

**Model: Gemini 3.6 Thinking**

**Date: Aug 19, 2026**

**Prompt:** I'm working with a customer who is trying to figure out the right combination of price and features for kitchen blenders that they want to sell the price points are a \$30 \$50 or a \$100 blender. The buttons that could be included are pulse, ice crush, blend, liquefy, generic on/off, and speeds 1-5. Create a conjoint study that could be used to help this customer identify the price point and feature list that would work best for the audience of potential blender buyers.

-----

Choice-Based Conjoint (CBC) is the ideal methodology here, as forcing respondents to make realistic trade-offs between price points and button configurations mimics actual online shopping behavior.

**Study Attributes & Levels**

| Attribute                  | Levels                                 | Design Rules                                                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Price                      | \$30, \$50, \$100                      | Tests low, mid, and high price tier elasticity                    |
| Primary Speed Controls     | Generic On/Off, Speeds 1–3, Speeds 1–5 | Mutually exclusive base motor controls                            |
| Specialty Function Buttons | <div>• None</div> <div>• Pulse</div>   | Multi-select or stacked options to test incremental feature value |

|  |                                                                                              |  |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ice Crush</li> <li>• Blend &amp; Liquefy</li> </ul> |  |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Sample Choice Task

Respondents complete 8–10 scenarios. Each screen presents three competing profiles alongside an opt-out option.

| Feature          | Profile 1      | Profile 2        | Profile 3                        |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Price            | \$30           | \$50             | \$100                            |
| Speed Controls   | Generic On/Off | Speeds 1–3       | Speeds 1–5                       |
| Included Buttons | Pulse          | Pulse, Ice Crush | Pulse, Ice Crush, Blend, Liquefy |
| Your Choice      | [ ]            | [ ]              | [ ]                              |

Option 4: None — I would not buy any of these blenders.

Key Analytical Insights Provided

- **Part-Worth Utilities:** Isolates the precise statistical value consumers place on each button (e.g., calculating if "Ice Crush" generates higher utility than "Speeds 1–5").
- **Willingness-to-Pay (WTP):** Quantifies the exact dollar premium buyers assign to specific features—revealing whether adding an "Ice Crush" button justifies moving a model from \$30 to \$50.
- **Relative Importance:** Identifies whether price or specific button combinations drive the primary purchase decision.
- **Market Share Simulator:** Runs "what-if" scenarios to predict revenue and volume share for different product lineup combinations (e.g., selling a bare-bones \$30 model alongside a feature-packed \$100 model versus offering a single \$50 sweet-spot blender).

Screen respondents to ensure they have bought or plan to buy a kitchen appliance within 12 months, and split the final reporting by user personas (e.g., daily smoothie drinkers vs. occasional cooks) to see if feature valuation changes significantly by segment.