a non-standard number of runs (factor level combinations or hypothetical products) is desired or when the number of runs must be limited,
5. When some factor levels combinations are unrealistic, such as of the best product at the lowest price, or
6. When a non-standard model is being used, such as a model with interactions.

When an orthogonal design is not available, nonorthogonal designs must be used. The measure of experimental design's quality is referred as "efficiency". In efficient experimental designs, both variance and covariance of estimated parameters are minimal. Some orthogonal designs are not always more efficient than the

$$\begin{bmatrix} k-1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & k-2 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & k-3 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & \dots & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & \dots & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & \dots & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Figure 1. Helmert’s contrast matrix for an attribute with k levels.

other orthogonal or nonorthogonal designs.

Coding

Before the design is used, it must be coded. One standard coding is the binary or dummy variable or (1,0) coding. Another standard coding is effects or deviations from means or (1,0,-1) coding. However, for evaluating design efficiency, an orthogonal coding is the most appropriate. This is because no standard orthogonal coding such as effects or binary is generally correlated, even for orthogonal designs. One of the standard ways to orthogonally coding data is Chakravarty’s coding. The other method is called the Helmert’s procedure.

Helmert’s procedure consists of arranging a set of data into a matrix which fulfils the Helmert’s characteristics, meaning that the sum of each column is equal to zero. Helmert’s contrast matrix is a matrix with $k-1$ number of columns and k number of rows (Figure 1). The diagonal of this matrix from (1,1) to ($k-1$, $k-1$) is filled with a decreasing series of numbers going from $k-1$ down to 1. The supra-diagonal elements are set to zero while the infra-diagonal elements are set to -1 . A matrix following these characteristic automatically has a mean of zero for each of the column.

Optimality criteria

An optimality criterion is a single number that summarizes how good a design is, and it is maximized or minimized by an optimal design. In order to generate an efficient design, specific methodology was developed. Efficient designs can be efficient for one criterion and less efficient for another one. There are some standard criteria for measuring efficiency of experimental design in conjoint analysis (Kuhfeld et al., 1994). Two general types are: Information-based *criteria* and distance-based *criteria*.

Consider the linear model where consumers provide

utility scores, y_j , for each profile:

$$y_j = \alpha + \beta_1 x_{1j} + \beta_2 x_{2j} + \dots + \beta_m x_{mj} + \epsilon_j \tag{1}$$

for $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$, where x_{ij} are independent variables. In matrix notation, Equation 1 can be written as $\mathbf{y} = \alpha + \beta \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{e}$, where \mathbf{X} is the orthogonally coded design matrix of independent variables.

For the distance-based criteria, the candidates are viewed as comprising a point cloud in p -dimensional Euclidean space, where p is the number of parameters in the model. The goal is to choose a subset of this cloud that "covers" the whole cloud as uniformly as possible or that is as broadly "spread" as possible. Two optimality criteria are introduced in this type, U-optimality and S-optimality criteria.

The information-based criteria such as D- and A-optimality are both related to the information matrix $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}$ for the design. This matrix is important because it is proportional to the inverse of the variance-covariance matrix for the least-squares estimates of the linear parameters of the model. Roughly, a good design should "minimize" the variance $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$, which is the same as "maximizing" the information $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}$. D- and A-efficiency are different ways of saying how large $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})$ or $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$ are.

D-optimality is based on the determinant of the information matrix for the design, which is the same as the reciprocal of the determinant of the variance-covariance matrix for the least-squares estimates of the linear parameters of the model.

$$(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}) = 1/|\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}^{-1}| \tag{2}$$

The determinant is thus a general measure of the size of $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$. D-optimality is the most common criterion for computer-generated optimal designs.

A-optimality is based on the sum of the variances of the estimated parameters for the model, which is the same as the sum of the diagonal elements, or trace, of $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$. Like the determinant, the A-optimality criterion

is a general measure of the size of $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$. A-optimality is less commonly used than D-optimality as a criterion for computer optimal design. This is partly because it is more computationally difficult to update. Also, A-optimality is not invariant to non-singular recoding of the design matrix; different designs will be optimal with different coding.

For both criteria A and D, if a balanced and orthogonal design exists, then it has optimum efficiency; conversely, the more efficient a design is, the more it tends towards

balance and orthogonality. Assuming an orthogonally coded \mathbf{X} :

1. A design is balanced and orthogonal when $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$ is diagonal;
2. A design is orthogonal when the sub matrix of $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$, excluding the row and column for the intercept, is diagonal; there may be off-diagonal nonzero for the intercept;
3. A design is balanced when all off-diagonal elements in the intercept row and column are zero;
4. As efficiency increases, the absolute values of the diagonal elements get smaller.

For appropriate coded matrix \mathbf{X} , measures of efficiency can be scaled to be in interval 0 to 100. For Helmert's coded data (matrix), it is more appropriate to use A-optimality criterion:

$$A - eff = 100 \times \frac{1}{N_D \cdot \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} / p} \quad (3)$$

When data are coded by Chakravarty's procedure, it is more appropriate to use D optimality criterion:

$$D - eff = 100 \times \frac{1}{N_D |(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}|^{1/p}} \quad (4)$$

In Equations 3 and 4, p is number of parameters in model. The total number of parameters to be estimated is given by the formula:

Total number of levels – number of attributes + 1

N_D is number of runs (profiles) in fractional factorial design specified by the user. It is suggested, when possible, including between two to three times, the numbers of runs as parameters estimated. However, design efficiency is not the only reason for including two to three times as many runs as parameters to be estimated. All real-world respondents answer conjoint questions with some degree of error, so those observations beyond the minimum required to permit utility estimation are needed to refine and stabilize utility estimates.

These optimality criteria measure the goodness of the design relative to hypothetical orthogonal designs that may be far from possible, so they are not useful as absolute measures of design efficiency. Instead, they should be used relatively, to compare one design to another for the same situation. Efficiencies that are not near 100 may be perfectly satisfactory.

The algorithms for constructing conjoint experimental designs

The algorithms based on standard optimality criteria

As mentioned previously, finding exact optimal designs is hard. In general, it requires solving a large nonlinear mixed integer programming problem, since the number of feasible designs explodes rapidly as the number of factors and levels increases. However, we live in the real world, and we do not need absolute best design, but the one that is good enough. This is where approximation algorithms come in.

One of most simple algorithms for constructing information-efficient designs is Dykstra's (1971) sequential search method (Cook and Nachtsheim, 1980). The method starts with an empty design and adds candidate points so that the chosen efficiency criterion is maximized at each step. This algorithm is fast, but it is not very reliable in finding a globally optimal design. Also, it always finds the same design.

A typical approximation algorithm seeks to locate a good solution by the following sequential process:

1. Choose initial feasible solution (random/greedy);
2. Modify solution slightly (random/greedy);
3. Repeat 2 until finished, then report best solution seen

Random methods modify the current solution in some random way, and this change is accepted or rejected via some decision routine. Even worse solutions may be accepted under certain decision routines. Simulated annealing is an example of a random approximation algorithm. Greedy methods modify the current solution in a way that improves the score; as they are seeking to improve every iteration score for of the process they are frequently referred to as hill climbing algorithms.

One large class of pure greedy algorithms for constructing efficient designs is the exchange algorithms. Exchange algorithms hill climb by adding new design points and removing the existing design points to improve the objective. There are both Rank-1 and Rank-2 exchange algorithms, and these classifications are based on how the algorithm changes the points in the current candidate design matrix:

Rank-1: Choose points to add and delete sequentially (Wynn, DETMAX)

Rank-2: Choose points to add and delete simultaneously (Fedorov, modified Fedorov, k -exchange, kl -exchange).

Although the Mitchell and Miller (1970) simple exchange algorithm is slower than Dykstra's, it is a more reliable method. It improves the initial design by adding a candidate point and then deleting one of the design points, stopping when the chosen criterion ceases to improve. The DETMAX algorithm of Mitchell (1974)

generalizes the simple exchange method. Instead of following each addition of a point by a deletion, the algorithm makes excursions in which the size of the design may vary. These algorithms add and delete points one at a time.

The next two algorithms add and delete points simultaneously, and for this reason they are usually more reliable for finding the truly optimal design; but because each step involves a search over all possible pairs of candidate and design points, they generally run much slowly. The Fedorov (1972) algorithm simultaneously adds one candidate point and deletes one design point. Cook and Nachtsheim (1980) define a modified Fedorov algorithm that finds the best candidate point to switch with each design point. The resulting procedure is generally as efficient as the simple Fedorov algorithm in finding the optimal design, but it is up to twice as fast.

The k -exchange algorithm modifies the current candidate design via the following process:

1. Examine k least critical points only;
2. Least critical: x with smallest $v(x)$, where $v(x) = f'(x) \cdot D \cdot f(x)$, x is a point in p -dimensional design space, where the total number of factors is p , $f(x)$ is the corresponding row of our design matrix \mathbf{X} , and $f'(x)$ is corresponding column;
3. Among these k , find the best exchange to make.
If $k = 1$, this is Wynn's algorithm; if $k = n$, this is the modified Fedorov algorithm.

The standard philosophy in approximation algorithms is that many small steps are generally better than fewer but larger steps. This is precisely the idea behind the coordinate-exchange algorithm, which follows the procedure:

1. Choose k least critical points
2. Examine each point for the best coordinate to exchange
3. Make this best coordinate exchange.

The coordinate exchange algorithm of Meyer and Nachtsheim (1995) does not use a candidate set. Instead it refines an initial design by exchanging each level with every other possible level, keeping those exchanges that increase efficiency. In effect, this method uses a virtual candidate set that consists of all possible runs, even when the full-factorial candidate set is too large to generate and store.

Some researchers have proposed nonstandard algorithms and criteria for constructing efficient experimental design. Steckel et al. (1991) proposed using computer-generated experimental designs for conjoint analysis in order to exclude unacceptable combinations from the design (SDM approach). They considered a nonstandard measure of design goodness based on the

determinant of the (m -factor \times m -factor) correlation matrix ($|\mathbf{R}|$) instead of the customary determinant of the (p -parameter \times p -parameter) variance matrix $(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$. The SDM approach represents each factor by a single column rather than as a set of coded indicator variables.

New algorithm for constructing efficient experimental designs

The basic idea behind the algorithm we propose for constructing efficient experimental designs is to generate random initial design and then remove and add points simultaneously in order to obtain more efficient design. The algorithm has the following features:

1. The variables (attribute levels) may be numeric or symbolic;
2. The number of runs is specified arbitrary by the user;
3. The user has control over how much effort is expended by the algorithm, and can if desired monitor the progress of the search. It is not necessary to specify initial points for the search;
4. The algorithm combines two measures of design goodness: A-efficiency and P-value.

Optimality criterion A-efficiency was discussed previously. There are at least two reasons for using P-value as the second criterion. First, it enables faster convergence to the optimal solution. Second, it is observed that two designs with the same A-efficiency can be differentially balanced. Thus, this criterion serves to choose a better balanced one.

P-value presents the return of F probability distribution. That is probability that there are not significant differences between the variances of columns in coded matrix \mathbf{X} . In other words, P-value can be used to determine whether parameters in orthogonally coded matrix \mathbf{X} have different degrees of diversity. P can take any value in interval $[0,1]$. Low values of P indicate that design has great unbalanced attribute levels. This value will be low even if some attributes have perfect balanced levels, while some others have extreme unbalanced levels. By improving of balance in sense of quantity and homogeneity, the P-value is also increased. If P-value is equal to one, it can mean either all levels are completely balanced or there are unbalanced levels which are consistently distributed.

The algorithm is based on the following: The solution will be accepted (change will be made) only if it is equally good or better than the existing one, considering the least one of the criteria. The underlying rationality is: Existence of unbalance has an impact on efficiency but still serves as guideline to detect the list of appropriate and inappropriate candidates while enabling convergence to the better solution (design).

The algorithm proceeds as follows:

Step 0 (Initialization):

Specify the number of iterations (NI) and number of runs (profiles) N_d ; set A efficiency to zero, $A_i = 0$, and set $i = 0$

Step 1 (Generation of initial solution): Randomly generate initial solution \mathbf{X}_0 ($N_d \times p$ matrix)

Step 2 (Calculation of initial solution efficiency): Calculate A_i, F_i, P_i for initial matrix \mathbf{X}_0

Step 3 (Estimation of initial solution efficiency): IF $A_0 = 100$ and $P = 1$ design \mathbf{X}_0 is optimal. GO TO Step 5. ELSE set $i = 1$. Go to Step 4

Step 4: (Iterative procedure for finding better solution)

a. Detect the worse balanced column in matrix \mathbf{X}_i (that is, column with high value of absolute sum of elements);
 b. Generate the list of candidate rows for excluding from existing (current) design (LE). Good candidates are those which levels affect on existing of unbalance;
 c. Generate the list of candidate rows for adding to the design (LA). Good candidates are those rows that can improve balance of design;

d. Choose randomly one row from LE list and remove from the design.

IF list LE is empty, go to Step 4a;

e. Choose randomly one row from LA list and add to the design. One candidate can be considered once in the current iteration.

IF list LA is empty, go to Step 4a;

f. Solve A_i and P_i

g. IF $A_i \geq A_{i-1}$ or $P_i \geq P_{i-1}$ make exchange. Current solution (design) is matrix \mathbf{X}_i . GO TO Step 4h. ELSE GO TO Step 4e;

h. IF $i = NI$ or IF $A_i = 100$ and $P = 1$, GO TO Step 5. Else set $i = i + 1$, go to Step 4

Step 5: Efficient experimental design is current matrix \mathbf{X}_i . END.

Since the initial design has been generated randomly, each time we start the procedure, different design for the same date will be obtained. If the procedure will repeat several times, the best suitable solution (design) can be chosen.

MCON PROCEDURE

The algorithm proposed previously was implemented in Visual Basic Application as the procedure for constructing of experimental designs, in the user friendly software

named MCON. The software also includes procedures for estimating conjoint data and module for market simulation.

A procedure for developing and producing experimental designs contains:

1. Dialog box which allows specification both of quantitative and qualitative attributes as well as their corresponding levels (Figure 2);
2. Module for orthogonal data coding according to Helmert's procedure;
3. Dialog box which allows specification of preferred number of profiles to generate. Depending on number of attributes and attributes' levels in the study, procedure automatically determines the number of profiles that needs to be administered to allow estimation of the utilities, but shows recommended number, too (Figure 3);
4. Procedure for constructing efficient experimental designs based on algorithm which combines two measures of design goodness: A-efficiency and P-value.
5. Report which shows details of constructed efficient experimental design as well as values of the designs' optimality criteria (Figure 4);
6. Procedure for experimental design decoding and exporting to MS Word in order to prepare questionnaire for printing.

MCON software performs conjoint analysis using the ordinary least-squares estimation method. This method has been found to perform as well as other methods and it has the advantage of being easier to use and interpret. Output from **MCON** software includes importance ratings of the attributes, part worth estimates showing preferences for attribute alternatives, and correlations relating predicted rankings from the conjoint model with observed rankings.

A key benefit of conjoint analysis is the ability to produce dynamic market models that enable companies to test out what steps they would need to take to improve market share, or how competitors' behaviour will affect their customers. Those models are known as conjoint market simulation models. **MCON** software employ logic model for market simulation and can be used to estimate market share of preference for selected profiles. With this procedure, it is possible to create a number of scenarios which include new product introduction or modification of the existing one in order to define effects of these changes.

COMPUTATIONAL EXPERIMENTS

The power of MCON procedure for constructing experimental designs was tested on numerous examples. Using A-optimality and attribute levels' balance criteria, the efficiency of constructed designs were compared with efficiency of the designs constructed by SPSS[®] Conjoint procedure.

Dizajniranje studije / Study Design

Title: PREFERENCE ŠTAMPAČA

Unos atributa | Unos prohibicija | Unos demografskih podataka

Attributes

Naziv atributa

Add Remove

MARKA
CENA
BROJ STRANICA
MAX BR. STRANICA
DVOSTRANA ŠTAMPA

Levels

Naziv nivoa

NE

Add Remove

DA

OK Cancel

Figure 2. Attributes entry form.

Broj profila u upitniku / Number of profiles

Min number of profiles: 10

Max number of profiles: 162

Recommended number of profiles: 20 - 30

Please specify preferred number of profiles: 24

Please specify max number of iterations: 25

Construct experimental design

Figure 3. Dialog box for specifying preferred number of profiles to construct.

Dizajn studije																				
Kreiraj upitnik																				
Dekodiraj																				
Obrisi sve																				
Simulacija																				
O25																				
87.493954169964																				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
1	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5															
2	-1	1	2	0	-1	-1	2	0	1					Anova: Single Factor						
3	-1	1	-1	-1	2	0	2	0	-1											
4	-1	1	-1	1	2	0	-1	-1	1					SUMMARY						
5	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1					Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance		
6	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	0	2	0	-1					Column 1	24	0	0	2.086956522		
7	-1	1	2	0	2	0	-1	1	1					Column 2	24	0	0	0.695652174		
8	-1	-1	2	0	-1	-1	-1	1	-1					Column 3	24	0	0	2.086956522		
9	2	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1					Column 4	24	0	0	0.695652174		
10	2	0	2	0	2	0	-1	1	-1					Column 5	24	0	0	2.086956522		
11	-1	-1	2	0	-1	1	-1	-1	1					Column 6	24	0	0	0.695652174		
12	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	0	-1	-1	1					Column 7	24	0	0	2.086956522		
13	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1					Column 8	24	0	0	0.695652174		
14	2	0	-1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	1					Column 9	24	0	0	1.043478261		
15	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1											
16	2	0	-1	1	2	0	-1	1	1											
17	-1	1	2	0	-1	1	-1	-1	-1					ANOVA						
18	2	0	2	0	-1	1	2	0	-1					Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
19	-1	1	2	0	-1	1	2	0	-1					Between Groups	0	8	0	0	1	1.983337938
20	2	0	-1	1	2	0	2	0	1					Within Groups	280	207	1.352657005			
21	2	0	-1	1	-1	-1	2	0	1					Total						
22	2	0	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1											
23	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1											
24	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1											
25	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	2	0	-1					Aefikasnost:	87.49395					
26																				
27																				

Figure 4. Efficient experimental design constructed by MCON procedure and values of the designs' optimality criteria.

SPSS® is a software package for data management and analysis. The conjoint option is an add-on enhancement that provides a comprehensive set of procedures for conjoint analysis:

1. Procedures for developing and producing profiles for use in conjoint studies;
2. Four different models for conjoint analysis;
3. Graphic summary of conjoint results.

A procedure for developing and producing profiles for use in conjoint studies consists of two sub-procedures:

1. Generate Orthogonal Design procedure (ORTHOPLAN) - automatically generates main-effects orthogonal fractional factorial plans, known as orthogonal arrays.
2. The Display Design procedure - enables to generate physical profiles that can be sorted by the respondent to arrive at a ranking.

The Generate Orthogonal Design Options dialog box allows specification of a minimum number of profiles to be included in the orthogonal design. If the Orthoplan procedure cannot generate at least the number of profiles requested for the minimum, it will generate the largest number it can that fits the specified factors and levels. Design does not necessarily include exactly the number of specified cases, but rather the smallest possible number of cases in the orthogonal design using this value as a minimum.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following examples present some of the results of comparing MCON and SPSS® Conjoint procedures for constructing experimental designs.

Example 1

Let us consider a conjoint study with five attributes with 3, 4, 3, 2, and 2 levels respectively. Here full-factorial design consists of 144 profiles ($3 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 = 144$). Saturated design consists of 10 profiles ($(3+4+3+2+2)-5+1=10$), while recommended number of profiles in design is between 15 and 30. The features of designs constructed by proposed algorithm as well as those constructed by SPSS® algorithm are shown in Table 1.

The first column in the Table 1 shows the number of profiles in experimental design arbitrarily chosen. The second column contains F-critical values for designs with various numbers of profiles. This value serves for testing hypothesis of variance diversity. Column A shows values of the designs' A-efficiency. Column F indicates existence of unbalance in design. When this value is equal to zero, the design is completely balanced. Column P-value indicates uniformity of unbalance in experimental design. If this value is near to 1, it means that the design is uniformly balanced.

As can be seen from Table 1, MCON software has constructed high efficient and well-balanced designs, no matter whether the dimensions of design are specified. Efficiency of all of constructed designs is greater than 82%, while for some of them (designs with 18 and 24 profiles) have reached A-efficiency greater than 90%. In all of these designs, very low and uniformly distributed unbalance of attribute levels exists (F is close to 0 and P

Table 1. Experimental results for Example 1.

Number of profile	F critical	SPSS®			MCON		
		A	F	P	A	F	P
12	2.0333	-	-	-	85.0155	0	1
14	2.0185	-	-	-	82.5527	0.0490	0.99994
15	2.0126	-	-	-	86.0423	0.0545	0.09999
16	2.0076	91.7611	0.52500	0.83607	89.0611	0.0117	0.99999
					88.3294	0.0406	0.99999
18	1.9990	-	-	-	92.7027	0.0268	0.99999
					88.4320	0.1068	0.99893
20	1.9929	-	-	-	89.7209	0.0346	0.99998
24	1.9833	-	-	-	92.0730	0.1296	0.99999
					90.2650	0	1
25	1.9814	89.6047	0.50625	0.85094	94.4193	0.0001	1
					90.0875	0.2065	1
32	1.9717	91.7611	1.08500	0.37365	94.0762	0.0171	0.99999
					92.7915	0.0061	0.99999

value is close to 1). Especially, design with 12 profiles is completely balanced with high efficiency (85%), while completely balanced design with 24 profiles reaches efficiency greater than 90%.

Most efficient design, constructed by MCON software consists of 25 profiles. A-efficiency of this design is equal to 94.42% and design has only one unbalanced level. On the other hand, SPSS® has constructed only the designs with specific number of profiles (16, 25 and 32). These designs are high A-efficient but tend to be highly unbalanced.

Furthermore, highly efficient designs constructed by SPSS® are those with 16 and 32 profiles. Their A-efficiency is 91.76%, but both of them are extremely unbalanced. Moreover, only the 16-profiles design constructed by SPSS® is more A-efficient than that one constructed by MCON. Actually, for 25 and 32-profile designs, MCON constructed more efficient and better balanced designs.

Example 2

Let us now consider somewhat larger five attributes example with 2, 2, 3, 4, and 4 levels respectively. Here full-factorial design consists of 192 profiles; saturated design consists of 11 profiles, while recommended number of profiles is between 20 and 33. Results of comparisons of SPSS® designs with MCON designs are given in Table 2.

Again, MCON software has constructed high efficient and well-balanced designs, no matter the dimensions of design are, while SPSS® had constructed only the designs with specific number of profiles.

Efficiencies of all of the designs constructed by MCON software, except of design with 12 profiles, are greater than 84%, while most of them have reached A-efficiency greater than 90%. Highly efficient designs constructed by MCON software is 36-profiles design. Its A-efficiency is equal to 94.15%, and it is completely balanced. 24-profiles design is completely balanced, too, but its A-efficiency is somewhat less (88.7%).

Highly efficient designs constructed by SPSS® are again those with 16 and 32 profiles. Their A-efficiency is 96.15%, but both are more unbalanced than the designs constructed by MCON software. Particularly, MCON software was constructed well-balanced 25-profiles design with efficiency equal to 91.24% (against the efficiency of design constructed by SPSS® which is equal to 87.7%).

Example 3

Let us now consider four attributes of conjoint study with 3, 4, 4, and 4 levels respectively. Here full-factorial design consists of 192 profiles ($3 \times 4 \times 4 \times 4 = 192$). Saturated design consists of 12 profiles ($((3+4+4+4)-4+1=12)$), while recommended number of profiles in design is between 20 and 36. Results of comparisons of SPSS® designs with

Table 2. Experimental results for Example 2.

Number of profiles	F critical	SPSS®			MCON		
		A	F	P	A	F	P
12	1.9660	-	-	-	72.0015	0.03718	0.99999
16	1.9428	96.1538	0.25424	0.98526	84.4061 81.0580	0.00713 0.00891	1 1
24	1.9207	-	-	-	91.3267 88.7010	0.01090 0	1 1
25	1.9190	87.7639	0.82474	0.59388	91.2385	0.00028	1
28	1.9146	-	-	-	93.1203 89.1572	0.00418 0.00418	1 1
32	1.9101	96.1538	0.52542	0.85587	93.8371 92.5821	0.00458 0.00366	1 1
36	1.9066	-	-	-	94.1552	0	1

Table 3. Experimental results for Example 3.

Number of profile	F critical	SPSS®			MCON		
		A	F	P	A	F	P
12	1.9097				48.4466	0	1
16	1.8885	96.4912	0.21127	0.99505	81.4438 90.5471	0.00599 0.00904	1 1
24	-	-	-	-	83.0279	0	1
25	1.8667	84.9341	0.99832	0.44520	89.1155 86.7398	0.05909 0.05909	0.99998 0.99998
32	1.8685	96.4912	0.43662	0.92809	91.9130	0.00308	1

MCON designs are given in Table 3.

As it can be seen from Table 3, MCON procedure has constructed 12-profiles fully balanced, but inefficient design (A-efficiency is only 48.45%). This is saturated design and result is as expected. Efficiency of all other designs is greater than 82%. In all of these designs, very low and uniformly distributed unbalance of attribute levels exists. Most efficient designs, constructed by MCON procedure consists of 24 and 32 profiles, with A-efficiency equal to 90.5471 and 91.9130%, respectively. Both of these designs have only one unbalanced level.

In this example, SPSS® procedure constructed more efficient designs, but some of them are extremely unbalanced, especially 25-profiles design.

Previous examples show that nonorthogonal designs may be more efficient than an unbalanced orthogonal

array. This phenomenon can be seen with other orthogonal arrays and in other situations as well. Preserving orthogonality at all costs can lead to decreased efficiency. Orthogonality was extremely important in the days before general linear model software became widely available. Today, it is more important to consider efficiency when choosing a design. It should be noted that good nonorthogonal designs exist in many situations in which no orthogonal designs exist, and it was demonstrated through the previous examples.

According to the experimental results presented previously, the following conclusions can be derived:

SPSS® Conjoint procedure constructs only the designs with specific number of profiles, but often in practice there is a need for various dimensions of designs. This weakness of SPSS® procedure is as a result of orthogonal

design nature. Another effect of using only orthogonality as criteria for constructing experimental design in SPSS[®] procedure is that these designs are often extremely unbalanced.

MCON procedure could construct the high efficient and well-balanced designs with arbitrary number of profiles. Constructed designs are always better balanced and in many cases has higher A-efficiency than designs constructed by SPSS[®]. This is the effect of using additional optimality criteria, P-value.

Finally, we can summarize that in optimizing efficiency, the algorithm implemented in MCON procedure, effectively optimize both balance and orthogonality. In contrast, in orthogonal arrays constructed by SPSS procedure, balance and efficiency may be sacrificed to preserve orthogonality.

Conclusion

Conjoint analysis is a technique for measuring consumer preferences for products or services and intentions to buy them. It is also a method for simulating consumers' possible reactions to changes in current products or newly introduced products into an existing competitive market.

One of the fundamental problems in performing conjoint analysis is how to construct experimental designs. The purpose of an experimental design is to give a rough overall idea as to the shape of the experimental response surface, while only requiring a relatively small number of runs. These designs are expected to be orthogonal and balanced in an ideal case. In practice, though, it is hard to construct optimal designs and thus constructing of near optimal and efficient designs is carried out. Efficient designs are typically nonorthogonal; however, they are efficient in the sense that the variances and covariances of the parameter estimates are minimized.

There are several ways to quantify the relative efficiency of experimental designs. The choice of measure will determine which types of experimental designs are favoured as well as the algorithms for choosing efficient designs.

This paper proposes a simultaneous algorithm for constructing experimental designs in traditional conjoint analysis. Proposed algorithm combines two optimality criteria: Standard criterion named by A-efficiency, and nonstandard criterion, P-value in ANOVA. The algorithm was implemented in Visual Basic application, as the procedure in MCON software. The computational experiments were made and results were compared with results of SPSS[®] procedure. The obtained results confirm effectiveness of the proposed procedure.

The proposed procedure has the following advantages: (a) It is easy to use for practitioners; (2) It is flexible to

construct various mixed-level designs; (3) It outperforms algorithm implemented in SPSS[®] in efficiency, and (4) It generates not only orthogonal but balanced designs. On the other hand, as with all other algorithms, this algorithm may be trapped in a local minimum. To overcome this problem, the procedure should be re-run few times.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was partially supported by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia, Project numbers: III44007 and TR33044.

REFERENCES

- Barone S, Lombardo A (2005). A tool for generating balanced optimal designs in Conjoint Analysis experiments. Proceedings of QMOD Conference 2005. Palermo, June 29 - July 1, 2005.
- Cook RD, Nachtsheim CJ (1980). A comparison of algorithms for constructing exact D-optimal designs. *Technometrics*. 22: 315-324.
- Dykstra O (1971). The Augmentation of Experimental Data to Maximize |X'X|. *Technometrics*. 13: 682-688.
- Federov VV (1972). *Theory of Optimal Experiments*, translated and edited by WJ Studden and EM Klimko, Academic Press, New York.
- Green PE, Rao VR (1971). Conjoint measurement for quantifying judgmental data. *J. Market. Res.*, 8: 355-363.
- Green PE, Wind Y (1973). Multiattribute Decisions in Marketing: A Measurement Approach, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale IL.
- Grossmann H, Holling H, Schwabe R (2002). Advances in optimum experimental design for conjoint analysis and discrete choice models. In *Advances in Econometrics, Volume 16*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 93-117.
- Gustafsson A, Herrmann A, Huber F (2003). Conjoint analysis as an instrument of market research practice. In: Gustafsson et al. (eds) *Conjoint Measurement: Methods and Applications*, third edition. Springer, Berlin, pp. 5-46.
- Haines LM (1996). The application of the annealing algorithm to construction of exact optimal designs for linear regression models. *Technometrics*. 29: 439-447.
- Huber J, Zwerina K (1996). The importance of utility balance in efficient choice designs. *J. Market. Res.*, 33(3): 307-317.
- Kessels R, Goos P, Vandebroek M (2008). Optimal designs for conjoint experiments. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 52: 2369-2387
- Kofteci S, Ergun M, Ay HS (2010). Modeling freight transportation preferences: Conjoint analysis for Turkish Region. *Sci. Res. Essays*, 5(15): 2016-2021.
- Kuhfeld WF (1997). Efficient experimental designs using computerized searches. Research Paper Series, SAS Institute, Inc.
- Kuhfeld WF, Tobias RD, Garrat M (1994). Efficient experimental design with marketing research applications, *J. Market. Res.* 32: 545-557.
- Kuzmanovic M, Krcevinac S, Vukmirovic D (2005). The algorithms for constructing efficient experimental designs in Conjoint analysis. Proceedings of VII Balkan Conference on Operations Research, Constanca, Romania.
- Kuzmanovic M (2006). Quantitative Methods in Marketing Management: Application of Conjoint Analysis, Operations Research Society of Serbia, Belgrade. (in Serbian)
- Kuzmanovic M, Panic B, Martic M (2011). Identification of key positioning factors in the retail sector: A conjoint analysis approach, accepted for publication in *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*
- Ma C-X, Fang K-T, Liski E (2000). A new approach in constructing orthogonal and nearly orthogonal arrays. *Metrika*. 50: 255-268.
- Meyer RK, Nachtsheim, CJ (1995). The coordinate-exchange algorithm for constructing exact optimal experimental designs. *Technometrics*. 37: 60-69.

- Mitchell TJ, Miller FL (1970). Use of design repair to construct designs for special linear models. Math. Div. Ann. Progr. Rept. (ORNL-4661), 130-31, Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- Mitchell TJ (1974). An algorithm for the construction of D-optimal experimental designs. *Technometrics*. 16: 203-210.
- Nguyen N-K (1996). A note on the construction of near-orthogonal arrays with mixed levels and economic run size. *Technometrics*. 38: 279-283.
- Steckel JH, DeSarbo WS, Mahajan V (1991). On the creation of feasible conjoint analysis experimental designs. *Decision Sci.*, 22: 435-442.
- Tawil NM, Che-Ani AI, Ramly A, Daud MN, Abdullah NAG (2011). Service charge issue in Malaysian high-rise residential management: An analysis using a fuzzy conjoint model. *Int. J. Phys. Sci.*, 6(3): 441-447.
- Wittink DR, Cattin P (1989). Commercial use of conjoint analysis: an update. *J. Market.*, 53(3): 91-96.
- Wittink DR, Vriens M, Burhenne W (1994). Commercial use of conjoint analysis in Europe: results and critical reflections. *Int. J. Res. Market.*, 11(1): 41-52.
- Xu H (2002). An algorithm for constructing orthogonal and nearly-orthogonal arrays with mixed levels and small runs. *Technometrics*. 44: 356-368.
- Xu H, Wan P (2011). An improved genetic algorithm for solving simulation optimization problems. *Int. J. Phys. Sci.*, 6(10): 2399-2404.
- Zwerina K, Huber J, Kuhfeld WK (1996). A general method for constructing efficient choice designs, Working Paper, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University.