



**HAL**  
open science

## Using partial least squares regression for conjoint analysis

Giorgio Russolillo, Gilbert Saporta

► **To cite this version:**

Giorgio Russolillo, Gilbert Saporta. Using partial least squares regression for conjoint analysis. *Statistica Applicata - Italian Journal of Applied Statistics*, 2020, Conjoint Analysis and Decision Making, 32, pp.67-84. 10.26398/IJAS.0032-005 . hal-02941462

**HAL Id: hal-02941462**

**<https://cnam.hal.science/hal-02941462v1>**

Submitted on 17 Sep 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## USING PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES REGRESSION FOR CONJOINT ANALYSIS

**Giorgio Russolillo, Gilbert Saporta<sup>1</sup>**

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, CNAM, Paris, France*

**Abstract.** *After a presentation of the classical methodology of conjoint analysis we advocate the use of PLS regression instead of classical regression in order to obtain a better accuracy in the estimation of utilities. PLS regression provides also interesting graphical representations allowing quick and easy interpretation of the relations among preferences, attributes and profiles.*

**Keywords:** *Conjoint analysis, Consumer choice, Data visualization, Partial Least Squares, Optimal Scaling.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Conjoint analysis (here CA) is a complete survey methodology aimed at quantifying how people make choices between products or services (a.k.a. profiles). CA is one of the most successful statistical techniques used in market research (Green and Srinivasan, 1990), but not only since one can find applications in other fields like education and health. The seminal paper is Green and Rao (1971) but one can trace back to fundamental studies in decision theory since Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1947), Debreu (1959) and Luce and Tukey (1964). However CA is still an active field of research with an increasing number of papers published during the last years according to Google Scholar (Figure 1).

### 2. A GENERAL PRESENTATION OF FULL PROFILE CONJOINT ANALYSIS

The full profile method (as opposed to the choice based method, see Section 3) submits one or several subsets of potential products to the judgement of a sample of consumers. A complete CA includes several phases:

1. Definition of a model that links product features to customer judgements.
2. Definition of the profiles to submit to consumer judgement.
3. A survey to collect consumer preferences.
4. A statistical analysis aimed at estimating the so-called part-worth utilities and attribute importance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gilbert Saporta, gilbert.saporta@cnam.fr

5. A simulation phase where market shares for submitted and new profiles may be estimated.




Fig. 1: Number of papers per year mentioning conjoint analysis.

## 2.1 THE MODEL

CA differs from classical choice models: it is not a collective model but an individual one. Consumer preferences are decomposed according to an additive utility model, specific to each respondent. This is a very important feature of CA: there is no average or typical consumer, but different consumers who have different ways of weighting attributes and their categories.

Suppose that a product is defined by a combination of levels  $(i, j, k, \dots)$  of  $P$  attributes: its global utility for a customer is equal to  $a_i + b_j + c_k + \dots$ , a sum of part-worth utilities. The previous model is an additive model without interaction, which is a clear limitation: one can easily think of examples where interactions are present (e.g. the influence of the price could depend on the brand). However, introducing interactions generates more parameters which in turn necessitates more products to evaluate, and this is not generally feasible since it is commonly accepted that a respondent cannot rank more than  $N = 16$  products.

## 2.2. THE CHOICE OF THE PROFILES

Each profile is defined by a combination of a (generally small) number  $P$  of attributes with  $m_1, \dots, m_P$  categories. Most of the time, attributes are qualitative variables with few ordered or non-ordered categories, but may be also discretized continuous variables (e.g. price) with few levels. Proposed profiles should not include the 'perfect' product (e.g. a car with high speed, high comfort, high security and low price), since it would be trivially chosen by all consumers. On the contrary, CA assumes that each consumer makes a trade off between attributes by putting into balance advantages and inconveniences.

Since the total number of products  $\prod_{p=1}^P m_p$  to be compared is generally large, the subsets have to be carefully chosen in such a way that the estimation of the part-worth utilities should be obtained with a minimal variance and attributes effects estimated without confounding. This is usually achieved through orthogonal designs, which have optimal properties. In a balanced orthogonal design, all combinations of levels of each pair of attributes should be observed the same number of times. This implies that the number of profiles proposed to the consumers  $N$  should be equal or proportional to the least common multiple of all pairs  $m_p m_{p'} \forall p \neq p'$  while being larger than the number of independent parameters  $\sum_{p=1}^P m_p - P$ <sup>2</sup>.

Let us take as an illustration the *Frozen Diet Entrées* example (Kuhfeld, 2010). There are three attributes (Ingredients, Fat quantity and Price) with 3 categories and one attribute (Calories) with 2 categories, which generates a total amount of  $\prod_{p=1}^P m_p = 54$  profiles. The least common multiple of  $3 \times 3$  and  $3 \times 2$  is 18, which leads to the orthogonal design in Table 1 (note that there are several equivalent designs which could be obtained by permutations of the labels of the categories of each attribute).

When  $P$  is too large, non-orthogonal designs may be used in order to decrease the number of products to be ranked. In the *Frozen Entrées* example, the size of the minimal set is 8 since 7 independent part-worth utilities have to be estimated:  $3(3 - 1) + (2 - 1)$ . The use of D-optimal designs is recommended. For the *Frozen Diet Entrées* example, if we look for a D-optimal design with 9 runs, we get the design in Table 2 which is actually an orthogonal but not fully balanced design (frequency 6 for 350 calories, and 3 for 250 calories). D-optimal algorithms generally find an orthogonal design if it exists, otherwise the best design according to the criterion.

### 2.3 COLLECTING CONSUMER PREFERENCES

The basic experience consists in asking  $Q$  consumers to fully rank the fictitious products. Sorting products is a rather difficult task when there are many products to rank. So why not to rate products by giving scores to each of them? Rating products is much easier but has severe drawbacks: there are no comparison between products,

<sup>2</sup> When all attributes have 2 levels, practitioners frequently use factorial fractional designs or Plackett & Burman designs up to 12 attributes. For more than two levels, Latin and and graeco-latin squares may be used for attributes with the same number of levels.

**Tab. 1:  $(3^3 \times 2)/3$  orthogonal design**

Obs.	Ingredients	Fat	Price	Calories
1	Turkey	5 Grams	\$1.99	350
2	Turkey	8 Grams	\$2.29	350
3	Chicken	8 Grams	\$1.99	350
4	Turkey	2 Grams	\$2.59	250
5	Beef	8 Grams	\$2.59	350
6	Beef	2 Grams	\$1.99	350
7	Beef	5 Grams	\$2.29	350
8	Beef	5 Grams	\$2.29	250
9	Chicken	2 Grams	\$2.29	350
10	Beef	8 Grams	\$2.59	250
11	Turkey	8 Grams	\$2.29	250
12	Chicken	5 Grams	\$2.59	350
13	Chicken	5 Grams	\$2.59	250
14	Chicken	2 Grams	\$2.29	250
15	Turkey	5 Grams	\$1.99	250
16	Turkey	2 Grams	\$2.59	350
17	Beef	2 Grams	\$1.99	250
18	Chicken	8 Grams	\$1.99	250

**Tab. 2: An optimal design in 9 runs**

Obs	Ingredients	Fat	Price	Calories
1	Turkey	8 grams	\$1.99	350
2	Turkey	5 grams	\$2.29	250
3	Turkey	2 grams	\$2.59	350
4	Chicken	8 grams	\$2.59	250
5	Chicken	5 grams	\$1.99	350
6	Chicken	2 grams	\$2.29	350
7	Beef	8 grams	\$2.29	350
8	Beef	5 grams	\$2.59	350
9	Beef	2 grams	\$1.99	250

scales across respondents may not be comparable, the risk of ties becomes important. Rankings are thus usually preferred since the implication of respondents is higher. It frequently happens that respondents are unable to give a complete order, but are able to rank only their 'best' products, the other products becoming *ex aequo*. This is not a behavior to be encouraged but simulation studies tends to prove that ranking half of the profiles is enough to estimate utilities (Benammou et al., 2003).

#### 2.4. ESTIMATION OF PART-WORTH UTILITIES AND ATTRIBUTE IMPORTANCE

Let  $X$  be the binary design matrix with  $N$  rows and  $\sum_{p=1}^P m_p + 1$  columns (one for the intercept). The  $Q$  ranks defined by consumer preferences are juxtaposed in

the response matrix  $Y$ . Practitioners use reversed ranks, in a way that low ranks mean highly preferred products. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression of  $Y$  on  $X$  is commonly used for estimating coefficients assigned to categories, which are interpreted as part-worth utilities. Since the matrix  $X$  is not of full rank we need constraints for the utilities. The usual constraints (unlike in the general linear model) are that the sum of part-worth utilities for each attribute is equal to zero.

The OLS approach forgets about the ordinal nature of the ranks. Many researchers recommend to use monotonous regression which comes down to look for the monotonous transformation  $T(Y)$  which is best fitted by a linear combination of the categories indicators according to the least squares criterion:

$$\min_{T,y} \|T(Y) - Xb\|$$

This is solved by an iterative algorithm, alternating Kruskal monotonic regression for finding  $T$  when  $b$  is known and OLS regression to find  $b$  when  $T$  is known (Kruskal, 1964).

OLS and monotonous regressions may lead to severe overfitting: in practical applications the degrees of freedom  $N - \left( \sum_{p=1}^P m_p - P \right)$  of standard linear model is usually low; moreover, transforming the ranks decreases the degrees of freedom even more. We will see later in this paper that PLS regression provides an elegant solution to the overfitting risk and other issues.

Part-worth utilities refer to attribute levels, while analysts are also interested in evaluating the impact of an attribute on the preferences as a whole. The importance of an attribute for a consumer is usually calculated as the normalized range of the part-worth coefficients of the attribute levels on the consumer's ranking. Clustering respondents according to their revealed utilities is very useful in real life applications to target classes of consumers.

## 2.5. SIMULATION AND MARKET SHARE ESTIMATION

Since for any respondent  $q$  ( $q = 1 \dots Q$ ), we know the  $m_1 + \dots + m_P$  part-worth utilities, it is possible to:

- *Simulate new profiles*: Model estimates allow us to compute the total utility of combinations of attribute levels which have not been considered in the design by simply adding the part-worth utilities. For discretized continuous attributes, like price, it is also possible to consider new levels: the part-worth utility of such a level being estimated by interpolation.

- *Estimate market shares*: Suppose that we want to estimate the market shares of 3 competing products. If the 3 utilities are  $U_q^1, U_q^2, U_q^3$ , a simple rule should be that respondent  $i$  chooses the product with the maximal utility. But when products have close utilities, a probabilistic choice is more realistic. There are two popular methods: the Bradley-Terry-Luce rule which assumes that the probabilities of choice are proportional to  $U_q^1, U_q^2, U_q^3$  and the logit rule where probabilities are proportional to  $\exp(U_q^1), \exp(U_q^2), \exp(U_q^3)$ . It is easy to obtain the market shares of the 3 products by averaging the probabilities of choice over the  $Q$  respondents.
- *Study consumer real purchase intents*: Simulating market shares, as explained before, might not be realistic since some products are unlikely to be bought when they do not belong to the universe of choice of some respondents. The value of the utility is not enough and often practitioners add a 'will buy' question for each submitted product. This allows to derive an intent of purchase function which will revise the utilities in the market shares models

### 3. ALTERNATIVE METHODS TO FULL PROFILE CONJOINT ANALYSIS

The full profile method is not well adapted to cases where the number of attributes and (or) the number of categories is large. For this reason choice based CA and (or) adaptive designs are often preferred to full profile designs.

Adaptive conjoint analysis (ACA) (Johnson, 1987), was very popular with the development of CAPI and CAWI systems. The core of the method consists in a set of paired comparisons involving an increasing number of attributes, depending on the previous answers, until parameters (part-worth utilities) are estimated with enough precision, in a bayesian style. Prior importance and category ordering are estimated through introductory questions.

In discrete choice models, also known as Choice Base Conjoint (CBC) (Huber et al., 1992), instead of rating or ranking product concepts, respondents are shown several sets of products and asked to indicate which one they would choose. The sets of choice questions is obtained by design of experiments techniques.

Utilities are estimated by the multinomial logit model which assumes that the probability that an individual will choose one of the  $N$  alternatives,  $c_i$ , from choice

set  $C$  is:

$$P(c_i/C) = \frac{\exp(U(c_i))}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(U(c_j))} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_i\beta)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(\mathbf{x}_j\beta)}$$

where  $x_i$  is a vector of coded attributes and  $\beta$  is a vector of unknown attribute parameters (part-worth utilities).  $U(c_i) = x_i\beta$  is the utility for alternative  $c_i$ , which is a linear function of the attributes.

Choice based conjoint designs may accommodate easily an additional choice: the ‘none’ alternative, which allows a customer to refuse all the products in a set. However it is not easy to use this possibility in the estimation phase of part-worth utilities. Elrod et al. (1992) specified the no choice as another alternative with attributes levels set to zero and determine the choice between the products and the option ‘zero’ by comparing their utilities. But this technique is highly arguable since the no-choice alternative is of a different kind. Ohannessian and Saporta (2008) proposed an other approach distinguishing two cases where a respondent does not choose any product. In the first case, no product have a utility larger than some minimum value and the whole submitted set of products is rejected. In the second case the ‘no choice’ results from what they call a conflict: it occurs when the respondent cannot decide between products when the differences between utilities are too small.

Some authors consider that CBC is not conjoint analysis (Louviere et al., 2010); our opinion is that any technique providing individual part-worth utilities belongs to CA in a broad sense.

Furlan and Corradetti (2005) made a comparison between several kinds of CA from the point of view of the respondents; they concluded that choice tasks are simpler than full profiles rankings and closer to real situations (see Figure 2 from their publication).

#### 4. PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES REGRESSION

Partial Least Square Regression (PLSR) (Tenenhaus, 1998) is a component-based regression method that aims at predicting a set of response variables  $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_Q]$  from a set of predictor variables  $X = [x_1, \dots, x_P]$ . In PLSR changing the relative scale of the responses and/or the predictors changes the predictive model. This ambiguity is usually solved by standardizing all the variables before the analysis is performed. For this reason hereinafter we assume without loss of generality that both predictor and response variables are standardized. PLSR involves two steps: In the first step, the  $X$ -matrix is approximated by a sum of  $H$  rank-1 ma-






Fig. 2: Perceptions of ACA, CBC and Full Profile, from Furlan and Corradetti (2005).

trices obtained as the matrix product of loading and score vectors named  $p_h$  and  $t_h$  respectively, with  $h \in \{1, 2, \dots, H\}$ . The score vectors (a.k.a. components) are orthogonal linear combinations of the predictors  $t_h = X_{h-1}w_h$  ( $h \in \{0, 1, \dots, H\}$ ). Components are sequentially extracted according to the criterion:

$$\max_{w_h, b_h} \text{cov}(X_{h-1}w_h, Yv_h) \quad \text{s.t. } w_h'w_h = 1 \text{ and } v_h'v_h = 1 \quad (1)$$

where  $X_{h-1}$  is the residual matrix obtained by regression of  $X = X_0$  on the component matrix  $T_{h-1} = [t_1, \dots, t_{h-1}]$  according to the regression equation  $X = T_{h-1}P_{h-1}' + X_{h-1}$ . The regression coefficient matrix  $P_{h-1}$  is called loading matrix. This procedure, known as deflation, ensures that  $X_{h-1}$  carries information that hasn't been explained by  $t_1, \dots, t_{h-1}$ , since the component  $t_h$  is orthogonal to the space spanned by the  $h-1$  previous components. In words, criterion (1) searches for components that not only approximate the predictor variables well, but also that are related to the response variable(s). The solution of the optimization problem for the  $h$ -th component is given by the eigenvector associated to the greatest eigenvalue of the matrix  $(X_{h-1}'Y)^2$ .<sup>3</sup>

In the second step,  $Y$  is regressed on the PLS component matrix  $T_H$  according to the least squares criterion to obtain the coefficient matrix  $C_H$  and the residual matrix  $Y_H$  of the multivariate linear regression equation  $Y = T_H C_H' + Y_H$ .

<sup>3</sup>  $X_{h-1}'Y$  is proportional to the cross-covariance matrix of  $X_{h-1}$  and  $Y$  variables

Since the component matrix can be re-expressed as  $T_H = XW_H(P'_H W_H)^{-1}$ , where  $W_H = [w_1, \dots, w_H]$ , the PLS regression equation can be written as a linear combination of  $X$ :

$$Y = XB_H + Y_H, \quad \text{where } B_H = W_H(P'_H W_H)^{-1} C'_H \quad (2)$$

When the response is univariate, the PLS (a.k.a. PLS1) estimator variability has been shown to increase as the number of components increases (De Jong, 1995). For this reason PLS1 is typically used to replace the OLS estimator when estimate variability and prediction accuracy are inflated by predictor multicollinearity. Moreover, PLS regression can handle flat predictor matrices, that is it yields a solution even if the number of the predictor variables is bigger than the number of the observed units. In this framework the number of components, usually chosen by cross-validation, is used as a regularization parameter  $H \in \{1, \dots, \text{rank}(X)\}$ . In the simplest, one-dimensional model, covariances between predictors are not at all considered in the coefficient estimation process. In the full,  $\text{rank}(X)$ -dimensional model the  $X$ -matrix is perfectly recomposed and PLSR provides the minimum length least square solution of the regression of  $Y$  on  $X$  (De Jong, 1995). This property holds even when the response is multivariate.

Multivariate response PLSR (a.k.a. PLS2) estimator variability does not increase systematically as the number of components increases. For this reason PLS2 regression is mostly used as a visualization tool for exploratory purposes. Observations and variables are projected onto the factorial subspaces spanned by PLS components and loadings to investigate the variable correlation structure and observation similarities through their visualization in two or three dimensional spaces. Moreover, biplots can be drawn to represent observations and variables at the same time.

#### 4.1. NON-METRIC PLS REGRESSION

Non-metric PLS (NM-PLS) regression (Russolillo, 2012) is an extension of PLSR that handles both quantitative and qualitative (non-metric) predictor and response variables.

According to the principles of the Optimal Scaling (OS), each distinct level of a qualitative variable is replaced by a numerical (*scaling*) value. This is equivalent to assign to the qualitative variable a new metric that quantifies the (relative) distances between each pair of levels. The new metric is typically required to hold some or all of the properties of the original measurement scale. So, for example, if the original variable is an ordinal variable then scaling values may be required

to reflect the intrinsic ordinality of its modalities.

NM-PLSR is powered by an enhanced PLS algorithm who works also as an OS algorithm. Since NM-PLSR takes into account the type of measurement scale on which the qualitative variable has been observed, it ensures a proper treatment for ordinal and nominal variables. NM-PLSR algorithm returns both the PLSR parameter estimates and the metrics (that is the scaling parameter estimates) that

1. maximize criterion 1 for  $h = 1$
2. respect the constraints defined by the properties of the original measurement scale that the analyst wants to keep in the transformation.

## 5. USING PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES REGRESSION FOR CONJOINT ANALYSIS

Using Least Squares for estimating part-worth utilities has some limitations. First of all, the number of products must be greater than the number of part-worth utilities to be estimated, as estimation procedure demands at least one degree of freedom for the error term. Moreover, the number of products must be not too large, as respondents are not able to build long rankings. As a result, most of regression models for conjoint analysis have one or few error degrees of freedom. As already discussed in Section 2.4, these models tend to overfit data, that is they fit almost perfectly in-sample profiles but they are expected not to fit well new (out-of-sample) profiles. The risk of overfitting is even higher when non-metric part-worth utilities are estimated.

Replacing OLS by PLS estimation allows overcoming these drawbacks. PLS increases the flexibility when building the design matrix, since it yields a solution independently on the number of attributes and the one of their levels. Moreover, as a shrinkage technique, PLSR provides more efficient estimations of the utilities of new products.

While PLS1 regression can be used as a predictive tool, PLS2 regression allows enriching CA by means of graphical tools for exploring sample data, as proposed by Russolillo (2009). Preference maps (Lauro et al., 1998) can be built, in which products, judges and attribute levels are visualized as points or vectors on PLS factorial plans. Finally non-metric PLS regression introduces even more flexibility for the exploratory analysis. Non-metric part-worth utilities can be obtained when judge rankings (the  $Y$ -variables) are handled as ordinal variables exactly as monotonic regression (Young et al., 1976) is used instead of standard OLS regres-

sion in monotonic CA. Finally non-metric PLSR can provide every  $X$ -variable - attribute with a new metric, transforming it into an interval-scaled variable. This strategy allows estimating a unique part worth coefficient, weight and loading for each attribute. This makes the visualization clearer and the interpretation of the graphics easier.

## 6. AN APPLICATION TO REAL DATA: TARIFF CHOICE FOR A MOBILE PHONE OPERATOR

In 1996 a French mobile phone operator commissioned a study to design a new commercial offer according to the requirements of the market. To this aim, 12 potential mobile phone contracts were selected through a quasi-orthogonal design and 263 consumers were asked to rank them according to their preference order. These rankings were reversed before the analysis in a way that higher values were associated to most favored products. The products were described by 7 attributes: device price (0F, 700F), subscription fees (0F, 200F), peak hours definition (p1, p2), monthly subscription price (0F, 30F, 60F), duration of subscription (6 months, 24 months), price/minute during peak hours (3F, 5F, 6F), price/minute during off-peak hours (0.5F, 0.75F, 1F), see Table 3.

We applied CA to this dataset. The  $12 \times 263$   $Y$ -matrix of the consumer's preferences is regressed on the  $12 \times 7$  binary  $X$ -matrix generated by the design. Both metric OLS and PLS1 models were used to analyse the data as predictive tools and the results were compared. Moreover, metric and non-metric PLS2 regressions were used to represent the data on factorial planes generated by PLS2 components.

### 6.1. SINGLE RESPONSE PLS REGRESSION VS OLS REGRESSION

We ran ordinary OLS regression to estimate part-worth utilities. Note that this design matrix leads to a OLS regression model with only 1 error degree of freedom. The model fitted almost perfectly the sample data: the median  $R^2$  over the 263 dependent variable was equal to 0.988. However, when assessing predictive accuracy by leave-one-out cross validation we obtained a median cross-validated determination index ( $cvR^2$ ) equal to -3.177 and only the 24.7% of the  $cvR^2$  were positive.

We ran repeated PLS1 regression on every  $Y$ -variable. Each model was based on the number of components that maximizes the  $cvR^2$  index. The median  $R^2$  of this model was pretty much the same as the one of the OLS model ( $R^2 = 0.988$ ). However, the median  $cvR^2$  was equal to 0.257 and 64.6% of the  $cvR^2$  was positive.

Tab. 3: Mobile Phone Data

Contr.	Device Price	Subscr. Fee	Attributes					Consumers		
			Min. Dur.	Peak Hours	Month Price	PH Pr/Min	Off-PH Pr/Min	1	...	263
1	700F	200F	24m	p2	60F	3F	0.50F	11	...	1
2	700F	200F	6m	p1	60F	6F	0.75F	8	...	2
3	700F	200F	6m	p1	0F	5F	1F	7	...	4
4	700F	0F	24m	p2	0F	5F	0.75F	6	...	3
5	700F	0F	24m	p1	30F	3F	1F	9	...	6
6	700F	0F	6m	p2	30F	6F	0.50F	5	...	8
7	0F	200F	24m	p2	0F	6F	1F	4	...	5
8	0F	200F	24m	p1	30F	5F	0.50F	3	...	7
9	0F	200F	6m	p2	30F	3F	0.75F	10	...	10
10	0F	0F	24m	p1	60F	6F	0.75F	2	...	9
11	0F	0F	6m	p2	60F	5F	1F	1	...	11
12	0F	0F	6m	p1	0F	3F	0.50F	12	...	12

Hence, PLSR performed comparably to OLS in fitting the data, but it showed a much higher predictive accuracy.

We compared the importance of each attribute for the consumers given by the two models. The results of the two models are overall consistent (Fig. 3): on average, the most important driver for consumers is the price of the device, followed by the price/minute peak hours and the monthly subscription price; price/minute off-peak hours and subscription fees influence consumer's choices too, while the peak hour definition and the duration of subscription play a marginal role.

To sum up, the two models showed the same fit and provided similar interpretations of attribute importance. However, the PLS regression model was much more accurate in predicting consumer preferences for new products.

## 6.2 METRIC AND NON-METRIC MULTIVARIATE RESPONSE PLS REGRESSION

PLS2 regression allows generating a unique set of orthogonal components to predict the whole set of consumer's rankings in a unique model. PLS componentbased biplots can be drawn to observe relations among consumer's preferences ( $Y$ -variables), attribute levels ( $X$ -variables) and contracts (observations). PLS biplots make it easy to respond answers like:

- Which contracts are favored (disfavored) by which consumers?
- Which attribute levels are important for the choice of which consumer?
- Which consumers show similar (dissimilar, opposite) preferences?

We run three PLS2 regression models; the first model is a standard metric model; the second Which model is a monotonic PLS2 model where consumer preference variables were quantified according to their ordinal nature; the third model is a full non-metric model where even contract-attribute variables were quantified as they were all nominal variables. This allowed modeling attributes with ordered levels non-monotonically related to consumer preferences (see e.g. peak hour price per minute).




Fig. 3: Each pair of bars represents the mean importance of an attribute given by the OLS and the PLS regression models. For each attribute, the correlation between the distributions of the importances in the two models is shown over the correspondent pair of bars.




Fig. 4: Metric PLS2 regression biplot

Figure 4 shows the biplot from two-component metric PLS2 regression. Dashed lines represent attribute levels, points represent customer preferences and numerals represent contracts. PLS criterion (1) is a compromise between the quality of representation of within-set correlations of  $X$  and  $Y$  variables and the quality of representation of correlation among  $X$  and  $Y$  variables. Since the  $X$ -matrix is generated by a quasi-orthogonal design, the criterion tends to explain mainly the  $Y$ -variables and their correlations with the  $X$ -variables. That's why the  $Y$ -variables are explained better than  $X$ -variables ( $R^2_Y = 0.59$ ,  $R^2_X = 0.24$ ). Starting from these considerations, to the extent that components fit the data well, the biplot can be interpreted according to the following rules:

- Virtual vectors joining the origin to the points that point the same (opposite) direction correspond to consumers that have similar (opposite) preferences.
- Dashed segments that point in the same direction correspond to attribute levels that are favored by the same consumers
- Numerals that are close together correspond to contracts that are favored by the same consumers
- The length of the dashed line is proportional to the quality of representation of the attribute level.
- The distance of a point from the origin is proportional to the quality of representation of the corresponding consumer's preferences
- The distance of a numeral from the origin is proportional to the quality of representation of the corresponding contract.

The best represented attribute levels are the most important drivers for consumer preferences: consistently with the previous analysis, they are price levels of the device (labeled as Dev700F and Dev0F), but also price/minute levels during peak hours (labeled as PH3F and PH6F) and the level 60F of the attribute Monthly subscription price.

Going from left to right we find less and less expensive contracts. The first axis is highly correlated to price levels of the device and to subscription fees: it represents fixed costs. The second axis is highly correlated to peak and off-peak hours prices/minute and to monthly subscription price: it represents variable costs.

The best represented contracts are 10, 12 and 2. The contract 10, which is positioned on the lower right of the plot, is characterized by low fixed cost and high variable costs. Contracts 12 and 2 are positioned opposite each other: they are the cheapest and the most expensive contract in terms of both fixed and variable costs. Most of consumers are on the upper right, so they prefer cheaper contracts like contract 12. However, there is a minority that prefers more expensive contracts, probably because higher prices are associated to a better quality and/or a higher social status.

It is noteworthy that any contract not included in the design can be represented on the plot too. As an example, in Figure 4 we plotted a new potential contract (labeled as 13). This contract includes a price of 700F for the device, an initial subscription fee of 200F, a monthly fee of 60F, a six-month minimum duration, call costs of 6F/minute during peak hours (defined by the option 'p1') and 0.75F/minute otherwise. Figure 5 shows the biplot from monotonic PLS2 regression. The two-component model explained 23% of variability of  $X$ -variables and the 77% of variability of (quantified)  $Y$ -variables. The interpretation is quite similar to the one of the metric model; however, ordinal quantifications highlighted contract 12 as it is markedly the most appreciated on average: in fact, it is opposed to all the others. Another effect of the quantifications was that the consumers tended to cluster in groups. We will discuss these clusters when investigating the outputs of the next model. Figure 6 shows the biplot from full non-metric PLS2 model. The two-component model explained 33% of variability of (quantified)  $X$ -variables and 74% of variability of (quantified)  $Y$ -variables. This approach to CA was proposed by (Russolillo, 2009) to avoid 'crowded' factorial representations, which can be difficult to interpret. Since each attribute is handled as a whole, it is represented in the plot by one dashed segment, independently on the number of levels. These dashed segments do not have a direction: relationships between attributes and preferences can be interpreted only in terms of intensity, not in terms of sign. For example, we can state that the




Fig. 5: Monotonic PLS2 regression biplot



price of the device is the main driver for the preferences of point-consumers on the lower-right of the plot, but we cannot say why. To answer this question Russolillo (2009) proposed to represent the level  $k$  of the variable attribute  $p$  as a diamond that lies on the dashed segment referring to the attribute. The coordinates of the diamond depend on the average prediction of the values of the variable-attribute  $p$  that refers to the observations-contracts sharing the level  $k$  of the attribute. The farther from the origin the diamond is, the most the presence (or the absence) of the level explains the importance of the attribute. For example, the preferences of the consumers on the lower-right of the plot depends on the device price because they want the device for free. In this model the tendency to form groups of consumers is more pronounced. Few point-consumers, for which variable costs are clearly the most important driver, lie on the upper-right and on the lower-left of the plot. Apart from them, consumers cluster in three groups. For consumer belonging to the group on the right of the plot, fixed and variable costs are equally important in the sense that cheapest contracts are favored. For consumers belonging to the group on the lower-right of the plot, fixed costs are the most important, in the sense that they favor cheapest contracts. For consumers belonging to the group on the left of the plot, fixed and variable costs are equally important in the sense that most expensive contracts are favored.




Fig. 6: Full non-metric PLS2 regression biplot

## CONCLUSION

Even if since almost fifty years CA is a well established methodology in marketing research, the application of this technique is not trivial. Practical implementations of CA require a lot of attention so as not to incur errors that could falsify the conclusions. In most of cases, CA is not a reliable tool to predict part worth utilities for out-of-sample profiles when it is implemented by OLS regression. This drawback is due to the lack of degrees of freedom which typically affects the model. We showed on real data that replacing OLS by PLS estimates sensibly improves CA prediction accuracy. Moreover, we showed how to use PLS2 regression graphical representations to quickly and easily interpret relations among preferences, attributes and profiles. A further advantage of using PLS to run CA is its flexibility: non-metric PLS regression can be used to transform preference and/or attribute variables to take into account their non-quantitative nature.

## REFERENCES

- Benammou, S., Harbi, S. and Saporta, G. (2003). Sur l'utilisation de l'analyse conjointe en cas de réponses incomplètes ou de non réponses. In *Revue de Statistique Appliquée*, 51 (4): 31–55. URL [http://www.numdam.org/item/RSA\\_2003\\_\\_51\\_4\\_31\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item/RSA_2003__51_4_31_0).
- De Jong, S. (1995). Pls shrinks. In *Journal of Chemometrics*, 9 (4): 323–326. doi:10.1002/cem.1180090406. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cem.1180090406>.
- Debreu, G. (1959). Cardinal utility for even-chance mixtures of pairs of sure prospects\*. In *The Review of Economic Studies*, 26 (3): 174–177. doi:10.2307/2295745. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2295745>.
- Elrod, T., Louviere, J.J. and Davey, K.S. (1992). An empirical comparison of ratings-based and choice-based conjoint models. In *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (3): 368–377. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3172746>.
- Furlan, R. and Corradetti, R. (2005). An empirical comparison of conjoint analysis models on a same sample. In *Rivista di Statistica Applicata*, 17 (2): 141 – 158. URL <http://sa-ijas.stat.unipd.it/sites/sa-ijas.stat.unipd.it/files/Furlan%20141-158.pdf>.
- Green, P.E. and Rao, V.R. (1971). Conjoint measurement for quantifying judgmental data. In *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8 (3): 355–363. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3149575>.
- Green, P.E. and Srinivasan, V. (1990). Conjoint analysis in marketing: New developments with implications for research and practice. In *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (4): 3–19. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1251756>.
- Huber, J., Wittink, D.R., Johnson, R.M. and Miller, R. (1992). Learning effects in preference tasks: Choice-based versus standard conjoint. In *Sawtooth Software Conference Proceedings*. Sun Valley, ID.
- Johnson, R.M. (1987). Adaptive conjoint analysis. In *Sawtooth Software Conference Proceedings*. Ketchum, ID.
- Kruskal, J. (1964). Nonmetric multidimensional scaling: A numerical method. In *Psychometrika*, 29 (2): 115–129. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289694>.

- Kuhfeld, W. (2010). *Marketing research methods in SAS - SAS9.2 Edition*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA.
- Lauro, C.N., Giordano, G. and Verde, R. (1998). A multidimensional approach to conjoint analysis. In *Applied Stochastic Models and Data Analysis*, 14 (4): 265–274. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0747(199812)14:4<265::AID-ASM362>3.0.CO;2-W. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0747\(199812\)14:4<265::AID-ASM362>3.0.CO;2-W](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0747(199812)14:4<265::AID-ASM362>3.0.CO;2-W).
- Louviere, J.J., Flynn, T.N. and Carson, R.T. (2010). Discrete choice experiments are not conjoint analysis. In *Journal of Choice Modelling*, 3 (3): 57 – 72. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1755-5345\(13\)70014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1755-5345(13)70014-9). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755534513700149>.
- Luce, R. and Tukey, J.W. (1964). Simultaneous conjoint measurement: A new type of fundamental measurement. In *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 1 (1): 1 – 27. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2496\(64\)90015-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2496(64)90015-X). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002224966490015X>.
- Ohannessian, S. and Saporta, G. (2008). ‘Zero option’ in conjoint analysis: a new specification of the indecision and the refusal. In *Atti della 44esima riunione scientifica della SIS*. Università della Calabria, Arcavacata di Rende, Italy.
- Russolillo, G. (2009). *Partial Least Squares Methods for Non-Metric Data*. Ph.D. thesis, Dipartimento di Matematica e Statistica, Università degli Studi di Napoli ‘Federico II’, Napoli, Italy.
- Russolillo, G. (2012). Non-metric partial least squares. In *Electron. J. Statist.*, 6: 1641–1669. doi:10.1214/12-EJS724. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-EJS724>.
- Tenenhaus, M. (1998). *La Régression PLS: théorie et pratique*. Technip, Paris.
- Von Neumann, J. and Morgenstern, O. (1947). *Theory of games and economic behavior (2nd rev. ed.)*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Young, F.W., J., D.L. and Takane, Y. (1976). Regression with qualitative and quantitative variables: an alternating least squares approach with optimal scaling features. In *Psychometrika*, 41: 505–529. doi:10.1214/12-EJS724.