ABSTRACT

This is observational-analysis study with quantitative measurement and cross-sectional method. The following attributes were chosen by a preselection of 26 randomly selected patients: cost of the products, travel time, experience of the aesthetic physician, method of referral, and easy to communicate / to consult. The study shows that the two most important attributes are easy to communicate / to consult and experience of the aesthetic physician. Another attributes are travel time, method of referral, and cost of the products. Conjoint analysis may help to determine client’s preferences. It also shows which levels positively or negatively contribute in every attribute.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Consumer needs for aesthetic services increase with the time. It has become one of the basic human traits in the past, the desire and ability to change and enhance various aspects of their lives. A thing that is basically seen as a tertiary need, but becomes a primary need for some individuals, related to social status, employment, and various other reasons.
The desire to remain fresh and youthful has become a separate issue for aesthetic patients, this is what makes them want to do treatment (mostly skin care) because the skin becomes an attractiveness of confidence and communication. The demand for aesthetic medicine services is high because the procedures used are comfortable and non-operative, and patients in general are still able to carry out daily activities after the action.

Marketing plays a role in maintaining the existence of a public health service center, especially in the field of aesthetics. Products are expected to provide satisfaction to customers and succeed in further product development. To survive in competition, identification of market demand can be done by looking at client preferences in choosing an aesthetic clinic. Client preferences come from the experience and thinking of the client. Preference is defined as individual behavior about a particular object, which is reflected in the decision making process, and is a tendency and evaluation of the decision to choose and tolerate something. Consumer preferences can change, even in an unconscious way. At present patient preferences have a role in the outcome of the service. Customer preferences obtained from conjoined analysis can be used by producers to design and determine service products to sell. Conjoined analysis is an appropriate survey technique for gaining patient views in a health service, an instrument that has great potential in structuring patient preferences and those associated with them.

In the competitive business world, to be a winner, attention to consumer needs must be prioritized (customer oriented), to achieve and maintain successful business relationships. The threat of business competition lurks every service provider, so an understanding of the needs of consumers is needed to understand the strength of the products being marketed, and service providers can provide relevant and personal solutions to each customer. Consumer behavior is complex and in it there is a process that involves psychological factors. Business control shifts to consumers, forcing business entities to improve the system used, with various modern marketing methods, to generate value for customers.

Based on the description above, the purpose of this study is to identify client preferences in Intan Clinic's aesthetic division of the desired aesthetic service products by analyzing factors that influence the client's decision in choosing an aesthetic clinic, knowing the dominant factors influence the client's decision in choosing aesthetic clinics, and know the combination of the reasons and attributes that are the most dominant influence on the client's decision in choosing an aesthetic clinic.

2. RESEARCH METHODS
This type of research is observational-analytic research, with a quantitative approach, using a cross-sectional research design. This research was conducted at Intan Clinic - Yogyakarta, a pratama clinic that had been established since 1995, but only opened the aesthetic division in 2014.

In the preliminary study, it was conducted in a descriptive way as a first step to determine the attributes and levels to be used in the study. In the preliminary study 26 respondents were selected by systematic random sampling, obtained attributes namely: service prices, travel time, experience of doctors, referrers, and ease of communication / consultation. Then this attribute is broken down and gets 13 levels.
By using conjoined analysis through a program package, 16 different aesthetic clinical scenarios were obtained. An example of a scenario is found in Table 2. Furthermore, 96 randomly selected clients were asked to give an assessment of 1 (very unwilling) to 7 (very much wanted) regarding the desire to visit the clinic. Data were analyzed using linear regression analysis. Demographic data is also seen to provide an overview of the respondent's population: gender, age, marital status, education level, employment, monthly expenses, and ownership of personal assets.

Table 2: Examples of aesthetic clinical scenarios

| Clinic A                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| • equivalent service prices/competitive compare to other clinic          |
| • travel time is more than 30 minutes from your location                |
| • the treating doctor has more than 3 years experiences                 |
| • recommended patient who have been here                                |
| • consultation by sms or feature smartphone                             |

please circle the scale below, how much would you like to visit this clinic

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Really don't Want to Really want to

3. RESEARCH RESULT

3.1. Characteristics of Respondents

Of the 96 respondents who filled out the questionnaire, 80 respondents were women (83.3%) and 16 were men (16.7%), with an average age of 30 years (age range 18-72 years). A total of 55 respondents were single (57.3%), 36 respondents were married (37.5%), 4 respondents were widowers/widows (4.2%), and 1 respondent was divorced (1%).

The final level of formal education of S1 is 42 respondents (43.8%), high school as many as 30 respondents (31.3%), diploma as many as 12 respondents (12.5%), S2 as many as 11 respondents (11.5%), and S3 1 respondent (1%).
17 respondents were employed as technicians and professional assistants (17.7%), 16 respondents worked as service business people and salespeople (16.7%), 14 respondents worked as administrative staff (14.6%), 12 respondents as professionals (12.5%), and 9 respondents worked as managers (9.4%). A total of 9 respondents worked as housewives (9.9%), while 18 respondents stated themselves as not yet employed (18.9%)

A total of 29 respondents had a monthly expenditure of Rp.1,500,001 - 3,000,000 (30.2%), 21 respondents Rp.4,500,001 - 6,000,000 (21.9%), 19 respondents Rp.3,000,001 - 4,500,000 (19, 8%), 15 respondents above Rp.6,000,001 (15.6%), and 12 respondents under Rp.1,500,000 (12.5%).

For ownership of personal assets, 96 respondents (100%) have communication devices or gadgets in the form of cellphones / smartphones / tablets / iPad.

### Table 3: Demographic Data

| Karakteristik                                      | Value (%) |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Sex                                               |           |
| Male                                              | 16 (16,7) |
| Female                                            | 80 (83,3) |
| Age (in year)                                     |           |
| Average                                           | 30        |
| Age range                                         | 18-72     |
| Marital status                                    |           |
| single                                            | 55 (57,3) |
| Married                                           | 36 (37,5) |
| Widower/widow                                     | 4 (4,2)   |
| Divorce                                           | 1 (1)     |
| Academic Level                                    |           |
| SMA                                               | 30 (31,3) |
| Diploma                                           | 12 (12,5) |
| S1                                                | 42 (43,8) |
| S2                                                | 11 (11,5) |
| S3                                                | 1 (1)     |
| Work                                              |           |
| Manager                                           | 9 (9,4)   |
| Professional                                      | 12 (12,5) |
| Technician dan professional asisstant             | 17 (17,7) |
| Administration                                    | 14 (14,6) |
| Service business and sales                        | 16 (16,7) |
| Operator                                          | 1 (1)     |
| Housewife                                         | 8 (9,4)   |
| Unemployment                                      | 18 (18,8) |
| Monthly expenses                                  |           |
| ≤ Rp 1,500,000                                    | 12 (12,5) |
| Rp 1,500,001 - 3,000,000                          | 29 (30,2) |
| Rp 3,000,001 - 4,500,000                          | 19 (19,8) |
| Rp 4,500,001 - 6,000,000                          | 21 (21,9) |
| > Rp 6,000,000                                    | 15 (15,6) |
| Personal Asset                                    |           |
| Ponsel / smartphone / tablet / iPad               | 96 (100)  |
3.2. Results of Conjoin Analysis

After interviewing 96 respondents, the results of the conjoint analysis described in Table 4.

| Atribut dan Level                                      | Utility Estimate | Std. Error | Importance Values (%) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Price of service                                      |                  |            |                       |
| Cheaper than competitors                              | 0.072            | 0.027      |                       |
| Equivalent/competitive compared to competitors         | -0.072           | 0.027      |                       |
| Travel time                                           |                  |            |                       |
| 0-30 minutes                                          | 0.187            | 0.027      |                       |
| >30 minutes                                           | -0.187           | 0.027      |                       |
| Doctor’s Experiences                                  |                  |            |                       |
| 0-3 years                                             | -0.359           | 0.027      |                       |
| >3 years                                              | 0.359            | 0.027      |                       |
| Referrer                                              |                  |            |                       |
| Doctor                                                | 0.074            | 0.036      |                       |
| Colleague                                             | 0.087            | 0.042      |                       |
| Patient                                               | -0.161           | 0.042      |                       |
| Communication/consultation                            |                  |            |                       |
| Come to clinic                                        | 0.412            | 0.047      |                       |
| Telepone                                              | -0.382           | 0.047      |                       |
| SMS or future smartphone                              | 0.423            | 0.047      |                       |
| E-mail                                                | -0.452           | 0.047      |                       |

At importance values, the results obtained 37.1% communication / consultation, 30.4% doctor experience, 15.8% travel time, 10.5% referrer, and 6.1% service prices. Importance values are also called importance attributes, namely the percentage that shows the degree of importance of the overall attribute.

The estimate utility, also called the part-worth utility, shows the level of influence in conjunctions. Positive results show a positive influence (desire) in making decisions: cheaper service prices than competitors, travel time to clinic 0-30 minutes, doctor's experience of more than 3 years, referrals from doctors and friends / relatives, and communication / consultation when coming to check or via SMS or smartphone service package.

The negative results in the utility estimate show a negative effect (unwillingness) in making decisions: the price of service is equal / competitive compared to competitors, the travel time to the clinic is more than 30 minutes, the doctor's experience is 0-3 years, the reference from other patients, and communication / consultation by telephone and e-mail.

4. DISCUSSION

This study tries to look at five important attributes for clients who will choose aesthetic medicine, where each of them has a level that wants to show the client's tendency in the aesthetic clinic selection process. A study similar to conjoined analysis was also carried out in the field of aesthetic plastic surgery by Waltzman et al. 2011 in the United States (n = 111)
and by Marsidi et al. 2014 in the Netherlands (n = 150), we use the results of the two previous studies as a comparison. The most important attribute is communication / consultation which has the highest percentage of 37.1%, where convenience in communicating / consulting about product services is the main thing for clients of Intan Clinic. The ease of communication is included in the conceptual framework in our study, but not in the attributes of the research conducted by Waltzman et al. and Marsidi et al. In a study conducted by Wernerfelt 1996, communication in service played the most important role so that consumers can study the product and consult about the services offered and those that have been obtained. The second important attribute is the experience of the treating doctor, with a percentage of 30.5%. Compared with the results of a study conducted by Marsidi et al. mentioning that the experience of doctors occupies the first important attribute of 35.6%, it is said that the higher the flight hours of a doctor who handles it, the more confident the client will get better results.

The third important attribute is travel time to the clinic, with a percentage of 15.8%. Travel times under 30 minutes increase client selection decisions against aesthetic clinics, but aesthetic clinics with a distance of more than 30 minutes have a negative effect on elections. Research conducted by Marsidi et al. states that 14.2% of their respondents expect a distance of under 30 minutes to go to the clinic, while Waltzman et al. instead it states that the farther away the clinic is taken, the more value it is.

The fourth important attribute is the reference giver, with a percentage of 10.5%. Clients are more inclined to choose an aesthetic clinic recommended by their friends / relatives, then followed by recommendations from other doctors. Recommendations from the clinic patient concerned, have a negative effect on the election. The data described in the study of Marsidi et al. said that the reference giver was the second important attribute (21.5%) after the doctor's experience. Waltzman et al. also stated that the reference giver was the second important attribute (23.5%) after the collegiate certification.

The last important attribute is the price of services, with a percentage of 6.1%. Clients prefer an aesthetic clinic that has a cheaper service price than other competing clinics. Clinics that have equal / competitive service prices compared to competitors have a negative effect on client selection. Waltzman et al. also mentioned that service prices were the last important attribute (7.2%). Research by Marsidi et al. mentioned that service prices became the fourth important attribute (12.9%) before online presentations and types of clinics.

Demographic data obtained in this study indicate that 83.3% of the study subjects were women with an average age of 30 years, single status of 52.3%. As many as 43.8% of respondents have a S1 education background, the majority of respondents 30.2% have a monthly expenditure range of Rp 1,500,001 - 3,000,000. For private asset ownership data, 100% of respondents have electronic communication devices in the form of cellphones / smartphones / tablets / iPad.

From these data, the majority of respondents were from middle segment workers who were single and with a college education background. Research conducted by Waltzman et al. explained demographic data 91% of the research subjects were women with an average age of 49.5 years. As many as 40.2% of respondents have a college education background. Research conducted by Marsidi et al. explained the demographic data 95.3% of the research subjects were women with an average age of 39 years, married status 40.7%. 61% of respondents have a post high school degree education (institute, university, etc.), the majority of respondents 40% have a monthly income range of EUR 20,000-40,000.

5. CONCLUSIONS
Conjoint analysis can identify client preferences in choosing an aesthetic clinic, as stated in this study. The level of importance of an attribute can be seen by conjoint analysis by
showing both positive (desires) and negative (unwilling) influences in attributes. In this study, we conclude that clients prefer an aesthetic service provider that prioritizes ease of communication / consultation via SMS or smartphone service package, which has an aesthetic doctor with more than 3 years experience, with travel time to the clinic in under 30 minutes, recommended by friends / relatives, and have a cheaper service price than competitors. Although this research was carried out in a private practice clinic setting, broadly speaking, client preferences can be taken in making decisions about aesthetic services.
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