

Kataria, Mitesh; Shogren, Jason F.

Working Paper

Incomplete preferences in choice experiments: A note on avoidable noise and bias in welfare estimates

Jena Economic Research Papers, No. 2010,003

Provided in Cooperation with:

Max Planck Institute of Economics

Suggested Citation: Kataria, Mitesh; Shogren, Jason F. (2010) : Incomplete preferences in choice experiments: A note on avoidable noise and bias in welfare estimates, Jena Economic Research Papers, No. 2010,003, Friedrich Schiller University Jena and Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/32583>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



JENA ECONOMIC RESEARCH PAPERS



2010 – 003

Incomplete Preferences in Choice Experiments: A note on avoidable noise and bias in welfare estimates

by

**Mitesh Kataria
Jason F. Shogren**

www.jenecon.de

ISSN 1864-7057

The JENA ECONOMIC RESEARCH PAPERS is a joint publication of the Friedrich Schiller University and the Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena, Germany. For editorial correspondence please contact markus.pasche@uni-jena.de.

Impressum:

Friedrich Schiller University Jena
Carl-Zeiss-Str. 3
D-07743 Jena
www.uni-jena.de

Max Planck Institute of Economics
Kahlaische Str. 10
D-07745 Jena
www.econ.mpg.de

© by the author.

**Incomplete Preferences in Choice Experiments:
A note on avoidable noise and bias in welfare estimates**

Mitesh Kataria^A
Jason F. Shogren^B

Abstract

How does a choice experiment (CE) model derived under standard preference axioms perform for respondents with incomplete preferences? Using simulated data, we show how such miss-specification results in unnecessary noise and bias in welfare estimates, and can be avoided.

Keywords: Choice experiment, Ordered Logit, Bias, Preference Axioms.

JEL Classification: D61, Q51.

Acknowledgments: We have received valuable comments from Astrid Matthey, Elina Lampi and Karin Larsén.

^A Max Planck Institute of Economics, Strategic Interaction Group, Kahlaische Strasse 10, D-07745 Jena, Germany. Tel: +49 3641 686 632. E-mail: kataria@econ.mpg.de
Kahlaische Straße 10, D-07745 Jena, Germany. Tel: : +49 3641 686 632. E-mail: kataria@econ.mpg.de

^B University of Wyoming, Department of Economics and Finance, Laramie, WY 82071-3985

1. Introduction

Choice experiments (CE) are a popular method to elicit preference (see Louviere, 2000). CEs are designed to reveal preferences by asking a person to choose between alternative consumption bundles—assuming people have a complete preference ordering. But in complex or hypothetical decisions such as those for public goods, a person can be indecisive or indifferent to a choice between alternatives (see e.g., Hey and Orne 1994; Wang 1997; Ariely et al. 2003; Cantillo et al. 2007; Hanley et al., 2009).¹ People with incomplete preferences might prefer being given a “no-opinion” option in a CE survey. Excluding this “no-opinion” option could yield biased estimates of preferences if the indecisive/indifferent person was treated in the econometric analysis as if he had complete preferences.²

But adding the no-opinion option also raises estimation issues. As noted by Fenichel et al. (2009): “Including no-opinion response options means that respondents will select them, which reduces the sample size of yes and no responses. However, if there is a way to recover information from some no-opinion responses, then adding no-opinion response options may be beneficial.”³

¹ These people are violating the fundamental completeness axiom underpinning demand theory. Recall the completeness axiom assumes a person choosing between two bundles x_1 and x_2 , can rank the alternatives as either: (i) x_1 is preferred to x_2 , (ii) x_1 is indifferent to x_2 , or (iii) x_2 is preferred to x_1 .

² Respondents' might still answer to please the experimenter. Another reason might be that they gain compensation if all questions in the survey are answered. In web-surveys it is not unusual that respondents' cannot proceed to next question if they have not answered previous questions.

³ Wang proposed a random valuation model that explicitly treats indecisive responses in a referendum contingent valuation (CV) study. Contillo et al. (2007) suggested a random threshold model for indifference responses and evaluates properties of part-whole values (WTP) using synthetic and real data. Using Monte Carlo Simulations we add total WTP (TWTP) and relative part-whole values (RWTP) and compare a model with and without fixed thresholds. In a recent study, Fenichel et al. (2009) used a split-sample design to explore the implications of including no-opinion responses in CE application to estimate preferences for inland, freshwater wetland mitigation. They found 25 percent of the responses to be no-opinion responses. For more complicated surveys one could of course expect higher amount of no-opinion responses.

In this paper, we illustrate how an *ordered logit* model could be used to recover the information from no-opinion responses that allow for incomplete preference orderings. Extending the work of Krishnan (1977) and Wang (1997), we find three key results based on simulated data. First, the traditional binary logit model becomes noisier and noisier as the fraction of indecisive/indifferent respondent grows. Second, the ordered logit approach estimates values without much more noise regardless of the indecisive fraction of the population. Third, while absolute welfare estimates are not significantly biased in the binary logit model, relative values are biased in proportion to the fraction of incomplete preferences.

2. Econometric Model and Monte Carlo Simulation

First, we define our benchmark model. The traditional model used in choice experiments is the Logit model, which assumes a complete preference ordering and the absence of indecision/indifference, also called the “no-opinion” response. In the binary choice model, a respondents’ choice between two alternatives, 1 and 2, is modeled as an index function:

$$y^* = 1 \text{ if } \Delta U^* (= U_2 - U_1) = \alpha + \beta'x + \varepsilon > 0, \quad (1)$$

$$y^* = 0 \text{ if } \Delta U^* (= U_2 - U_1) = \alpha + \beta'x + \varepsilon < 0 \quad (2)$$

The latent function U^* can be interpreted either as general index function or as a net-utility function. Assuming each error terms is independently and identically Logistic distributed we have the Logit Model. This is the standard model in which the no-opinion response is not elicited.

Second, we now develop our *ordered logit* model which can recover information from no-opinion responses that allow for indecision/indifference in the preference

ordering. We incorporate the notion of indecision/indifference by adding thresholds into the standard binary model. Assume the respondent chooses alternative 2 if

$\alpha + \beta'x + \varepsilon > k_1$; alternative 1 if $\alpha + \beta'x + \varepsilon < k_2$. The net-utility of the alternatives must exceed a threshold values for the respondent to choose one of the alternatives. The respondent is defined as *indecisive/indifferent* when $k_2 < \alpha + \beta'x + \varepsilon < k_1$.

If each error term is independently and identically normal distributed, we have the order probit model (Zavoina and McElvey, 1975). Assume the error term is logistic distributed. For the standard model, the probability of choosing alternative 1 or 2 is:

$$P_{n,1} = P(\varepsilon < k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x) = \frac{\exp(k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x)}, \quad (3)$$

$$P_{n,2} = 1 - P(\varepsilon < k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x) = 1 - \frac{\exp(k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x)} \quad (4)$$

Write the joint probability a person will choose the indecisive/indifferent alternative as:

$$P_{n,Ind} = P(k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x < \varepsilon < k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x) = P(\varepsilon < k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x) - P(\varepsilon < k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x) = \frac{\exp(k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k_1 - \alpha - \beta'x)} - \frac{\exp(k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k_2 - \alpha - \beta'x)} \quad (5)$$

Let $y_1 = 1$ if alternative 2 is chosen, 0 otherwise; and $y_2 = 1$ if alternative 1 is chosen, 0 otherwise. Consequently, $1 - y_1 - y_2 = 1$ if the no-opinion alternative is chosen;

$1 - y_1 - y_2 = 0$ otherwise.

The log likelihood function for the three response categories is:

$$LL(\beta) = \sum y_1 * \log \left[\frac{\exp(-k + \alpha + \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(-k + \alpha + \beta'x)} \right] + \sum y_2 * \log \left[\frac{\exp(k - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k - \alpha - \beta'x)} \right] + \sum (1 - y_1 - y_2) * \log \left[\left(\frac{\exp(k - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(k - \alpha - \beta'x)} \right) - \left(\frac{\exp(-k - \alpha - \beta'x)}{1 + \exp(-k - \alpha - \beta'x)} \right) \right] \quad (6)$$

We impose an identification restriction $k_2 = -k_1$ in equation (6), which implies the two thresholds are symmetrically placed around zero in the net-utility space. Assuming $k = |k_1| = |k_2|$ we map the preferences of the respondent accordingly to: $U_1 \succ U_2$ (U_1 is preferred to U_2) if $U_1 > U_2 + k$; $U_2 \succ U_1$ if $U_2 > U_1 + k$ and $U_1 \sim U_2$ (perceived as equal) if $|U_1 - U_2| \leq k$. The threshold k maps what is “too similar” in the utility space and identifies the indecision-indifference responses. The standard binary logit model is a special case with $k = 0$. If the threshold is incorrectly neglected the variance will increase as $|\Delta U^*|$ decreases.⁴

Third, we use Monte Carlo simulations to explore the relative validity of the benchmark binary logit and ordered logit choice models. The benefit of the simulations is that the true parameters and thresholds of the utility function are known. The choices are simulated based on the difference in utility from the deterministic part and a randomly drawn error term from a standardized logistic distribution. Except for when the absolute difference in utility was smaller than the threshold value, a value of 1 was assigned to the choice alternative that produced the greatest utility and 0 to the other choice alternative(s). When the absolute difference in utility was smaller than the threshold, one of the alternatives in the binary choice models were randomly assigned the value of 1. In the ordered logit model, a value of 1 was assigned to the indifferent/indecisive alternative and 0 to the other choice alternative(s). These steps were repeated 2000 times using two sample sizes: 1152 and 2304 observations.

We ran the Monte Carlo study assuming a linear and additive utility function.

Equation (7) reflects the *true* difference in utility between the two alternatives:

⁴ It is well-known that heteroscedasticity in non-linear models is problematic and results in inconsistent parameters (Yatchew and Griliches, 1984).

$$\Delta U^*(=U_2 - U_1) = 2,0 + 2,0x_1 + 1,0x_2 - 0,01Cost \quad (7)$$

The choice sets were created from the collective factorial (Louviere 1988). The first two attribute (x_1, x_2) are dummy variables; followed by the cost attribute taking the levels 100, 200, 300, 400, 600, and 800. Based on the utility function, economic measures of value is retrieved using Hanneman's (1984) classic formula to calculate (a) *total willingness to pay* (TWTP) for both attributes; the (b) *willingness to pay* for each attribute separately (WTP1 and WTP2); and (c) the *relative willingness to pay* (RWTP = WTP2/WTP1) to illustrate relative values, which can be useful for public policy decisions.⁵ The validity of the choice models are evaluated by comparing the true welfare values with the estimated.

We have two indicators of success— *bias* and *precision*. We calculate *bias* by taking the difference of the average welfare estimates and the true value, in which we calculate the average welfare estimates from the 2000 simulated welfare observations. As a measure of *precision* the distribution of the 2000 simulated welfare observations is used, where a wider distribution indicates less precision.

3. Result and Conclusions

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the simulation results based on sample size, $n = 2304$ or $n = 1152$. Three key findings emerge. First, as the share of indifferent/indecisive choices is increased, the standard binary model produces welfare estimates with more noise, i.e., more variance and wider distributions (see Table 1). This is intuitive and

⁵ TWTP = $-(2+2+1)/-0.01=500$, WTP1 = $-(2/-0.01)=200$, WTP2 = $-(1/-0.01)=100$ and RWTP = $2/1=2$

expected—as more respondents cannot decide between alternatives, methods that assume they can decide become more imprecise.

Second, in contrast, the precision of the ordered logit model remains good. The reason is that the ordered logit model includes an additional alternative that captures the indecisive responses. Those that worry that including a no-opinion response will reduce the amount of yes and no responses will be pleased to see the model is fairly accurate even when the amount of no-opinion responses increases.

Third, the additional noise has more impact on RWTP relative to WTP and TWTP. Also note that the bias in TWTP never exceeds 5 percent. The bias in WTP is slightly greater, with an upper-limit of 13 percent. In either case, it could be concluded that the bias in TWTP and WTP is relatively small. If share of randomized choices is more than around 40 percent (see column 11 in Table 2) the bias in RWTP is considerable.⁶ In practice this suggests resource allocation advice (i.e. share of a budget to spend on different attributes) could be misleading.

In conclusion, our results show how a CE model that does not address the no-opinion alternative could suffer from unnecessarily noisy welfare measures. This noise could lead to misleading conclusions on the significance of WTP, and on significant difference of WTP across attributes and differences across treatments. On the positive side, we show that the problem is less serious when the amount of no-opinion responses is low and the sample size is high.

⁶ The welfare estimates are unbounded, meaning that when the parameter in the denominator goes to zero, the welfare measure goes to infinity. Increased error variance because of neglected threshold implies higher risk for this to occur, which explains the occurrence of extreme RWTP estimates.

References

- Ariley, D., G. Lowenstein, and D. Prelec. 2003. "Coherent Arbitrariness: Stable Demand Curves Without Stable Preferences." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(1), 73-15
- Cantillo, V., J. Amaya, and J. Ortúzar. 2007. "Modelling indifference in binary SP choice experiments." European Transport Conference 2007.
- Fenichel, E., F. Lupi., J. P., Hoehn and M. D. Kaplowitz. 2009. "Split-Sample Tests of "No Opinion" Responses in an Attribute-Based Choice Model." *Land Economics* 85, 348-362.
- Hanley, N., B. Kriström, and J. F. Shogren. 2009. "Coherent Arbitrariness: On Value Uncertainty for Environmental Goods." *Land Economics* 85, 41-50.
- Hanemann, M. 1984. "Welfare evaluations in contingent valuation experiments with discrete responses." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 66, 332-341.
- Hey, J., and C. Orme. 1994. "Investigating Generalizations of Expected Utility Theory Using Experimental Data." *Econometrica* 62, 1291-1326.
- Krishnan, K.S. 1977. "Incorporating thresholds of indifference in probabilistic choice models." *Management Science* 23, 1224-1233.
- Louviere, J.J. 1988. *Analyzing Decision Making: Metric Conjoint Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Louviere, J.J., D.A. Hensher and J.U.D. Swait. 2000. *Stated Choice Methods: Analysis and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yatchew, A. and Z. Griliches. 1985. "Specification Error in Probit Models." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 67, 134-139.
- Wang, H. 1997. "Treatment of 'don't know' responses in contingent valuation survey: a random valuation model." *J. Environ. Econom. Manage.* 32, 219-232.

Table 1: Large Sample: Logit and Ordered Logit model (2304 observations).

Threshold	Nr. Obs.	Random Choices (%)	TWTP (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	WTP1 (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	WTP2 (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	Relative part-whole value (RWTP) (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)
Binary Logit,										
0,00	2304	0	500	0	200	0	100	0	2,03	1,5
			(464 - 542)		(160 - 238)		(54 - 140)		(1,29 - 3,56)	
			(482 - 519)		(179 - 220)		(80 - 119)		(1,64 - 2,55)	
1,50	2304	36	498	-0,4	200	0	101	1	2,04	2,0
			(457 - 545)		(152 - 250)		(52 - 154)		(1,25 - 4,14)	
			(476 - 520)		(175 - 225)		(76 - 125)		(1,55 - 2,70)	
3,00	2304	65	489	-2,2	203	1,5	103	3	2,12	6,0
			(410 - 558)		(121 - 307)		(3 - 194)		(1,00 - 54,33)	
			(454 - 523)		(163 - 246)		(65 - 142)		(1,36 - 3,22)	
4,50	2304	84	480	-4,0	219	9,5	111	11	0,44*10 ¹¹	2,2*10 ¹²
			(339 - 632)		(54 - 440)		(-48 - 328)		(-0,73*10 ¹⁵ - 0,81*10 ¹⁵)	
			(410 - 551)		(137 - 311)		(35 - 194)		(1,00 - 5,91)	
Ordered Logit										
1,50	2304	37	500	0	200	0	100	0	2,03	1,5
			(472 - 529)		(166 - 232)		(70 - 132)		(1,43 - 2,87)	
			(486 - 514)		(185 - 216)		(83 - 116)		(1,70 - 2,43)	
3,00	2304	65	500	0	200	0	100	0	2,02	1,0
			(472 - 530)		(164 - 240)		(53 - 137)		(1,47 - 3,70)	
			(486 - 515)		(181 - 218)		(83 - 218)		(1,67 - 2,46)	
4,50	2304	84	500	0	200	0	100	0	2,05	2,5
			(460 - 544)		(148 - 261)		(56 - 152)		(1,14 - 3,84)	
			(481 - 519)		(173 - 229)		(77 - 123)		(1,59 - 2,65)	

True TWTP = 500, True WTP1=200, True WTP2=100, True RWTP=2.

Table 2: Small Sample: Logit and Ordered Logit model (1152 observations).

Threshold	Nr. Obs.	Random Choices (%)	TWTP (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	WTP1 (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	WTP2 (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)	Relative part-whole value (RWTP) (100 & 90 % CI)	Bias (%)
Binary Logit										
0,00	1152	0	499	-0,2	200	0	99	-1	2,08	4
			(451 - 550)		(147 - 259)		(45 - 164)		(1,19 - 5,37)	
			(474 - 526)		(171 - 228)		(71 - 127)		(1,52 - 2,86)	
1,50	1152	38	498	-0,4	200	0	101	1	2,10	5
			(428 - 563)		(130 - 275)		(29 - 186)		(1,05 - 7,08)	
			(467 - 530)		(165 - 238)		(66 - 136)		(1,40 - 3,18)	
3,00	1152	64	491	-1,8	206	3	104	4	0,19*10 ¹³	9,5*10 ¹³
			(398 - 606)		(85 - 332)		(-2 - 221)		(-93,48 - 0,39*10 ¹⁶)	
			(443 - 543)		(145 - 269)		(48 - 163)		(1,16 - 4,42)	
4,50	1152	83	483	-3,4	224	12	113	13	0,15*10 ¹²	7,5*10 ¹²
			(254 - 720)		(12 - 534)		(-143 - 441)		(-0,74*10 ¹⁶ - 0,16*10 ¹⁷)	
			(386 - 585)		(109 - 353)		(4 - 231)		(0,46 - 8,93)	
Ordered Logit										
1,50	1152	35	500	0	200	0	99	1	2,05	2,5
			(458 - 534)		(138 - 248)		(54 - 144)		(1,09 - 4,17)	
			(480 - 519)		(179 - 224)		(77 - 121)		(1,61 - 2,65)	
3,00	1152	64	500	0	200	0	100	0	2,06	3
			(463 - 542)		(150 - 258)		(43 - 151)		(1,30 - 4,37)	
			(479 - 521)		(174 - 227)		(75 - 151)		(1,57 - 2,75)	
4,50	1152	83	500	0	201	0	100	0	2,10	5
			(451 - 562)		(131 - 291)		(29 - 181)		(0,94 - 5,28)	
			(474 - 527)		(164 - 242)		(68 - 133)		(1,45 - 3,02)	