TABLES FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

Table A. Means of performance metrics by condition and period with results of tests for carryover and period effects.

Ease of use

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 2.54 | NA | 2.67 | 2.81 |
| Rating scale | 1.87 | 2.00 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 2.40 | 2.51 | NA | NA |

No significant carryover effects (p = .20). Period effect was 0.15 (p=.047), indicating that scores for Period 2 were on average 0.15 points higher than scores for Period 1. Therefore used results from Period 1 only.

Satisfaction

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 2.02 | NA | 1.71 | 1.94 |
| Rating scale | 1.64 | 1.87 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 2.19 | 2.06 | NA | NA |

No significant carryover effects (p = .42). No significant period effect (p = .300).

Internal validity (R2 of utility function)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 0.92 | NA | 0.94 | 0.93 |
| Rating scale | 0.91 | 0.93 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 0.35 | 0.51 | NA | NA |

Joint significance test for any carryover effect has p = .062. There was a significant carryover effect of conjoint on TTO (p <.001). Therefore used results from Period 1 only.

Predictive validity: conjoint stimuli

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 0.58 | NA | 0.71 | 0.70 |
| Rating scale | 0.54 | 0.61 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 0.51 | 0.60 | NA | NA |

No significant carryover effects (p = .15). Period effect was significant such that scores tended to be higher in Period 2 (p = .025). Therefore used results from Period 1 only.

Predictive validity: holdout stimuli

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 0.62 | NA | 0.69 | 0.57 |
| Rating scale | 0.44 | 0.49 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 0.51 | 0.64 | NA | NA |

No significant carryover effects (p = .38). No significant period effect (p = .20).

Consistency

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition | Period 1 | Period 2 with conjoint during Period 1 | Period 2 with rating scale during Period 1 | Period 2 with TTO during Period 1 |
| Conjoint | 0.73 | NA | 0.80 | 0.76 |
| Rating scale | 0.66 | 0.66 | NA | NA |
| TTO | 0.67 | 0.71 | NA | NA |

No significant carryover effects (p = .14). Significant period effect such that scores tended to be higher in Period 2 (p = .026). Therefore, we used results from Period 1 only.