

Contingent Valuation: From Dubious to Hopeless

Jerry Hausman

Approximately 20 years ago, Peter Diamond and I wrote an article for this journal analyzing contingent valuation methods (Diamond and Hausman 1994). At that time Peter's view was that contingent valuation was hopeless, while I was dubious but somewhat more optimistic. But 20 years later, after millions of dollars of largely government-funded research, I have concluded that Peter's earlier position was correct and that contingent valuation is hopeless.

In this paper, I selectively review the contingent valuation literature, focusing on empirical findings. I find that three long-standing problems continue to exist: 1) hypothetical response bias that leads contingent valuation to overstatements of value; 2) large differences between willingness to pay and willingness to accept; and 3) the embedding problem which encompasses scope problems. In their overview essay in this journal, Kling, Phaneuf, and Zhao discuss all three of these issues. On the first two points, I do not find their conclusions differ too much from mine. But I think they underestimate the problems of embedding and scope, which are likely to be the most intractable of the problems. Indeed, I believe that respondents to contingent valuation surveys are often not responding out of stable or well-defined preferences, but are essentially inventing their answers on the fly, in a way which makes the resulting data useless for serious analysis. In this comment, I first discuss these issues. I then offer a case study of a prominent contingent valuation study done by recognized experts in this approach, a study that should be only minimally affected by these concerns but in which the answers of respondents to the survey are implausible and inconsistent.

■ *Jerry Hausman is the John and Jennie S. MacDonald Professor of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. His email address is jhausman@mit.edu.*

I am often asked what should be done given my view that contingent valuation should not be used. Should nonuse value be ignored? My view is that expert government agencies and Congress should make informed decisions and enact regulations that attempt to improve the economic allocation process (see also Diamond and Hausman 1994). To the extent that contingent valuation is interpreted as an opinion poll about the environment in general, rather than a measure of preferences about a specific project, public officials and regulators should recognize this concern.¹ However, public policy will do better if expert opinion is used to evaluate specific projects, including nonuse value, and to set appropriate financial incentives to reduce the risk of accidents such as the *Exxon Valdez* and BP disasters.

Responses to contingent valuation surveys for a single environmental issue are typically based on little information, given the limited time involved for each survey respondent. Thus, the results of such surveys are unlikely to be accurate predictors of informed opinion. Contingent valuation about specific projects does not improve the inputs to the analysis, so it should not be included in the policy analysis. Contingent valuation does not provide a good basis for either informed policymaking or accurate damage assessments in judicial proceedings.

Have the Empirical Problems of Contingent Valuation Been Addressed?

Possible problems of contingent valuation have been discussed in the literature for at least the past 30 years. While I focus on three of those problems, my chosen focus should not be taken to imply that other problems do not exist for individual studies or for the method as a whole.

Hypothetical Bias and Upward-Biased Results

The nature of a survey is that it asks a hypothetical question. Hypothetical bias is the bias that arises in answering a hypothetical question with which the respondent has no market experience; put simply, what people say is different from what they do. When hypothetical questions are asked about willingness to pay, the results tend to be upward-biased. This fact is well-known. For example, Jamieson and Bass (1989) studied people's stated intentions to purchase new products, and found that such measures were overstated. Other studies have affirmed this finding, like

¹Referenda are similar to opinion polls except the results are often binding. The claim is sometimes made that contingent valuation studies, to the extent they can forecast how voters would respond in a binding referendum, should be used to design public policy. But even for referenda, the necessity of calibration to individual preferences to do welfare analysis remains, an issue which I discuss subsequently. Further, the use of actual referenda to obtain economic values is highly questionable. For example, because no immediate obvious budget constraint exists for voters in referenda, the evaluation of individual preferences from referenda is highly problematic. The importance of a budget constraint is fundamental to economic choices and its absence has an important distorting effect in contingent valuation studies, as we discuss in Diamond and Hausman (1994).

Hsiao et al. (2002) and Morwitz et al. (2007). (The latter paper finds that familiarity with the new product leads to more successful forecasts of whether people will buy, but familiarity with the product will not be present in most contingent valuation studies.) The NOAA panel (Arrow, Solow, Portney, Leamer, Radner, and Schuman 1993) found upward bias to be present in willingness-to-pay responses for both private goods and public goods, which they determined would extend to contingent valuation studies. In their overview paper, Kling, Phaneuf, and Zhao find that significant biases exist and their “net impact varies with the characteristics of participants and the commodity, and the type of script used.”

A standard response to this problem has long been to apply a “fudge factor”—that is, to deflate the stated willingness to pay by some amount. How much? NOAA proposed dividing contingent valuation results by two (*Federal Register* 1994). But of course, there is no reason that the degree of overstatement should be the same across all survey methods, commodities, and types of survey respondents. I do not see how past studies provide a basis for an appropriate estimate of the needed adjustment. Suppose that a new econometric estimator was proposed that had a mean bias of 300 percent, but the 95 percent confidence interval varied from 150 to 800 percent. Such an estimator would not be used in serious policy formation.

Why the bias and large variation in answers to hypothetical questions? One issue, common in the opinion survey literature, is that those being interviewed often seek to please the interviewer (Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski 2000). Other issues may arise because of the specific nature of contingent valuation surveys. As Horowitz (2000) points out, the standard form of a contingent valuation question asks about one’s willingness to pay a certain amount for a certain outcome, but doesn’t say explicitly how the answer will be used, nor offer a range of options, nor offer a chance for discussion and interaction with others (as does a public voting process). Supporters of such surveys spend considerable time and energy on the precise wording of their questions and they test different wording choices in focus groups in an effort to make respondents feel that their answer really matters and that they should take the task of answering seriously. But as Harrison (2007) writes: “The literature on non-market valuation in environmental economics is littered with assertions that one can somehow trick people into believing something that is not true. . . . The claims tend to take the form, ‘if we frame the hypothetical task the same way as some real-world task that is incentive compatible, people will view it as incentive compatible.’”

But despite such efforts, for whatever reason, hypothetical bias persists. For example, Murphy and Stevens (2004) note that the literature shows hypothetical bias across a wide variety of contingent valuation approaches. Johnston (2006, p. 469) concurs: “Most research finds significant divergence between stated and actual behaviors.” Kling, Phaneuf, and Zhao agree as well.

Sometimes supporters of contingent valuation surveys compare them to polls about public referenda—and thus seek to give them a presumption of legitimacy because polls are useful at predicting the outcome of the democratic process. But of course, polls predicting the outcome of referenda are sometimes accurate, sometimes

not. Often, the polls about a referenda change considerably over the period of time leading up to an election, suggesting that preferences about the choice were not especially stable at the beginning of the process. Vossler, Kerkvliet, Polasky, and Gainutdinova (2003) look at survey responses and an actual referendum vote on a proposal to protect open space in Corvallis, Oregon. They find that it is necessary to treat the “undecided” vote as “no” if the survey is to avoid hypothetical bias and to reflect the actual outcome of the vote. Of course, one should be cautious about extrapolating from surveys about a vote on a local public good to contingent valuation surveys on other subjects. The empirical basis for weighting undecided or other responses to a contingent valuation survey in some way that is intended to reduce hypothetical bias is scanty at best.

Difference between Willingness to Pay and Willingness to Accept

Contingent valuation questions can be phrased in two broad ways: the willingness-to-pay approach seeks to discern what the respondent would pay to avoid a negative outcome (or to achieve a positive outcome), while the willingness-to-accept approach seeks to discern how large a payment the respondent would need to receive in order to accept the negative outcome (or not to receive a positive outcome). Basic economic theory suggests that these two approaches should give (approximately) the same answer, but both supporters and skeptics of contingent value methods recognize that large and persistent disparities commonly arise in answers to contingent valuation surveys.

Broadly speaking, there have been two approaches to rationalizing the large gaps between willingness to pay and willingness to accept: use a theoretical background rooted in behavioral economics, or relax enough assumptions in the neoclassical model. The difficulty with either approach is that if benefit–cost analysis is to be logically coherent, it requires a theoretical framework. The Hicksian foundations of standard welfare analysis are based on compensated demand curves and potential Pareto improvements, and no substitute foundational framework has received wide acceptance to replace the Hicksian approach. (For a discussion of the Hicksian basis for welfare analysis, see Hausman 1981, and Hausman and Newey 1995.) Rationalizations of the gap between willingness to pay and willingness to accept come at the expense of introducing assumptions that render standard benefit–cost analysis invalid.

For example, suppose that consumers do not have neoclassical preferences, but instead are subject to “loss aversion,” and thus they will weight prospective losses more heavily than equivalent gains. Such “behavioral” preferences will indeed drive a wedge between willingness to accept and willingness to pay. But it becomes unclear how to do welfare analysis of gains to some groups and losses to others with these assumptions; necessary compensation for aggrieved losers from any policy may well outstrip gains to the winners.

Various efforts have been made to extend the neoclassical framework in a way that rationalizes the gap. Proponents of contingent valuation have attempted rationalizations of these differences, but have not overcome the findings of Diamond and Hausman (1994) or the results of Milgrom (1993). Both papers demonstrate

that the attempts to rationalize the well-recognized and persistent disparity between willingness to pay and willingness to accept fail as a matter of economic theory and observed empirical outcomes.

Of course, one can claim that consumers do not have neoclassical preferences. But standard cost–benefit analysis, and the underlying logic of being able to sum the willingness to pay of many individuals, requires that individual preferences are being measured (Diamond and Hausman 1994, pp. 55–58). Essentially, use in policy analysis or damage analysis depends on willingness to pay being a measure of the compensating variation for avoiding a negative outcome. If the neoclassical assumptions are relaxed so that willingness to pay includes, say, a component for altruism or for sympathy, then willingness to pay will diverge from willingness to accept—but then addition across the willingness to pay of individuals is no longer appropriate. In aggregation, the neoclassical model requires that preferences be over states of the world and not over acts: for example, preferences must be over the choice between two different states of a wilderness area, not over whether the respondent receives a warm glow from the idea of saving a wilderness area, nor about a general attitude about providing public goods in general. Again, this assumption is required for consistent economic policy choices (see also the NOAA Report, Arrow et al. 1993).

Of course, there are a number of other ways to attempt to rationalize the large gaps between willingness to pay and willingness to accept in contingent valuation surveys. It's possible to create a theory that is consistent with (almost) any given set of facts. But the task of building the foundations of a benefit–cost analysis on top of those alternative theories has not been done. And as I demonstrate throughout this essay, the gaps are likely due to the reality that answers to contingent valuation surveys do not actually reflect stable or well-defined preferences but instead are opinions invented on the fly.

Scope and Embedding

The most fundamental challenge to the contingent value method, and the strongest evidence that the answers to such surveys are invented in response to the questions, comes from concerns that are referred to as “scope” and “embedding.” Kahneman and Knetsch (1992) were the first to explore the “embedding effect,” which demonstrates the nonexistence of preferences in a contingent valuation setting. As they wrote, “perhaps the most serious shortcoming of CVM [contingent value methods]” is that “the assessed value of a public good is demonstrably arbitrary, because willingness to pay for the same good can vary over a wide range depending on whether the good is assessed on its own or embedded as part of a more inclusive package.” In Diamond and Hausman (1994), we provide an example of the embedding effect, where willingness to pay to clean one lake is approximately equal to stated willingness to pay to clean up five lakes—including the one asked about individually. Embedding is related to the scope effect, which is the broader proposition that respondents to contingent valuation surveys should be more willing to pay for a large effect than for a subset of that effect. Proponents of contingent valuation would like to demonstrate a scope effect, but the scope

effects typically found are not nearly large enough to make contingent valuation results credible.

In the earlier version of their overview paper, Kling, Phaneuf, and Zhao acknowledged that “scope effects are typically present and positive, if not always large.” But I find this result to be similar to a finding in econometric estimation that demand curves slope downward—a very weak test with almost no power. We do not know how large scope effects should be. Indeed, since contingent valuation surveys are typically pretested, the survey design can be manipulated to ensure that at least minimal scope effects are present.

Thus, in Diamond and Hausman (1994), we proposed a more stringent version of a scope test called an “adding-up test.” The test works this way: a first group of respondents is asked their willingness to pay for a public good X; a second group is asked their willingness to pay for public good Y; and a third group is asked their willingness to pay for X and Y together. The total value of the entire project minus the value of the first project should approximately equal the value of the incremental projects.² A specification test then permits one to statistically determine whether embedding is present. If Diamond–Hausman tests are done correctly, they first establish what the willingness to pay is for a given project. They then establish the willingness to pay for a larger project in which the first project is present, which establishes the *incremental amount* of willingness to pay for the additional projects. In this way, the adding-up test overcomes the problem of a more general scope test.

Desvousges, Mathews, and Train (2012a) review 109 contingent valuation studies on environmental goods since 1994 that apply a scope test. They find that most studies do not provide sufficient information to determine whether the difference in survey response to variations in scope is “adequate” (p. 4). Those who conduct contingent valuation surveys have typically not collected their data in way that makes an adding-up test possible. They find only one study that permits a test of adding-up: a study by Chapman et al. (2009). This study passes a scope test, but fails the more stringent adding-up test. Desvousges, Mathews, and Train (2012b) expand the Chapman et al. (2009) survey to measure the value of each increment directly with contingent valuation, and they find that the sum of the estimated values of the incremental parts is three times greater than the estimated value of the whole. They conclude—as do Heberlein, Wilson, Bishop, and Schaeffer (2005) and Bateman (2011)—that “standard scope tests are uninformative.”

My view is that until contingent valuation surveys can reliably pass the Diamond–Hausman adding-up test (or a similar test) to demonstrate that embedding is not present, the results do not indicate stable or coherent individual preferences.

² This statement of the test leaves out income effects, but income effects are typically quite small for projects considered by contingent valuation. In a paper we are still working on (Hausman and Newey, no date), my coauthor and I develop bounds that take account of the share of income spent on a good and its income derivative. Our results demonstrate that for the size of contingent valuation projects, typically less than \$100, the upper and lower bounds are almost identical for consumer surplus.

Recent empirical evidence demonstrates that some problems that exist in contingent valuation studies also exist in actual market situations. For example, framing of questions can lead to very different results in contingent valuation studies, as I discuss below in my case study. Evidence demonstrates that framing can also affect consumer choices in the market. Thus, some of the problems in contingent valuation also exist in revealed preference outcomes. However, I expect that consumers do better (even though they still make mistakes) for important decisions and for repeated decisions. And consumers have a budget constraint which has a large effect on their decisions. For public policy purposes, expert analysis, as I discuss above, will hopefully avoid the “mistakes” that would arise with the use of contingent valuation and come to better allocative outcomes than if we were to depend on results from contingent valuation surveys that are not consistent with fundamental economic preferences on which we base economic welfare analysis.

A Case Study: Contingent Valuation and Australian Cable Television

To provide a more concrete illustration of these issues, I will consider a particular contingent valuation study.³ This particular study is chosen for several reasons. It was implemented by Richard Carson, a participant in this symposium and someone widely recognized as a top expert in contingent valuation studies.⁴ The design and implementation of the study was not constrained in any meaningful way by lack of a budget. It had large sample sizes. Unlike some contingent value surveys that deal with issues far-removed from the daily experience of the respondents—like the value to be placed on cleaning up Prince William Sound where the *Exxon Valdez* ran aground—this survey dealt with a product well-known to those being surveyed: cable television. Yet despite these advantages, I will demonstrate that the results from this contingent value survey are unreliable. The results demonstrate that although people responded to the survey, their answers cannot correctly be treated as a meaningful measure of preferences.

Of course, one study does not discredit contingent valuation methodology. And the decisionmakers in this case, on the Australian Copyright Tribunal, do not have the last word on economic methodology. Yet the case study is potentially useful for thinking about the issues of contingent valuation. The contingent valuation study did not solve the well-recognized problems of contingent valuation, even though it

³ As an econometrician, I typically do not rely on case studies in my academic research. However, contingent valuation studies that include both a critique and then a decision from an outside party are limited to “high stakes” proceedings. I am not aware of many such cases. Thus, I cannot do a meta-analysis of many contingent valuation studies, because the cost of analyzing them is typically quite high. The Australian case study seems especially useful since it was a “high stakes” proceeding with significant analysis and a decision by an informed tribunal.

⁴ All the participants in this study, including myself, involved in the Australian case study were paid consultants. The contingent valuation study was paid for by Screenrights (the copyright holder) and my report was paid for by the cable TV providers.

had experienced academic experts in contingent valuation who were not subject to a tight budget constraint to finance their analysis. And the Australian contingent valuation study failed the Diamond–Hausman test as I describe below.

The background situation is that cable TV companies in Australia retransmit the free-to-air TV channels' broadcasts, as do cable TV companies in most of the world. In 2001, a change in Australian law defined retransmission as an infringement of copyright, requiring the cable TV companies to pay "equitable remuneration" to the copyright owners via their declared collecting society, Screenrights. The cable TV companies and Screenrights were unable to agree upon what constituted "equitable remuneration," and the matter was brought before the Copyright Tribunal, which is administered by the Federal Court of Australia. Screenrights' primary evidence before the Tribunal was a contingent valuation study designed by Jeff Borland and Richard T. Carson, and conducted by a leading Australian research company. The primary evidence opposing this approach was a study provided by Tim Bock and myself.⁵ Thus, I confess that yet another reason for choosing this study is that it was the most recent contingent valuation study that I have analyzed in detail. The 2006 Copyright Tribunal decision has a useful extended overview of all the issues of the case, with several sections focused on contingent valuation, available online at <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/ACopyT/2006/2.html>.

The contingent valuation study actually involved two parts. In the first part, 2,622 subscribers participated in a 10-minute personal interview by surveyors who knocked on their doors at home. The survey asked general questions about household structure and behavior, and then respondents were both read and asked to read descriptions about the benefits of retransmission and available substitutes. They were then asked, using a formal script, if they had the choice of 1) paying \$X extra per month to continue receiving the regular TV channels through cable TV, or 2) paying the same as before and losing these channels from cable TV (but perhaps getting them through a TV aerial), what would they choose? The respondents were randomly allocated to one of five monthly fees: \$1.00, \$2.50, \$5.00, \$7.50, and \$10.00. In an unexpected twist, it was discovered that the first part of the study had not correctly implemented procedures for recontacting those households not at home ("call-backs"), therefore the study was repeated with a new sample of 2,369 households, and some minor wording changes were made in the second study.

Specific responses to the first and the second survey appear in Table 1. One oddity jumps out immediately: In both studies, the quantity demanded at \$10 is higher than demanded at \$7.50. Although it is highly unusual in real markets to find that a 33.3 percent increase in price does not cause an outright decline in quantity demanded, at least the increase in quantity demanded here is not statistically significant. Other questions also come to mind: for example, the Copyright Tribunal questioned why the lowest value surveyed was set at \$1, rather than some

⁵ More explanation and detail are provided in Hausman and Bock (2007).

Table 1
**Binary Choice Data from the Australian Cable Television
 Contingent Valuation Survey**

	<i>Monthly subscription fee</i>				
	<i>\$1.00</i>	<i>\$2.50</i>	<i>\$5.00</i>	<i>\$7.50</i>	<i>\$10.00</i>
Study 1					
Pay	299	224	176	139	140
Not pay/Don't know	224	294	333	403	390
Study 2					
Pay	292	207	152	85	90
Not pay/Don't know	199	288	321	375	360

lower number. But I will focus on two fundamental issues and then mention some other points.

First, preferences in this contingent valuation study appear to be irrationally unstable, in the sense that minor differences in wording—that is, the framing of the questions—led to large differences in response. Study 1 finds a 32 percent higher share of respondents who state they are willing to pay \$10 per month for retransmission compared to Study 2. Similarly, 39 percent more respondents in Study 1 said they would pay \$7.50 than in Study 2. Yet the questions in the two studies are essentially identical, with only a small amount of additional information in Study 2. Borland and Carson agreed that the discrepancies in the demand curves were attributable to changes in question wording. In my view, the only significant change was that respondents were shown both a monthly and annual fee in Study 2, while in Study 1 only the monthly fee was shown. If relatively minor changes in wording lead to significant differences in results, I would refer to this situation as “irrational preference instability.” Such results support a conclusion that consumers did not reveal true preferences in the stated preference questionnaire and are instead, to some unknown extent, “making-up” or “inventing” their answers to a hypothetical situation with which they are unfamiliar. I conclude that consumers do not have well-formed preferences, which is why their responses to the main contingent valuation question were significantly influenced by the survey wording.

Second, the study results fail a Diamond–Hausman (1994) adding-up test, discussed earlier. Specifically, this test checks to see if average willingness to pay (WTP) for divisible good X is equivalent to the sum of average WTP for kX and average WTP for $(1 - k)X$ conditional upon kX already having been supplied, where $0 < k < 1$. For example, if a consumer is willing to pay \$50 for two items together, such as local telephone service and a broadband Internet connection, the consumer should be willing to pay (approximately) this same amount if the consumer first purchases the local telephone service and then buys the broadband service (after purchasing the local telephone service).

The Diamond–Hausman test was administered by another fieldwork company using the protocols employed in Study 1. Some minor wording changes were made to the contingent question to improve its intelligibility, but these changes were not contentious between the parties and their experts involved in the proceeding. Three independent samples ($N=200$ in each; 600 in total) received different versions of the questionnaire, as follows:

Version 1: Retransmission of only ABC, Channel 9 and SBS (that is, kX).

Version 2: Retransmission of Channel 7 and Channel 10, given that ABC, Channel 9 and SBS are already being retransmitted to the household (that is, $(1-k)X$ given kX).

Version 3: Retransmission of all the free-to-air channels (that is, X).

To estimate a mean from the kind of data in Table 1, one standard approach is to use the Turnbull Lower Bound estimator. (The nonparametric Turnbull estimator begins by determining the fraction of refusals falling into each dollar interval, and a lower-bound estimate of the mean follows from these fractions.⁶) By this measure, the mean for Version 1 is \$2.96, the mean for Version 2 is \$1.64, and the sum of these two is \$4.60. However, the mean is \$2.81 for Version 3. Thus, the sum of Version 1 and 2 is 64 percent greater than Version 3.

One potential objection to this comparison is that something is amiss with the follow-up survey. However, the estimated willingness to pay for in Versions (2) and (3) of the adding-up test survey are quite close to the willingness to pay in Study 2 shown in Table 1. This outcome strongly suggests that respondents reacted in a similar manner to these two surveys. Another objection sometimes raised is that asking a respondent to “pretend” they have already obtained part of a good is problematic because it may be difficult to get respondents to take such an exercise seriously. But if this objection is true, it would invalidate both the potential problem and the original contingent valuation study. After all, contingent valuation questions—including the ones in this study—often set up scenarios that ask respondents to pretend.

As one might expect, there were a number of other points at issue in the discussion before the Copyright Tribunal, which are summarized in its report. For example, we also demonstrated that if the demand curves estimated from the contingent valuation survey were to be taken seriously, the cable television companies would increase

⁶The Turnbull estimator is computed using the Pooled Adjacent Violators Algorithm and treating “don’t know” as “not pay” (as discussed in Bateman et al. 2002, p. 231). The algorithm for the Turnbull estimator is roughly as follows: For the lowest bid level, calculate the proportion of refusals. Then move to the next-highest bid level and again calculate the number of refusals. Continue this process up through the bid levels, and use this data to calculate a cumulative density function from which you can derive a probability density function. Multiply the probability density function by the bid defining the lower bound, and then sum over all bid levels. The other method often used for this calculation is a Weibull distribution, which is a two-parameter location-scale distribution often used in duration models. In this case, the approach is to estimate the two parameters that would characterize a Weibull distribution that fits the pattern of the data, and then to use the properties of that distribution to calculate the mean. The Weibull distribution will typically give a mean estimate greater than the Turnbull estimator.

their profits by charging an extra \$10 per month (or more): that is, the extra revenue they would gain by charging more would more than offset the losses from those who decided not to subscribe to cable television at all. Instead, it turned out that one cable company, Foxtel, was charging the same for digital satellite and digital cable, but was including all the free-to-air stations in the first delivery mechanism but not the second. Apparently, providing the free-to-air stations was not a service for which the company thought it could charge more. But the primary argument that is relevant for thinking about contingent valuation methods as a whole is that the answers from such studies are unstable and inconsistent, invented for the moment of the survey, and cannot be treated as preferences in the sense that economists understand that term.

After reviewing all the arguments, Australia's Copyright Tribunal (2006, par. 510 and 512) chose to disregard completely the evidence from the contingent value survey. It quoted a 1965 case to the effect that "[A] person exercising quasi-judicial functions must . . . not spin a coin or consult an astrologer, but he may take into account any material which, as a matter of reason, has some probative value. . . . If it is capable of having any probative value, the weight attached to it is a matter for the person to whom Parliament has entrusted the responsibility of deciding the issue." Having expressed a willingness to give at least some weight to any evidence that might be relevant, the Tribunal wrote: "Courts and tribunals must proceed on the basis of probative evidence, not speculation. . . . We have such a level of doubt about the Survey that we attach no weight to it."

Although the Copyright Tribunal decided that in this situation—to paraphrase the title of Diamond and Hausman (1994)—no number was better than the contingent valuation number, it did rely on a range of other evidence to decide that the cable companies should pay 22.5 cents per subscriber per month in exchange for transmitting the free-to-air content. This amount was not even in the range of possibilities considered in the contingent valuation study. Thus the Copyright Tribunal chose to use its expert opinion to set the rate per subscriber, and it completely ignored the outcome of the contingent valuation study.

Of course, this particular case study addresses only one contingent value survey—but, again, it is presumably a "high quality" study by the standards of this literature. The study by Chapman et al. (2009) of the aesthetic and ecosystem value of certain water resources in Oklahoma is another "high quality" contingent study designed and implemented by proponents of such studies. It had large sample sizes, a budget constraint that did not bind very tightly, and claimed to meet best-practice guidelines. Yet as discussed earlier, Desvousges, Mathews, and Train (2012a, b) show that the results of this contingent valuation survey are unreliable for various reasons, including failing an adding-up test.

Conclusion

The controversy over contingent valuation studies often follows a predictable pattern. A contingent value study is designed and carried out, with much talk about

how methodology has strengthened over time. When the results are announced, critics point out potentially severe problems, like hypothetical bias and overstatement, disagreements between willingness to pay and willingness to accept, and problems of scope or embedding. Supporters then respond that perhaps this particular study wasn't well-designed, and that there are ways to make adjustments, and that it would be wrong to conclude from one study that the enterprise of contingent valuation is fundamentally flawed. Then the next study arrives and is criticized and defended in the same way. For those of us who have criticized a number of contingent valuation studies, it feels as if proponents of contingent valuation retreat to the position that all studies shown to be inaccurate are examples of poor practice rather than any inherent flaw. But despite all the positive-sounding talk about how great progress has been made in contingent valuation methods, recent studies by top experts continue to fail basic tests of plausibility.

I expect that if contingent value respondents had been asked about Prince William Sound (where the *Exxon Valdez* ran aground) and another group was asked about Prince Andrew Sound (fictitious) after being told that Prince William Sound had been saved, and a third group was asked about Prince William Sound and Prince Andrew Sound together, the combined response would not be much different than the individual responses, so that the sum of the individual responses would be significantly greater than the combined response. When contingent studies can routinely pass Diamond–Hausman adding-up tests I am willing to reconsider my conclusion of little or no progress over the past 20 years in solving the most important problems with contingent valuation. But even if that event occurs, contingent valuation would still face problems like how to address the upward bias in responses and how to build a framework for cost–benefit analysis in a setting where the data show a gulf between willingness to pay and willingness to accept.

I do not expect these problems to be resolved, so in my view “no number” is still better than a contingent valuation estimate. Moreover, as the discussion of Australian Copyright Tribunal (2006) showed, other pieces of evidence can be brought to bear on goods that are not directly valued in the market. For example, in environmental damage situations, the method of “habitat equivalency analysis” relies on a group of trustees appointed through government or the courts to analyze what expenditures are needed to restore the environment (Damage Assessment and Restoration Program 2006). The political process can also provide outcomes. As Diamond and I wrote in our 1994 essay in this journal (pp. 58–59), “the choice is between relying on Congress after doing a contingent valuation study and relying on Congress without doing such a contingent valuation study.” My theme is that unless or until contingent value studies resolve their long-standing problems, they should have zero weight in public decision-making.

I do not expect that proponents and opponents of contingent valuation will ever agree. Some bad ideas in economics and econometrics maintain a surprising viability. Numerous branches of the federal government continue to fund contingent valuation research in the hope that it will support their favored policies subject to cost–benefit analyses. In turn, the proposed regulations lead to push-back from

those who would bear the costs. In cases like the *Exxon Valdez* spill or the BP *Deep-water Horizon* spill, vast amounts of money are at stake. I do not find my view that such debates will persist to be at all cynical; rather, it is the expected outcome given the incentives that all parties face.

■ *I am not involved in any ongoing paid research or litigation involving contingent valuation. I previously served as a paid consultant on the Exxon Valdez matter and the Australian Copyright matter discussed in this paper. I have also testified before Congress on contingent valuation, but I do not accept payment for Congressional testimony. I thank the editors for help in revising the paper.*

References

- Arrow, Kenneth, Robert Solow, Paul R. Portney, Edward E. Leamer, Roy Radner, and Howard Schuman.** 1993. "Report of the NOAA Panel on Contingent Valuation." National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (U.S. Department of Commerce).
- Australian Copyright Tribunal (see Copyright Tribunal of Australia)**
- Bateman, Ian J.** 2011. "Valid Value Estimates and Value Estimate Validation: Better Methods and Better Testing for Stated Preference Research." Chap. 16 in *The International Handbook on Non-Market Environmental Valuation*, Jeff Bennett, editor, Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bateman, Ian J., et al.** 2002. *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques: A Manual*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Chapman, David J., Richard C. Bishop, W. Michael Hanemann, Barbara J. Kanninen, Jon A. Krosnick, Edward R. Morey, and Roger Tourangeau.** 2009. "Natural Resource Damages Associated with Aesthetic and Ecosystem Injuries to Oklahoma's Illinois River System and Tenkiller Lake." Expert Report for State of Oklahoma. Case No. 05-CV-0329-GKF-SAJ. *State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et al.* In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma. Volume I.
- Copyright Tribunal of Australia.** 2006. *Audio-Visual Copyright Society Ltd v Foxtel Management Pty Ltd (No 4) [2006] ACopyT 2* (Ruling), Date of Judgment: May 3, 2006. <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/ACopyT/2006/2.html>.
- Damage Assessment and Restoration Program, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.** 2006. "Habitat Equivalency Analysis: An Overview." May 23. (Originally published March 21, 1995.) <http://www.darrp.noaa.gov/library/pdf/heaoverv.pdf>.
- Desvousges, William, Kristy Mathews, and Kenneth Train.** 2012a. "Adequate Responsiveness to Scope in Contingent Valuation." <http://elsa.berkeley.edu/~train/scope.pdf>.
- Desvousges, William, Kristy Mathews, and Kenneth Train.** 2012b. "Rationality Reduc: The Incremental Adding up Test for Contingent Valuation." Unpublished paper, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley.
- Diamond, Peter A., and Jerry A. Hausman.** 1994. "Contingent Valuation: Is Some Number Better Than No Number?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 8(4): 45–64.
- Federal Register.** 1994. May 14, 59(85): 1183.
- Harrison, Glenn W.** 2007. "Making Choice Studies Incentive Compatible." Chap. 4 in *Valuing Environmental Amenities Using Stated Choice Studies: A Common Sense Approach to Theory and Practice*, edited by Barbara Kanninen. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hausman, Jerry.** 1981. "Exact Consumer Surplus and Deadweight Loss." *American Economic Review* 71(4): 662–76.
- Hausman, Jerry A., and Timothy Bock.** 2007. "The Falsification of Contingent Valuation: A Case Study." Unpublished paper.

- Hausman, Jerry A., and Whitney K. Newey.** 1995. "Nonparametric Estimation of Exact Consumers Surplus and Deadweight Loss." *Econometrica* 63(6): 1445–76.
- Hausman, Jerry A., and Whitney K. Newey.** No date. "Non-separable Estimation of Exact Consumers Surplus and Deadweight Loss with Arbitrary Heterogeneity." Paper not completed.
- Heberlein, Thomas A., Matthew A. Wilson, Richard C. Bishop, and Nora Cate Schaeffer.** 2005. "Rethinking the Scope Test as a Criterion for Validity in Contingent Valuation." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 50(1): 1–22.
- Horowitz, John.** 2000. Policy Discussion section of "Stated Preference: What Do We Know? Where Do We Go?" Proceedings of Session One of "Theory and Design of Stated Preference Methods," A Workshop Sponsored by the USEPA's National Center for Environmental Economics and National Center for Environmental Research. October 12–13, Doubletree Hotel, Washington, DC. <http://epa.gov/ncer/publications/workshop/pdf/EE-0436-01.pdf>.
- Hsiao, Cheng, Baohong Sun, Vicki G. Morwitz.** 2002. "The Role of Stated Intentions in New Product Purchase Forecasting." In *Advances in Econometrics*, vol. 16, pp. 11–28. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Jamieson, Linda F., and Frank M. Bass.** 1989. "Adjusting Stated Intention Measures to Predict Trial Purchase of New Products: A Comparison of Models and Methods." *Journal of Marketing Research* 26(3): 336–45.
- Johnston, Robert J.** 2006. "Is Hypothetical Bias Universal? Validating Contingent Valuation Responses Using a Binding Public Referendum." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 52(1): 469–81.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Jack Knetsch.** 1992. "Valuing Public Goods: The Purchase of Moral Satisfaction." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 22(1): 57–70.
- Milgrom, Paul.** 1993. "Is Sympathy an Economic Value?" In *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*, edited by J. Hausman, 417–42. Amsterdam: North Holland Press.
- Morwitz, Vicki, Joel H. Steckel, and Alok Gupta.** 2007. "When Do Purchase Intentions Predict Sales?" *International Journal of Forecasting* 23(3): 347–64.
- Murphy, James J., and Thomass H. Stevens.** 2004. "Contingent Valuation, Hypothetical Bias, and Experimental Economics." *Agricultural Resource Economics Review* 33(2): 182–192.
- Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski.** 2000. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vossler, Christian A., Joe Kerkvliet, Stephen Polasky, and Olesya Gainutdinova.** 2003. "Externally Validating Contingent Valuation: An Open-Space Survey and Referendum in Corvallis, Oregon." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 51(2): 261–77.

This article has been cited by:

1. Lina Isacs, Cecilia Håkansson, Therese Lindahl, Ulrika Gunnarsson-Östling, Pernilla Andersson. 2024. 'I didn't count "willingness to pay" as part of the value': Monetary valuation through respondents' perspectives. *Environmental Values* 2. . [[Crossref](#)]
2. H. Holly Wang, Yizhou Hua, Christine Wilson. 2024. Do college students demand lower tuition for online learning? Empirical evidence from choice experiments during COVID-19. *Education Economics* 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
3. T. Ann-Chyi, L. Sheau-Ting. 2024. Methodological influences on ecosystem valuation: a systematic review of contingent valuation studies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 58, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Henry A. Bartelet, Michele L. Barnes, Graeme S. Cumming. 2024. Estimating and comparing the direct economic contributions of reef fisheries and tourism in the Asia-Pacific. *Marine Policy* 159, 105939. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Susana Ferreira, Mirko Moro, Heinz Welsch. 2024. Using Life Satisfaction and Happiness Data for Environmental Valuation: An Experienced Preference Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 164. . [[Crossref](#)]
6. Andrea Baldin, Trine Bille. 2023. Measuring the impact of the embedding effect in contingent valuation studies of cultural public goods: the case of museums. *Applied Economics* 58, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Valentini Stamatiadou, Antonios Mazaris, Zisis Mallios, Stelios Katsanevakis. 2023. Valuation and mapping of the recreational diving ecosystem service of the Aegean Sea. *Ecosystem Services* 64, 101569. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Samar Ghanem, Silvia Ferrini, Corrado Di Maria. 2023. Air pollution and willingness to pay for health risk reductions in Egypt: A contingent valuation survey of Greater Cairo and Alexandria households. *World Development* 172, 106373. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Ahrum Chang. 2023. Risk aversion and public sector employment. *Public Administration Review* 38. . [[Crossref](#)]
10. Rebecca Livernois. 2023. Externalities and the Limits of Pigovian Policies. *Ethics, Policy & Environment* 1, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Chentao Zhang, Ben Ma, Qianqian Du. 2023. Public acceptability and its determinants of unit pricing for municipal solid waste disposal: Evidence from a household survey in Beijing. *Journal of Environmental Management* 346, 118966. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Jonathan Daniel Gómez-Zapata, María José del Barrio-Tellado. 2023. Social impact and return on investment from cultural heritage institutions: An application to public libraries in Colombia. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 64, 102-112. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Emmanouil Tyllianakis. 2023. Can Knowledge, Responsibility and Environmentalism Explain Preference Heterogeneity? A Latent-Class Probit Model Analysis for Plastic Pollution Abatement. *Water Economics and Policy* 13. . [[Crossref](#)]
14. Malte Welling, Alexandra Dehnhardt, Sophie-Marie Aß. 2023. Does validity matter for policymakers? Evidence from choice experiments on urban green. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 12:4, 524-538. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Sebastian Neumann-Böhme, Iryna Sabat, Carolin Brinkmann, Arthur E. Attema, Tom Stargardt, Jonas Schreyögg, Werner Brouwer. 2023. Jumping the Queue: Willingness to Pay for Faster Access to COVID-19 Vaccines in Seven European Countries. *PharmacoEconomics* 41:10, 1389-1402. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Diane Coyle, Annabel Manley. 2023. What is the value of data? A review of empirical methods. *Journal of Economic Surveys* . [[Crossref](#)]

17. Oscar Becerra, José-Alberto Guerra. 2023. Personal safety first: Do workers value safer jobs?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **212**, 996-1016. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Benedetta Lerva. The Monetary Value of Externalities: Experimental Evidence from Ugandan Farmers **5**, . [[Crossref](#)]
19. Nicole Maestas, Kathleen J. Mullen, David Powell, Till von Wachter, Jeffrey B. Wenger. 2023. The Value of Working Conditions in the United States and Implications for the Structure of Wages. *American Economic Review* **113**:7, 2007-2047. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
20. Henry A. Bartelet, Michele L. Barnes, Lalu A.A. Bakti, Graeme S. Cumming. 2023. Testing the reliability of adaptive capacity as a proxy for adaptive and transformative responses to climate change. *Global Environmental Change* **81**, 102700. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Katriina Heinola, Terhi Latvala, Jarkko K. Niemi. 2023. Consumer trust and willingness to pay for establishing a market-based animal welfare assurance scheme for broiler chickens. *Poultry Science* **102**:7, 102765. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Esther Blanco, Lina Moros, Alexander Pfaff, Ivo Steimanis, Maria Alejandra Velez, Björn Vollan. 2023. No crowding out among those terminated from an ongoing PES program in Colombia. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **120**, 102826. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Gianluca Grimalda, Fabrice Murtin, David Pipke, Louis Putterman, Matthias Sutter. 2023. The politicized pandemic: Ideological polarization and the behavioral response to COVID-19. *European Economic Review* **156**, 104472. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Sooriyakumar Krishnapillai, Linoja Sajanthan, Sivashankar Sivakumar. 2023. Households' willingness to pay for sustainable sanitation and wastewater management in Jaffna municipal area, Sri Lanka. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* **13**:2, 312-320. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Eva Wanek, Bartosz Bartkowski, Sacha Bourgeois-Gironde, Marije Schaafsma. 2023. Deliberately vague or vaguely deliberative: A review of motivation and design choices in deliberative monetary valuation studies. *Ecological Economics* **208**, 107820. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Maximilian N Burger, Marco Nilgen, Ivo Steimanis, Björn Vollan. 2023. Relational values and citizens' assemblies in the context of adaptation to sea-level rise. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **62**, 101295. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Trine Bille. 2023. Museernes økonomiske værdi for den danske befolkning. *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift* **26**:1, 8-25. [[Crossref](#)]
28. RICKY N. LAWTON, DANIEL FUJIWARA. 2023. EXPLORING CONSUMER PREFERENCES FOR NET-ZERO POLICIES: WILLINGNESS TO PAY AMONG UK CITIZENS FOR NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION TARGETS UNDER DIFFERENT FUTURE DISCOUNTING ASSUMPTIONS. *Climate Change Economics* **14**:02. . [[Crossref](#)]
29. Benjamin Blemings, Peilu Zhang, Clinton L. Neill. 2023. Where is the value? The impacts of sow gestation crate laws on pork supply and consumer value perceptions. *Food Policy* **117**, 102447. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Christian A. Vossler, Stéphane Bergeron, Maurice Doyon, Daniel Rondeau. 2023. Revisiting the Gap between the Willingness to Pay and Willingness to Accept for Public Goods. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **10**:2, 413-445. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Alexander J. Smalley, Mathew P. White. 2023. Beyond blue-sky thinking: Diurnal patterns and ephemeral meteorological phenomena impact appraisals of beauty, awe, and value in urban and natural landscapes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* **86**, 101955. [[Crossref](#)]

32. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Salvador Gil-Pareja, María José García-Grande. 2023. On the economic evaluation of online learning in higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: a willingness-to-accept approach. *Applied Economic Analysis* 31:91, 19-38. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Elisa Borowski, Amanda Stathopoulos. 2023. Protection or Peril of Following the Crowd in a Pandemic-Concurrent Flood Evacuation. *Natural Hazards Review* 24:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
34. Luis Maldonado, María Molinos-Senante, Máximo Quiero-Bastias, Gabriela Atal. 2023. Willingness to pay for improving water supply continuity in case of climatic extreme natural events: an empirical approach for Chile. *Urban Water Journal* 20:1, 74-88. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Sven Ove Hansson. Zero Visions and Other Safety Principles 1-75. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Sven Ove Hansson. Zero Visions and Other Safety Principles 31-105. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Ana M. Sousa, Tiago P. Ribeiro, Maria J. Pereira, Henrique A. Matos. 2023. Review of the Economic and Environmental Impacts of Producing Waxy Crude Oils. *Energies* 16:1, 120. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Ingvild Almås, Orazio Attanasio, Pamela Jervis. 2023. Economics and Measurement: New Measures to Model Decision Making. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 4. . [[Crossref](#)]
39. Francesco Giffoni, Massimo Florio. 2023. Public support of science: A contingent valuation study of citizens' attitudes about CERN with and without information about implicit taxes. *Research Policy* 52:1, 104627. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Michael Rushton. The Economic Method 15-40. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Kiran Chawla. Normative Challenges in Climate Change Economics 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
42. John Charles Bradbury, Dennis Coates, Brad R. Humphreys. 2023. The Economics of Stadium Subsidies: A Policy Retrospective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
43. Xiao Dong, H. Allen Klaiber, Zoë Plakias. 2023. I scream, you scream, we all scream for local ice cream: Consumer preferences for locally processed foods. *Agribusiness* 39:1, 51-64. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Kiran Chawla. Normative Challenges in Climate Change Economics 249-266. [[Crossref](#)]
45. J.C. Whitehead, T.C. Haab. Contingent valuation method . [[Crossref](#)]
46. Seyyedehsara Sadrmousavigargari, Emilia Cubero Dudinskaya, Serena Mandolesi, Simona Naspetti, Seyed Mojtaba Mojaverian, Raffaele Zanoli. 2022. Assessing Consumer Willingness to Pay for Nutritional Information Using a Dietary App. *Nutrients* 14:23, 5023. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Ana M. Sousa, Tiago P. Ribeiro, Maria J. Pereira, Henrique A. Matos. 2022. On the economic impact of wax deposition on the oil and gas industry. *Energy Conversion and Management: X* 16, 100291. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Diriba Abdeta. 2022. Willingness to pay for forest conservation in developing countries: A systematic literature review. *Environmental and Sustainability Indicators* 16, 100201. [[Crossref](#)]
49. David Worden, Getu Hailu, Kate Jones, Yu Na Lee. 2022. The effects of bundling on livestock producers' valuations of environmentally friendly traits available through genomic selection. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue canadienne d'agroeconomie* 70:4, 263-286. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Jinyang Li, Arshad Ahmad Khan, Sufyan Ullah Khan, Muhammad Abu Sufyan Ali, Jianchao Luo. 2022. Estimating farmers' willingness to pay for photovoltaic industry to improve agricultural green resources and environment. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 10. . [[Crossref](#)]
51. Dan Qiao, Han Liu, Desheng Zhang, Tao Xu, Yu Gan. 2022. Chasing the unbiased willingness to pay: Using an integrated contingent valuation survey in estimating the non-market value of rubber plantation ecological restoration programs in China. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 10. . [[Crossref](#)]
52. Felix Boronczyk, Niklas Zarins. 2022. Fans' monetary evaluation of traditional and sponsored stadium names in the German Bundesliga. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 22:6, 768-787. [[Crossref](#)]

53. Lauren Chenarides, Carola Grebitus, Jayson L Lusk, Iryna Printezis. 2022. A calibrated choice experiment method. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 49:5, 971-1004. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Diriba Abdeta. 2022. Households' willingness to pay for forest conservation in Ethiopia: A review. *Journal of Forest Science* 68:11, 437-451. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Will Gorman. 2022. The quest to quantify the value of lost load: A critical review of the economics of power outages. *The Electricity Journal* 35:8, 107187. [[Crossref](#)]
56. John Charles Bradbury, Dennis Coates, Brad R. Humphreys. 2022. The impact of professional sports franchises and venues on local economies: A comprehensive survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 1. . [[Crossref](#)]
57. Frances C. Moore, Arianna Stokes, Marc N. Conte, Xiaoli Dong. 2022. Noah's Ark in a Warming World: Climate Change, Biodiversity Loss, and Public Adaptation Costs in the United States. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 9:5, 981-1015. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Fabio Bertoni, Stefano Bonini, Vincenzo Capizzi, Massimo G. Colombo, Sophie Manigart. 2022. Digitization in the Market for Entrepreneurial Finance: Innovative Business Models and New Financing Channels. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 46:5, 1120-1135. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Sheng Zhang, Bingyu Yang, Chuanwang Sun. 2022. Can payment vehicle influence public willingness to pay for environmental pollution control? Evidence from the CVM survey and PSM method of China. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 365, 132648. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Matthew W. Herring, Stephen T. Garnett, Kerstin K. Zander. 2022. Producing rice while conserving the habitat of an endangered waterbird: Incentives for farmers to integrate water management. *Land Use Policy* 120, 106269. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Danielle J. Ufer, Sonja A. Christensen, David L. Ortega, Nick Pinizzotto, Krysten Schuler. 2022. Stamping out wildlife disease: Are hunter-funded stamp programs a viable option for chronic wasting disease management?. *Conservation Science and Practice* 4:9. . [[Crossref](#)]
62. Juliano Scarpelin, Feni Dalano Roosevelt Agostinho, Cecília Maria Villas Bôas de Almeida, Biagio Fernando Giannetti, Lívia Cristina Pinto Dias. 2022. Valuation of losses and damages resulting from the Fundão's dam failure: An emery perspective. *Ecological Modelling* 471, 110051. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Olivier Armantier, Antonio Filippin, Michael Neubauer, Luca Nunziata. 2022. The expected price of keeping up with the Joneses. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 200, 1203-1220. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Henry A. Bartelet, Michele L. Barnes, Kim C. Zoeller, Graeme S. Cumming. 2022. Social adaptation can reduce the strength of social-ecological feedbacks from ecosystem degradation. *People and Nature* 4:4, 856-865. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Douglas Cumming, Fabrice Hervé, Elodie Manthé, Armin Schwiendbacher. 2022. Testing-the-Waters Policy With Hypothetical Investment: Evidence From Equity Crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 46:4, 1019-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Lusi Xie, Wiktor Adamowicz, Maik Kecinski, Jacob R. Fooks. 2022. Using economic experiments to assess the validity of stated preference contingent behavior responses. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 114, 102659. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Daniel Herrera-Araujo, Christoph M. Rheinberger, James K. Hammitt. 2022. Valuing non-marginal changes in mortality and morbidity risk. *Journal of Health Economics* 84, 102627. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Eda Ustaoglu, Arif Cagdas Aydinoglu. The External Costs of Road Transport 249-284. [[Crossref](#)]
69. José L. Oviedo, Pablo Campos, Alejandro Caparrós. 2022. Contingent valuation of landowner demand for forest amenities: application in Andalusia, Spain. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 49:3, 615-643. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Vladimir Krivtsov, Heather Forbes, Steve Birkinshaw, Valerie Olive, David Chamberlain, Jim Buckman, Rebecca Yahr, Scott Arthur, Derek Christie, Yamina Monteiro, Cameron Diekonigin. 2022.

Ecosystem services provided by urban ponds and green spaces: a detailed study of a semi-natural site with global importance for research. *Blue-Green Systems* 4:1, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]

71. Antonio Massarutto, G. Roder, S. Troiano. 2022. Better safe than sorry? Stated preferences and the precautionary principle for securing drinking water quality in an Italian district. *Utilities Policy* 76, 101355. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Nicholas Bardsley, Graziano Ceddia, Rachel McCloy, Simone Pfuderer. 2022. Why Economic Valuation Does Not Value the Environment: Climate Policy as Collective Endeavour. *Environmental Values* 31:3, 277-293. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Farina Wille, Florian Lange. 2022. Potential Contributions of Behavior Analysis to Research on Pro-environmental Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13. . [[Crossref](#)]
74. Pierre D. Glynn, Scott J. Chiavacci, Charles R. Rhodes, Jennifer F. Helgeson, Carl D. Shapiro, Crista L. Straub. 2022. Value of Information: Exploring Behavioral and Social Factors. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 10. . [[Crossref](#)]
75. Jianhong Xiao, Yihui Wu, Min Wang, Zegang Ma. 2022. Scope Issue in Contingent Valuation Studies of the COVID-19 Vaccine: The Case of China. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* 20:3, 417-429. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Patrizia Riganti. 2022. Embedding Effects in Contingent Valuation Applications to Cultural Capital: Does the Nature of the Goods Matter?. *Sustainability* 14:9, 5685. [[Crossref](#)]
77. R.A. Iles, Y. Choi, S. Kagundu, H. Gatumu. 2022. Estimating willingness-to-pay for a livestock vaccine among the marginalized: The role of reflective thought in discrete choice experiments. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 201, 105592. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Daniel A. Brent, Lata Gangadharan, Anke D. Leroux, Paul A. Raschky. 2022. Reducing bias in preference elicitation for environmental public goods*. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 66:2, 280-308. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Seth Binder. Economic Valuation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services 261-280. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Ricky N. Lawton, Daniel Fujiwara, Ulrike Hotopp. 2022. The value of digital archive film history: willingness to pay for film online heritage archival access. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 46:1, 165-197. [[Crossref](#)]
81. David Worden, Helen Hambly. 2022. Willingness to pay and pricing for broadband across the rural/urban divide in Canada. *Telecommunications Policy* 46:2, 102247. [[Crossref](#)]
82. David A. Comerford, Leonhard K. Lades. 2022. Responsibility utility and the difference between preference and desirance: implications for welfare evaluation. *Social Choice and Welfare* 58:2, 201-224. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Jon R. Neill. 2022. Using consumer's surplus to bound willingness to pay for non-market goods. *Resource and Energy Economics* 67, 101276. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Paul Glewwe, Petra Todd. Cost-Benefit Analysis and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis 389-401. [[Crossref](#)]
85. P. J. Metcalfe, A. Sen. 2022. Sensitivity to scope of water and wastewater service valuations: a meta-analysis of findings from water price reviews in Great Britain. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 11:1, 21-38. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Ali Chalak, Paul Metcalfe. 2022. Valuing water and wastewater service improvements via impact-weighted numbers of service failures. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 11:1, 39-55. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Sven Ove Hansson. Zero Visions and Other Safety Principles 1-75. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Erik van Doorn, Jens Laugesen, Matthias Haeckel, Nélia Mestre, Frode Skjeret, Annemiek Vink. Risk Assessment for Deep-Seabed Mining 497-526. [[Crossref](#)]

89. Shekar Bose. Transitioning Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture into the Blue Economy Framework 109-130. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Felix Ekardt. Frictions on the Application Level: Costs and Benefits, Discounting, Uncertainty, Fact Base 77-94. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Willem I. J. de Boer, Ruud H. Koning. Willingness to Pay for Professional Road Cycling Events 181-193. [[Crossref](#)]
92. José J. Sánchez, Thomas P. Holmes, John Loomis, Armando González-Cabán. 2022. Homeowners willingness to pay to reduce wildfire risk in wildland urban interface areas: Implications for targeting financial incentives. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **68**, 102696. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Bedasa Taye Merga, Galana Mamo Ayana, Belay Negash, Addisu Alemu, Mohammed Abdurke, Ahmedmenewer Abdu, Bikila Balis, Miressa Bekana, Gelana Fekadu, Temam Beshir Raru. 2022. Health-care Workers' Willingness to Pay for COVID-19 Vaccines in Eastern Ethiopia: Using Contingent Valuation Method. *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research* **Volume 14**, 395-404. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Haojie Chen, Tong Zhang, Luhua Wu. 2022. Deliberative and Conventional Stated-Preference Valuation on Protected Areas' Cultural Ecosystem Services: A Case Study in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
95. John Charles Bradbury, Dennis Coates, Brad R. Humphreys. 2022. The impact of professional sports franchises and venues on local economies: A comprehensive survey. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **59**. . [[Crossref](#)]
96. Philippe Bance, Angélique Chassy. Combining the Contingent Valuation Method with Citizen Advisory Committees 1850-1858. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Felipe Flores-Golfin, Angela Gunn. 2022. Estimating Willingness-to-Pay for Water Quality in the US. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **116**. . [[Crossref](#)]
98. Michael J. Rushton. 2022. The Economic Approach to Public Funding for the Arts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
99. Tom Ndebele. 2022. Energy Transition and Consumer Support for Green Energy Beyond the 50% Renewable Energy Target: Evidence from Stated Choice Experiments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **39**. . [[Crossref](#)]
100. Jie Yang, Kaiwen Su, Zhiyu Zhou, Yuan Huang, Yilei Hou, Yali Wen. 2022. The impact of tourist cognition on willing to pay for rare species conservation: Base on the questionnaire survey in protected areas of the Qinling region in China. *Global Ecology and Conservation* **33**, e01952. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Anthony Amoah, Adusei Jumah, Kofi Korle. 2022. Exploring willingness-to-pay for the restoration and maintenance of reserved forests in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. *Forest Ecosystems* **9**, 100041. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Kegnie Shitu, Maereg Wolde, Simegnew Handebo, Ayenew Kassie. 2021. Acceptance and willingness to pay for COVID-19 vaccine among school teachers in Gondar City, Northwest Ethiopia. *Tropical Medicine and Health* **49**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
103. C.K. Woo, K.H. Cao, J. Zarnikau, T.L. Yip, A. Chow. 2021. What moves Hong Kong's train ridership?. *Research in Transportation Economics* **90**, 101133. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Thi Dan Xuan Huynh, Tien Dung Khong, Viet Khai Huynh. 2021. Estimating economic value of household municipal solid waste reduction program: A willingness-to-accept (WTA) approach. *Can Tho University Journal of Science* **13**:3, 79-88. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Artem Korzhenevych, Charles Kofi Owusu. 2021. Renewable Minigrid Electrification in Off-Grid Rural Ghana: Exploring Households Willingness to Pay. *Sustainability* **13**:21, 11711. [[Crossref](#)]

106. Richard C. Bishop, Kevin J. Boyle. 2021. On Adding-Up as a Validity Criterion for Stated-Preference Studies. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **80**:3, 587-601. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Ángel Perni, Jesús Barreiro-Hurlé, José Miguel Martínez-Paz. 2021. Contingent valuation estimates for environmental goods: Validity and reliability. *Ecological Economics* **189**, 107144. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Joseph E. Aldy, Giles Atkinson, Matthew J. Kotchen. 2021. Environmental Benefit-Cost Analysis: A Comparative Analysis Between the United States and the United Kingdom. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **13**:1, 267-288. [[Crossref](#)]
109. S.Yu. Bogatyrev. 2021. New risks in the new beta coefficient: Behavioral approach. *Risk and Decision Analysis* **8**:3-4, 103-112. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Ruggiero Sardaro, Piermichele La Sala, Gianluigi De Pascale, Nicola Faccilongo. 2021. The conservation of cultural heritage in rural areas: Stakeholder preferences regarding historical rural buildings in Apulia, southern Italy. *Land Use Policy* **109**, 105662. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Amita Basu, Narayanan Srinivasan. 2021. A Modified Contingent Valuation Method Shrinks Gain-Loss Asymmetry. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **94**, 101747. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Damian Clarke, Sonia Oreffice, Climent Quintana-Domeque. 2021. On the Value of Birth Weight*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **83**:5, 1130-1159. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Adriana E. S. Ford, Sandy P. Harrison, Yiannis Kountouris, James D. A. Millington, Jayalaxshmi Mistry, Oliver Perkins, Sam S. Rabin, Guillermo Rein, Kate Schreckenber, Cathy Smith, Thomas E. L. Smith, Kapil Yadav. 2021. Modelling Human-Fire Interactions: Combining Alternative Perspectives and Approaches. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
114. Wubeshet Teshome, Nesru Temam. 2021. Valuing local bread wheat farmer's varieties (*Triticum aestivum* L.) for conservation and sustainable utilization in goro and agarfa CSBs, bale zone OF Oromiya regional state. *MOJ Ecology & Environmental Sciences* **6**:5, 175-180. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Anders Dugstad, Kristine M. Grimsrud, Gorm Kipperberg, Henrik Lindhjem, Ståle Navrud. 2021. Scope Elasticity of Willingness to pay in Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **80**:1, 21-57. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Daniel Pérez-Troncoso, David M. Epstein, José A. Castañeda-García. 2021. Consumers' Preferences and Willingness to Pay for Personalised Nutrition. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* **19**:5, 757-767. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Moisés Carrasco-Garcés, Felipe Vásquez-Lavín, Roberto D. Ponce Oliva, Francisco Diaz Pincheira, Manuel Barrientos. 2021. Estimating the implicit discount rate for new technology adoption of wood-burning stoves. *Energy Policy* **156**, 112407. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Yingying Qiu, Erda Wang, Yan Bu, Yang Yu. 2021. Valuing recreational fishery attributes, opportunities and associated activities in China from the tourists' satisfaction perspectives. *Marine Policy* **131**, 104616. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Moisés Carrasco Garcés, Felipe Vasquez-Lavin, Roberto D. Ponce Oliva, José Luis Bustamante Oporto, Manuel Barrientos, Arcadio A. Cerda. 2021. Embedding effect and the consequences of advanced disclosure: evidence from the valuation of cultural goods. *Empirical Economics* **61**:2, 1039-1062. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Mesfin Sahle, Osamu Saito, Travis W. Reynolds. 2021. Nature's contributions to people from church forests in a fragmented tropical landscape in southern Ethiopia. *Global Ecology and Conservation* **28**, e01671. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Syed M. Hasan, Agha Ali Akram, Marc Jeuland. 2021. Awareness of coping costs and willingness to pay for urban drinking water service: Evidence from Lahore, Pakistan. *Utilities Policy* **71**, 101246. [[Crossref](#)]

122. Mohammad Younus Bhat, Arfat Ahmad Sofi. 2021. Willingness to pay for biodiversity conservation in Dachigam National Park, India. *Journal for Nature Conservation* **62**, 126022. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Heuristics as a new way of adjusting the end market value. *Finance and Credit* **27**:7, 1581-1599. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Leidy Y. García, Arcadio A. Cerda, Rocio del P. Lagos, Patricio I. Muñoz, Monserrat Muñoz. 2021. Society's Willingness to Pay for Certified Dry Firewood Energy in Chile. *Frontiers in Energy Research* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
125. C.K. Woo, A. Tishler, J. Zarnikau, Y. Chen. 2021. Average residential outage cost estimates for the lower 48 states in the US. *Energy Economics* **98**, 105270. [[Crossref](#)]
126. S.Y BOGATYREV. 2021. BEHAVIORAL DEVIATIONS OF THE MARKET VALUE OF MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES AND CURRENCY ASSETS. *AZIMUTH OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: ECONOMICS AND ADMINISTRATION* **10**:35. . [[Crossref](#)]
127. Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Simulation of emotional differences in the structured query language for databases of financial markets. *Financial Analytics: Science and Experience* **14**:2, 156-173. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Semen Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. New finance: Psychological measurement of value. *Finance and Credit* **27**:5, 1156-1177. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Ye jin Choi, Won Seok Lee, Joonho Moon, Kyoung-Bae Kim. 2021. The value of preserving endangered folk games using the contingent valuation method. *Current Issues in Tourism* **24**:9, 1319-1330. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Arcadio A. Cerda, Leidy Y. García. 2021. Willingness to Pay for a COVID-19 Vaccine. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* **19**:3, 343-351. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Mona Ahmadiani, Susana Ferreira. 2021. Well-being effects of extreme weather events in the United States. *Resource and Energy Economics* **64**, 101213. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Corey Lang, Michael Weir, Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2021. Status quo bias and public policy: evidence in the context of carbon mitigation. *Environmental Research Letters* **16**:5, 054076. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Christos Evangelinos, Stefan Tscharaktschiew. 2021. The Valuation of Aesthetic Preferences and Consequences for Urban Transport Infrastructures. *Sustainability* **13**:9, 4977. [[Crossref](#)]
134. C.K. Woo, A. Tishler, J. Zarnikau, Y. Chen. 2021. A back of the envelope estimate of the average non-residential outage cost in the US. *The Electricity Journal* **34**:4, 106930. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Sergei Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. Looking into bubbles in financial markets and the emotional side of corporate forecast completion through modeling in the structured query language of financial databases. *Finance and Credit* **27**:4, 833-850. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Sergei Yu. BOGATYREV. 2021. The sentiment analysis method in finance: The psychological-financial index. *Finance and Credit* **27**:3, 561-584. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Noel Semple. 2021. Good Enough for Government Work? Life-Evaluation and Public Policy. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **22**:3, 1119-1140. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Coralie Lemoine, Sandrine Loubière, Mohamed Boucekine, Vincent Girard, Aurélie Tinland, Pascal Auquier. 2021. Cost-effectiveness analysis of housing first intervention with an independent housing and team support for homeless people with severe mental illness: A Markov model informed by a randomized controlled trial. *Social Science & Medicine* **272**, 113692. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Sonia Aziz, Emily L. Pakhtigian, Ali S. Akanda, Antarpreet Jutla, Anwar Huq, Munirul Alam, Gias U. Ashan, Rita R. Colwell. 2021. Does improved risk information increase the value of cholera prevention? An analysis of stated vaccine demand in slum areas of urban Bangladesh. *Social Science & Medicine* **272**, 113716. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Russell Lundberg. Comparative Risk Rankings in Support of Homeland Security Strategic Plans 101-124. [[Crossref](#)]

141. Matthias Schröter, Emilie Crouzat, Lisanne Hölting, Julian Massenber, Julian Rode, Mario Hanisch, Nadja Kabisch, Julia Palliwoda, Jörg A. Priess, Ralf Seppelt, Michael Beckmann. 2021. Assumptions in ecosystem service assessments: Increasing transparency for conservation. *Ambio* **50**:2, 289-300. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Elizabeth Asantewaa Obeng, Francisco Xavier Aguilar. 2021. Willingness-to-pay for restoration of water quality services across geo-political boundaries. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability* **3**, 100037. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Valentino Dardanoni, Carla Guerriero. 2021. Young people' s willingness to pay for environmental protection. *Ecological Economics* **179**, 106853. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Joseph E. Aldy, Giles Atkinson, Matthew Kotchen. 2021. Environmental Benefit-Cost Analysis: A Comparative Analysis Between the United States and the United Kingdom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **48**. . [[Crossref](#)]
145. Felix Schläpfer. 2021. Inadequate Standards in the Valuation of Public Goods and Ecosystem Services: Why Economists, Environmental Scientists and Policymakers Should Care. *Sustainability* **13**:1, 393. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Fabio Bertoni, Stefano Bonini, Vincenzo Capizzi, Massimo G. Colombo, Sophie Manigart. 2021. Digitization in the Market for Entrepreneurial Finance: Innovative Business Models and New Financing Channels. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **39**. . [[Crossref](#)]
147. Robert Germeshausen, Sven Heim, Ulrich J. Wagner. 2021. Support for Renewable Energy: The Case of Wind Power. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **38**. . [[Crossref](#)]
148. Aleksandra Wiśniewska, Wiktor Budziński, Mikołaj Czajkowski. 2020. An economic valuation of access to cultural institutions: museums, theatres, and cinemas. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **44**:4, 563-587. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Hamidreza Asgari, Xia Jin. 2020. Propensity toward ride-sourcing: Desired savings in travel time and mobility cost to switch from private mobility. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* **121**, 102883. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Navid Saadatfar, Mohammad Pooyan Jadidfar. 2020. An overview of the methodological aspects and policy implications of willingness-to-pay studies in oral health: a scoping review of existing literature. *BMC Oral Health* **20**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
151. James B. Tidwell. 2020. Users are willing to pay for sanitation, but not as much as they say: empirical results and methodological comparisons of willingness to pay for peri-urban sanitation in Lusaka, Zambia using contingent valuation, discrete choice experiments, and hedonic pricing. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development* **10**:4, 756-767. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Francisco González-Gómez, Jorge Guardiola. 2020. Valuing water supply infrastructure improvements using life satisfaction data as a complement to contingent valuation. *Water and Environment Journal* **34**:S1, 401-413. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Sebastian Himmeler, Job van Exel, Werner Brouwer. 2020. Estimating the monetary value of health and capability well-being applying the well-being valuation approach. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **21**:8, 1235-1244. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Donald S. Kenkel, Sida Peng, Michael F. Pesko, Hua Wang. 2020. Mostly harmless regulation? Electronic cigarettes, public policy, and consumer welfare. *Health Economics* **29**:11, 1364-1377. [[Crossref](#)]
155. John C. Whitehead, O. Ashton Morgan, William L. Huth, Gregory S. Martin, Richard Sjolander. 2020. Altruistic and Private Values For Saving Lives With an Oyster Consumption Safety Program. *Risk Analysis* **40**:11, 2413-2426. [[Crossref](#)]

156. Bonnie L. Keeler. 2020. Mainstream and Heterodox Approaches to Water Quality Valuation: A Case for Pluralistic Water Policy Analysis. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 12:1, 235-258. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Klaas van 't Veld. 2020. Eco-Labels: Modeling the Consumer Side. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 12:1, 187-207. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Achilleas Vassilopoulos, Niki Avgeraki, Stathis Klonaris. 2020. Social desirability and the WTP-WTA disparity in common goods. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 22:7, 6425-6444. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Felix Schläpfer, Michael Getzner. 2020. Beyond Current Guidelines: A Proposal for Bringing Behavioral Economics to the Design and Analysis of Stated Preference Surveys. *Ecological Economics* 176, 106720. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Kuo-Cheng Hsu. 2020. House Prices in the Peripheries of Mass Rapid Transit Stations Using the Contingent Valuation Method. *Sustainability* 12:20, 8701. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Rui Wang, James S. Fishkin, Robert C. Luskin. 2020. Does Deliberation Increase Public-Spiritedness?. *Social Science Quarterly* 101:6, 2163-2182. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Ana Faria Lopes, Gorm Kipperberg. 2020. Diagnosing Insensitivity to Scope in Contingent Valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77:1, 191-216. [[Crossref](#)]
163. C. Romero, P. Arancibia-Avila, L. Améstica-Rivas, F. Toledo-Montiel, G. Flores-Morales. 2020. Economic valuation of the eco-systemic benefits derived from the environmental asset lake Laguna Santa Elena, through the multi-criteria analysis. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 80:3, 557-564. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Isabel Lissner, Marius Mayer. 2020. Tourists' willingness to pay for Blue Flag's new ecolabel for sustainable boating: the case of whale-watching in Iceland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 20:4, 352-375. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Kevin E. Cavasos, Mahadev G. Bhat. 2020. Impact of risk perception on household willingness-to-pay to restock the threatened staghorn coral. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 193, 105244. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Bernadeta Gołębiewska, Anna Bartczak, Mikołaj Czajkowski. 2020. Energy Demand Management and Social Norms. *Energies* 13:15, 3779. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Philippe Bance, Angélique Chassy. 2020. Citizen Advisory Committees in the Contingent Valuation Method Process. *Politics & Policy* 48:4, 766-797. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Daniel Herrera-Araujo, James K. Hammitt, Christoph M. Rheinberger. 2020. Theoretical bounds on the value of improved health. *Journal of Health Economics* 72, 102341. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Manuel A. Zambrano-Monserrate, Maria Alejandra Ruano. 2020. Estimating the damage cost of plastic waste in Galapagos Islands: A contingent valuation approach. *Marine Policy* 117, 103933. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Stephen D. Wong, Caspar G. Chorus, Susan A. Shaheen, Joan L. Walker. 2020. A Revealed Preference Methodology to Evaluate Regret Minimization with Challenging Choice Sets: A Wildfire Evacuation Case Study. *Travel Behaviour and Society* 20, 331-347. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Youngran Choi, Kuan-Ju Chen, Thomas L. Marsh. 2020. Consumer preference for bio-based batteries. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 19:4, 382-396. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Nils Soguel, Eugenio Caperchione, Sandra Cohen. 2020. Allocating government budgets according to citizen preferences: a cross-national survey. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management* 32:3, 487-504. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Jonathan Cohen, Keith Marzilli Ericson, David Laibson, John Myles White. 2020. Measuring Time Preferences. *Journal of Economic Literature* 58:2, 299-347. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
174. Sofia M. Lourenço. 2020. Do self-reported motivators really motivate higher performance?. *Management Accounting Research* 47, 100676. [[Crossref](#)]

175. Jakub Dostál. 2020. Revealed value of volunteering: A volunteer centre network. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* **91**:2, 319-345. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Drew Capone, Helen Buxton, Oliver Cumming, Robert Dreibelbis, Jackie Knee, Rassul Nalá, Ian Ross, Joe Brown. 2020. Impact of an intervention to improve pit latrine emptying practices in low income urban neighborhoods of Maputo, Mozambique. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* **226**, 113480. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Dong Guo, Anyi Wang, Alice Tianbo Zhang. 2020. Pollution exposure and willingness to pay for clean air in urban China. *Journal of Environmental Management* **261**, 110174. [[Crossref](#)]
178. A. Banerji, Jeevant Rampal. 2020. Reverse Endowment Effect for a New Product. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **102**:3, 786-805. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Manuel A. Zambrano-Monserrate. 2020. The economic value of the Andean Condor: The national symbol of South America. *Journal for Nature Conservation* **54**, 125796. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Maximiliane Sievert, Jevgenijs Steinbuks. 2020. Willingness to pay for electricity access in extreme poverty: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development* **128**, 104859. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Kenneth Lee, Edward Miguel, Catherine Wolfram. 2020. Experimental Evidence on the Economics of Rural Electrification. *Journal of Political Economy* **128**:4, 1523-1565. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Abbie A. Rogers, Michael P. Burton, Jonelle A. Cleland, John C. Rolfe, Jessica J. Meeuwig, David J. Pannell. 2020. Expert judgements and community values: preference heterogeneity for protecting river ecology in Western Australia. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* **64**:2, 266-293. [[Crossref](#)]
183. S.Yu. Bogatyrev. 2020. Behavioral valuation in the Russian and Western stock markets. *Finance and Credit* **26**:3, 549-564. [[Crossref](#)]
184. S.Yu. Bogatyrev. 2020. The behavioral valuation apparatus. *Finance and Credit* **26**:2, 257-269. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Sandrine Loubière, Owen Taylor, Aurelie Tinland, Maria Vargas-Moniz, Branagh O'Shaughnessy, Anna Bokszczanin, Hakan Kallmen, Roberto Bernad, Judith Wolf, Massimo Santinello, Anderson Loundou, Jose Ornelas, Pascal Auquier. 2020. Europeans' willingness to pay for ending homelessness: A contingent valuation study. *Social Science & Medicine* **247**, 112802. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Katherine Needham, Nick Hanley. 2020. Prior knowledge, familiarity and stated policy consequentiality in contingent valuation. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **9**:1, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Asha Gunawardena, Sayed Iftekhar, James Fogarty. 2020. Quantifying intangible benefits of water sensitive urban systems and practices: an overview of non-market valuation studies. *Australasian Journal of Water Resources* **24**:1, 46-59. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Felix Ekardt. Ethics and Law of Sustainability – Especially of Freedom, Human Rights, Democracy, and Balancing in a Reinterpreted Perspective 111-223. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Henrik Andersson. The value of a statistical life 75-99. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Carl Koopmans, Niek Mouter. Cost-benefit analysis 1-42. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Tom Ndebele. 2020. Assessing the potential for consumer-driven renewable energy development in deregulated electricity markets dominated by renewables. *Energy Policy* **136**, 111057. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Seth Binder. 2020. Is Existence Value Appropriate for Regulatory Benefit–Cost Analysis?. *Journal of Benefit–Cost Analysis* **11**:3, 441-456. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Gioberti Raul Morantes Quintana, Gladys Rincón Polo, Narciso Pérez Santodomingo. 2020. Disposición a pagar por mejor calidad de aire ante la contaminación por emisiones industriales en Venezuela. *Cuadernos de Economía* **39**:79, 191-217. [[Crossref](#)]

194. Botao Qin. 2020. Does a promise script work to reduce the hypothetical bias? Evidence from an induced value experiment. *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
195. Bartosz Bartkowski, Stephan Bartke, Katharina Helming, Carsten Paul, Anja-Kristina Techen, Bernd Hansjürgens. 2020. Potential of the economic valuation of soil-based ecosystem services to inform sustainable soil management and policy. *PeerJ* **8**, e8749. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Emilio Picasso, Mark A. Cohen. 2019. Valuing the public's demand for crime prevention programs: a discrete choice experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* **15**:4, 529-550. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Anthony Amoah, Silvia Ferrini, Marije Schaafsma. 2019. Electricity outages in Ghana: Are contingent valuation estimates valid?. *Energy Policy* **135**, 110996. [[Crossref](#)]
198. R. Douglas Scott, Rachel B. Slayton, Fernanda C. Lessa, James Baggs, Steven D. Culler, L. Clifford McDonald, John A. Jernigan. 2019. Assessing the social cost and benefits of a national requirement establishing antibiotic stewardship programs to prevent *Clostridioides difficile* infection in US hospitals. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control* **8**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
199. Sofía Garrido, Emilio Gutiérrez. 2019. Time goes by so slowly (for those who wait): a field experiment in health care. *Latin American Economic Review* **28**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
200. Marija Opačak, Erda Wang. 2019. Estimating Willingness to Pay for a Future Recreational Park Atop the Current Jakuševac Landfill in Zagreb, Croatia. *Sustainability* **11**:21, 6038. [[Crossref](#)]
201. José Luis Pinto-Prades, Neil McHugh, Cam Donaldson, Sarkis Manoukian. 2019. Sequence effects in time trade-off valuation of hypothetical health states. *Health Economics* **28**:11, 1308-1319. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Robert Tinch, Nicola Beaumont, Tim Sunderland, Ece Ozdemiroglu, David Barton, Colm Bowe, Tobias Börger, Paul Burgess, Canon Nigel Cooper, Michela Faccioli, Pierre Failler, Ioanna Gkolemi, Ritesh Kumar, Alberto Longo, Alistair McVittie, Joe Morris, Jacob Park, Neil Ravenscroft, Marije Schaafsma, James Vause, Guy Ziv. 2019. Economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services: a review for decision makers. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **8**:4, 359-378. [[Crossref](#)]
203. SuZanne Troske, Stephanie Waters, James Allen, Alison Davis, C. Jill Stowe. 2019. Central Kentuckians' Willingness to Pay for Horse Farm Preservation. *Sustainability* **11**:19, 5210. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Niek Mouter, Manuel Ojeda Cabral, Thijs Dekker, Sander van Cranenburgh. 2019. The value of travel time, noise pollution, recreation and biodiversity: A social choice valuation perspective. *Research in Transportation Economics* **76**, 100733. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Rodgers Makwinja, Ishmael Bobby Mphangwe Kosamu, Chikumbusko Chiziwa Kaonga. 2019. Determinants and Values of Willingness to Pay for Water Quality Improvement: Insights from Chia Lagoon, Malawi. *Sustainability* **11**:17, 4690. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Vanessa J. Fundel, Nadine Fleischhut, Stefan M. Herzog, Martin Göber, Renate Hagedorn. 2019. Promoting the use of probabilistic weather forecasts through a dialogue between scientists, developers and end-users. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **145**:S1, 210-231. [[Crossref](#)]
207. S. Meunier, D. T. Manning, L. Quéval, J. A. Cherni, P. Dessante, D. Zimmerle. 2019. Determinants of the marginal willingness to pay for improved domestic water and irrigation in partially electrified Rwandan villages. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* **26**:6, 547-559. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Parvaneh Shahnoori, Glenn P. Jenkins. 2019. The value of online banking to small and medium-sized enterprises: evidence from firms operating in the uae free trade zones. *Applied Economics* **51**:37, 4046-4055. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Fernando Gordillo, Peter Elsasser, Sven Günter. 2019. Willingness to pay for forest conservation in Ecuador: Results from a nationwide contingent valuation survey in a combined "referendum" – "Consequential open-ended" design. *Forest Policy and Economics* **105**, 28-39. [[Crossref](#)]

210. Ben Balmford, Ian J. Bateman, Katherine Bolt, Brett Day, Silvia Ferrini. 2019. The value of statistical life for adults and children: Comparisons of the contingent valuation and chained approaches. *Resource and Energy Economics* **57**, 68-84. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Simona Bigerna, Silvia Micheli, Paolo Polinori. 2019. Willingness to pay for electric boats in a protected area in Italy: A sustainable tourism perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **224**, 603-613. [[Crossref](#)]
212. James B. Tidwell, Fern Terris-Prestholt, Matthew Quaife, Robert Aunger. 2019. Understanding demand for higher quality sanitation in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia through stated and revealed preference analysis. *Social Science & Medicine* **232**, 139-147. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Nick Hanley, Mikołaj Czajkowski. 2019. The Role of Stated Preference Valuation Methods in Understanding Choices and Informing Policy. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* **13**:2, 248-266. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Philippe Bance, Angélique Chassy. 2019. Citizen Advisory Committees: A Tool to Remedy the Shortcomings of the Contingent Valuation Method Within the System of Multi-Level Governance. *International Journal of Public Administration* **42**:8, 685-695. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Kahsay Haile Zemo, Toke Emil Panduro, Mette Termansen. 2019. Impact of biogas plants on rural residential property values and implications for local acceptance. *Energy Policy* **129**, 1121-1131. [[Crossref](#)]
216. D. Lazaridou, A. Michailidis, M. Trigkas. 2019. Socio-economic factors influencing farmers' willingness to undertake environmental responsibility. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **26**:15, 14732-14741. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Melanie Franke, Claudia Nadler. 2019. Energy efficiency in the German residential housing market: Its influence on tenants and owners. *Energy Policy* **128**, 879-890. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Clinton L. Neill, Rodney B. Holcomb. 2019. Does a food safety label matter? Consumer heterogeneity and fresh produce risk perceptions under the Food Safety Modernization Act. *Food Policy* **85**, 7-14. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Edward Mutandwa, Robert K. Grala, Daniel R. Petrolia. 2019. Estimates of willingness to accept compensation to manage pine stands for ecosystem services. *Forest Policy and Economics* **102**, 75-85. [[Crossref](#)]
220. John Buckell, Stephane Hess. 2019. Stubbing out hypothetical bias: improving tobacco market predictions by combining stated and revealed preference data. *Journal of Health Economics* **65**, 93-102. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Chris R. J. Pollard, Steve Redpath, Luc F. Bussière, Aidan Keane, Des B. A. Thompson, Juliette C. Young, Nils Bunnefeld. 2019. The impact of uncertainty on cooperation intent in a conservation conflict. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **56**:5, 1278-1288. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Ulrich J. Frey. 2019. Crowdfunding – revealing preferences for environmental goods. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* **30**:3, 538-556. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Emily L. Pakhtigian, Marc Jeuland. 2019. Valuing the Environmental Costs of Local Development: Evidence From Households in Western Nepal. *Ecological Economics* **158**, 158-167. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Christopher Neher, Lucas Bair, John Duffield, David Patterson, Katherine Neher. 2019. Convergent validity between willingness to pay elicitation methods: an application to Grand Canyon whitewater boaters. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **62**:4, 611-625. [[Crossref](#)]
225. David A. Keiser, Catherine L. Kling, Joseph S. Shapiro. 2019. The low but uncertain measured benefits of US water quality policy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**:12, 5262-5269. [[Crossref](#)]

226. Matto Mildenerger, Mark Lubell, Michelle Hummel. 2019. Personalized risk messaging can reduce climate concerns. *Global Environmental Change* **55**, 15-24. [[Crossref](#)]
227. John C. Whitehead, Pamela Wicker. 2019. Valuing nonmarket benefits of participatory sport events using willingness to travel: Payment card versus random selection with mitigation of hypothetical bias. *International Journal of Tourism Research* **21:2**, 180-186. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Richard C. Bishop, Kevin J. Boyle. 2019. Reliability and Validity in Nonmarket Valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **72:2**, 559-582. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Stella Nalukwago Settumba, Marian Shanahan, Willings Botha, Muhammad Zulilhaam Ramli, Georgina Mary Chambers. 2019. Reliability and Validity of the Contingent Valuation Method for Estimating Willingness to Pay: A Case of In Vitro Fertilisation. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* **17:1**, 103-110. [[Crossref](#)]
230. David A Keiser, Joseph S Shapiro. 2019. Consequences of the Clean Water Act and the Demand for Water Quality*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **134:1**, 349-396. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Willem I. J. de Boer, Ruud H. Koning, Jochen O. Mierau. 2019. Ex Ante and Ex Post Willingness to Pay for Hosting a Large International Sport Event. *Journal of Sports Economics* **20:2**, 159-176. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Clemens Hetschko, Louisa Reumont, Ronnie Schöb. 2019. Embedding as a Pitfall for Survey-Based Welfare Indicators: Evidence from an Experiment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* **182:2**, 517-539. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Ulrich J. Frey, Frauke Pirscher. 2019. Distinguishing protest responses in contingent valuation: A conceptualization of motivations and attitudes behind them. *PLOS ONE* **14:1**, e0209872. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Aditi Bhattacharyya, Levent Kutlu, Robin C. Sickles. Pricing Inputs and Outputs: Market Prices Versus Shadow Prices, Market Power, and Welfare Analysis 485-526. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Philippe Bance, Angélique Chassy. Combining the Contingent Valuation Method with Citizen Advisory Committees 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Ana Navarrete-Tudela, José Ramón Alcalá-Mellado, Daniel Carlos del Saz-Salazar. 2019. On the Use of Life Satisfaction Data for Valuing Cultural Goods: A First Attempt and a Comparison with the Contingent Valuation Method. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **20:1**, 119-140. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Thomas J. Kniesner, W. Kip Viscusi. 2019. The Value of a Statistical Life. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
238. Noel Semple. 2019. Good Enough for Government Work? Life-Evaluation and Public Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
239. Ana Ruiz-Frau, James M. Gibbons, Hilmar Hinz, Gareth Edwards-Jones, Michel J. Kaiser. 2019. Preference classes in society for coastal marine protected areas. *PeerJ* **7**, e6672. [[Crossref](#)]
240. Wolfgang Buchholz, Dirk Rübhelke. Monetary Valuation of the Environment 37-66. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Joachim Marti, John Buckell, Johanna Catherine Maclean, Jody Sindelar. 2019. TO “VAPE” OR SMOKE? EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE ON ADULT SMOKERS. *Economic Inquiry* **57:1**, 705-725. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Lisa A. Wainger, Ryan Helcoski, Kevin W. Farge, Brandy A. Espinola, Gary T. Green. 2018. Evidence of a Shared Value for Nature. *Ecological Economics* **154**, 107-116. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Yonas Alem, Håkan Eggert, Martin G. Kocher, Remidius D. Ruhinduka. 2018. Why (field) experiments on unethical behavior are important: Comparing stated and revealed behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **156**, 71-85. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Benjamin Leard. 2018. Consumer inattention and the demand for vehicle fuel cost savings. *Journal of Choice Modelling* **29**, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]

245. Brandon R. McFadden, Trey Malone. 2018. How will mandatory labeling of genetically modified food nudge consumer decision-making?. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 77, 186-194. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Bodo Herzog. 2018. Valuation of Digital Platforms: Experimental Evidence for Google and Facebook. *International Journal of Financial Studies* 6:4, 87. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Levan Elbakidze, Rodolfo M. Nayga. 2018. The Adding-Up Test in an Incentivized Value Elicitation Mechanism: The Role of the Income Effect. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71:3, 625-644. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Jie-Sheng Tan Soo. 2018. Valuing Air Quality in Indonesia Using Households' Locational Choices. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71:3, 755-776. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Ana Pinto Borges, Elvira Pacheco Vieira, João Romão. 2018. The evaluation of the perceived value of festival experiences: the case of Serralves em Festa!. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management* 9:3, 279-296. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Paul Mwebaze, Jeff Bennett, Nigel W. Beebe, Gregor J. Devine, Paul De Barro. 2018. Economic Valuation of the Threat Posed by the Establishment of the Asian Tiger Mosquito in Australia. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71:2, 357-379. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Alaya Spencer-Cotton, Marit E. Kragt, Michael Burton. 2018. Spatial and Scope Effects: Valuations of Coastal Management Practices. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 69:3, 833-851. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Ulrich J. Frey, Frauke Pirscher. 2018. Willingness to pay and moral stance: The case of farm animal welfare in Germany. *PLOS ONE* 13:8, e0202193. [[Crossref](#)]
253. James O'Brien. 2018. Age, autos, and the value of a statistical life. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 57:1, 51-79. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Miranda A. Galvin, Thomas A. Loughran, Sally S. Simpson, Mark A. Cohen. 2018. Victim Compensation Policy and White-Collar Crime. *Criminology & Public Policy* 17:3, 553-594. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Marta Bruno Soares, Meaghan Daly, Suraje Dessai. 2018. Assessing the value of seasonal climate forecasts for decision-making. *WIREs Climate Change* 9:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
256. Pasquale Lucio Scandizzo, Maria Rita Pierleoni. 2018. ASSESSING THE OLYMPIC GAMES: THE ECONOMIC IMPACT AND BEYOND. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 32:3, 649-682. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Fitalew Agimass, Thomas Lundhede, Toke Emil Panduro, Jette Bredahl Jacobsen. 2018. The choice of forest site for recreation: A revealed preference analysis using spatial data. *Ecosystem Services* 31, 445-454. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Michael Jakob. 2018. Can carbon pricing jointly promote climate change mitigation and human development in Peru?. *Energy for Sustainable Development* 44, 87-96. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Erik Brynjolfsson, Felix Eggers, Avinash Gannamaneni. 2018. Measuring Welfare with Massive Online Choice Experiments: A Brief Introduction. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 108, 473-476. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
260. Cathrine Ulla Jensen, Toke Emil Panduro, Thomas Hedemark Lundhede, Anne Sofie Elberg Nielsen, Mette Dalsgaard, Bo Jellesmark Thorsen. 2018. The impact of on-shore and off-shore wind turbine farms on property prices. *Energy Policy* 116, 50-59. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Christoph M. Rheinberger, Felix Schläpfer, Michael Lobsiger. 2018. A novel approach to estimating the demand value of public safety. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 89, 285-305. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Maria Christantoni, Dimitris Damigos. 2018. Individual contributions, provision point mechanisms and project cost information effects on contingent values: Findings from a field validity test. *Science of The Total Environment* 624, 628-637. [[Crossref](#)]

263. Silvana Karina de Melo Travassos, José Carlos de Lacerda Leite, Jose Isidio de Freitas Costa. 2018. Contingent Valuation Method and the beta model: an accounting economic vision for environmental damage in Atlântico Sul Shipyard. *Revista Contabilidade & Finanças* **29**:77, 266-282. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Jerrod Penn, Wuyang Hu. 2018. Euthanizing value of a statistical life: monetizing differences in public perception and alternatives. *Applied Economics* **50**:16, 1824-1836. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Elliott T. Campbell. 2018. Revealed social preference for ecosystem services using the eco-price. *Ecosystem Services* **30**, 267-275. [[Crossref](#)]
266. John C. Whitehead, Pamela Wicker. 2018. Estimating willingness to pay for a cycling event using a willingness to travel approach. *Tourism Management* **65**, 160-169. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Brad R. Humphreys, Bruce K. Johnson, Daniel S. Mason, John C. Whitehead. 2018. Estimating the Value of Medal Success in the Olympic Games. *Journal of Sports Economics* **19**:3, 398-416. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Pamela Wicker, Dennis Coates. 2018. FLAME GOES OUT: DETERMINANTS OF INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT AT THE 2024 HAMBURG GAMES REFERENDUM. *Contemporary Economic Policy* **36**:2, 302-317. [[Crossref](#)]
269. David Cook, Kristín Eiríksdóttir, Brynhildur Davíðsdóttir, Daði Már Kristófersson. 2018. The contingent valuation study of Heiðmörk, Iceland – Willingness to pay for its preservation. *Journal of Environmental Management* **209**, 126-138. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Bernd Frick, Pamela Wicker. 2018. The Monetary Value of Having a First Division Bundesliga Team to Local Residents. *Schmalenbach Business Review* **70**:1, 63-103. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Nicolas Borzykowski, Andrea Baranzini, David Maradan. 2018. Scope Effects in Contingent Valuation: Does the Assumed Statistical Distribution of WTP Matter?. *Ecological Economics* **144**, 319-329. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Rolf A. Groeneveld, Heleen Bartelings, Tobias Börger, Francesco Bosello, Erik Buisman, Elisa Delpiazzi, Fabio Eboli, Jose A. Fernandes, Katell G. Hamon, Caroline Hattam, Maria Loureiro, Paulo A.L.D. Nunes, Joanna Piwowarczyk, Femke E. Schasfoort, Sarah L. Simons, Adam N. Walker. 2018. Economic impacts of marine ecological change: Review and recent contributions of the VECTORS project on European marine waters. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **201**, 152-163. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Tobias Börger, Anne Böhnke-Henrichs, Caroline Hattam, Joanna Piwowarczyk, Femke Schasfoort, Melanie C. Austen. 2018. The role of interdisciplinary collaboration for stated preference methods to value marine environmental goods and ecosystem services. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **201**, 140-151. [[Crossref](#)]
274. Colin Price. Stated Willingness to Pay for Tree Health Protection: Perceptions and Realities 235-267. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Felix Schläpfer, Christian Fichter. *Entwicklung* 263-276. [[Crossref](#)]
276. William H. Desvousges, Nicholas Gard, Holly J. Michael, Anne D. Chance. 2018. Habitat and Resource Equivalency Analysis: A Critical Assessment. *Ecological Economics* **143**, 74-89. [[Crossref](#)]
277. James K. Hammitt, Daniel Herrera-Araujo. 2018. Peeling back the onion: Using latent class analysis to uncover heterogeneous responses to stated preference surveys. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **87**, 165-189. [[Crossref](#)]
278. O. Ashton Morgan, William L. Huth, Paul Hindsley. 2018. Examining the perceptions and effects of survey consequentiality across population subgroups. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* **9**:2, 305-322. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Matthew Wibbenmeyer, Sarah Anderson, Andrew Plantinga. 2018. Salience and the Government Provision of Public Goods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

280. Mahesh Poudyal, Julia P.G. Jones, O. Sarobidy Rakotonarivo, Neal Hockley, James M. Gibbons, Rina Mandimbiniaina, Alexandra Rasoamanana, Nilsen S. Andrianantenaina, Bruno S. Ramamonjisoa. 2018. Who bears the cost of forest conservation?. *PeerJ* **6**, e5106. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Kristin Floress, Adam Reimer, Aaron Thompson, Mark Burbach, Cody Knutson, Linda Prokopy, Marc Ribaud, Jessica Ulrich-Schad. 2018. Measuring farmer conservation behaviors: Challenges and best practices. *Land Use Policy* **70**, 414-418. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Edward L. Glaeser, Scott Duke Kominers, Michael Luca, Nikhil Naik. 2018. BIG DATA AND BIG CITIES: THE PROMISES AND LIMITATIONS OF IMPROVED MEASURES OF URBAN LIFE. *Economic Inquiry* **56**:1, 114-137. [[Crossref](#)]
283. B. C. Dealy, B. P. Horn, A. K. Bohara, R. P. Berrens, A. D. Bryan. 2017. The impact of behavioural risk-reduction interventions on willingness to pay to avoid sexually transmitted infections: a stated preference study of justice-involved youth. *Applied Economics* **49**:56, 5673-5685. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Nabin Baral, Sapna Kaul, Joel T. Heinen, Som B. Ale. 2017. Estimating the value of the World Heritage Site designation: a case study from Sagarmatha (Mount Everest) National Park, Nepal. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* **25**:12, 1776-1791. [[Crossref](#)]
285. H el ene Rey-Valette, Synthia Math e, Jean Michel Salles. 2017. An assessment method of ecosystem services based on stakeholders perceptions: The Rapid Ecosystem Services Participatory Appraisal (RESPA). *Ecosystem Services* **28**, 311-319. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Chiradip Chatterjee, Russell Triplett, Christopher K. Johnson, Parvez Ahmed. 2017. Willingness to pay for safe drinking water: A contingent valuation study in Jacksonville, FL. *Journal of Environmental Management* **203**, 413-421. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Sara M. Galbraith, Troy E. Hall, H ector S. Tav arez, Chad M. Kooistra, Jenny C. Ordo ez, Nilsa A. Bosque-P erez. 2017. Local ecological knowledge reveals effects of policy-driven land use and cover change on beekeepers in Costa Rica. *Land Use Policy* **69**, 112-122. [[Crossref](#)]
288. Niek Mouter, Sander van Cranenburgh, Bert van Wee. 2017. Do individuals have different preferences as consumer and citizen? The trade-off between travel time and safety. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **106**, 333-349. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Hale Ko , Hans van Kippersluis. 2017. Thought for Food: Nutritional Information and Educational Disparities in Diet. *Journal of Human Capital* **11**:4, 508-552. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Laura E Koehn, Timothy E Essington, Kristin N Marshall, William J Sydeman, Amber I Szoboszlai, Julie A Thayer. 2017. Trade-offs between forage fish fisheries and their predators in the California Current. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **74**:9, 2448-2458. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Jos e Luis Pinto-Prades, Jos e Antonio Robles-Zurita, Fernando-Ignacio S anchez-Mart inez, Jos e Mar a Abell an-Perpi an, Jorge Mart inez-P erez. 2017. Improving scope sensitivity in contingent valuation: Joint and separate evaluation of health states. *Health Economics* **26**:12. . [[Crossref](#)]
292. Sergi Alonso, Kh atia Munguambe, Elisa Sicuri. 2017. Market for Artemether-Lumefantrine to treat childhood malaria in a district of southern Mozambique. *Health Economics* **26**:12. . [[Crossref](#)]
293. Sandra H. Goff, Timothy M. Waring, Caroline L. Noblet. 2017. Does Pricing Nature Reduce Monetary Support for Conservation?: Evidence From Donation Behavior in an Online Experiment. *Ecological Economics* **141**, 119-126. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Mandy Ryan, Emmanouil Mentzakis, Suthi Jareinpituk, John Cairns. 2017. External Validity of Contingent Valuation: Comparing Hypothetical and Actual Payments. *Health Economics* **26**:11, 1467-1473. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Ryan M. Roberts, Kelly W. Jones, Andrew Seidl, Audrey Ek, Hannah Smith. 2017. Conservation finance and sustainable tourism: the acceptability of conservation fees to support the Tambopata National Reserve, Peru. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* **25**:10, 1353-1366. [[Crossref](#)]

296. Cameron Weber. On the “Value Paradox” in Art Economics 149-175. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Stefan Eriksson, Per Johansson, Sophie Langenskiöld. 2017. What is the right profile for getting a job? A stated choice experiment of the recruitment process. *Empirical Economics* 53:2, 803-826. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Ulrich B. Morawetz, Dieter B. A. Koemle. 2017. Contingent Valuation of Measures against Urban Heat: Limitations of a Frequently Used Method. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 143:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
299. Matthew J Kotchen, Zachary M Turk, Anthony A Leiserowitz. 2017. Public willingness to pay for a US carbon tax and preferences for spending the revenue. *Environmental Research Letters* 12:9, 094012. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Steven M. Sheffrin. 2017. Behavioral Law and Economics Is Not Just a Refinement of Law and Economics. *Oeconomia* :7-3, 331-352. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Susanne Rewitzer, Robert Huber, Adrienne Grêt-Regamey, Jan Barkmann. 2017. Economic valuation of cultural ecosystem service changes to a landscape in the Swiss Alps. *Ecosystem Services* 26, 197-208. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Tae-Goun Kim, James Opaluch, Daniel Seong-Hyeok Moon, Daniel R. Petrolia. 2017. Natural resource damage assessment for the Hebei Spirit oil spill: An application of Habitat Equivalency Analysis. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 121:1-2, 183-191. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Eric A. Posner, E. Glen Weyl. 2017. Quadratic voting and the public good: introduction. *Public Choice* 172:1-2, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Jonathan S. Masur. 2017. Quadratic voting as an input to cost-benefit analysis. *Public Choice* 172:1-2, 177-193. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Maria L. Alva, Carmen D. Samuel-Hodge, Deborah Porterfield, Tainayah Thomas, Jennifer Leeman. 2017. A Feasibility Study of Supply and Demand for Diabetes Prevention Programs in North Carolina. *Preventing Chronic Disease* 14. . [[Crossref](#)]
306. Robert J. Johnston, Kevin J. Boyle, Wiktor (Vic) Adamowicz, Jeff Bennett, Roy Brouwer, Trudy Ann Cameron, W. Michael Hanemann, Nick Hanley, Mandy Ryan, Riccardo Scarpa, Roger Tourangeau, Christian A. Vossler. 2017. Contemporary Guidance for Stated Preference Studies. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 4:2, 319-405. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Douglas S. Noonan, Ilde Rizzo. 2017. Economics of cultural tourism: issues and perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 41:2, 95-107. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Nik Sawe. 2017. Using neuroeconomics to understand environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* 135, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
309. J.L. McCune, Anja M. Carlsson, Sheila Colla, Christina Davy, Brett Favaro, Adam T. Ford, Kevin C. Fraser, Eduardo G. Martins. 2017. Assessing public commitment to endangered species protection: A Canadian case study. *FACETS* 2:1, 178-194. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Jost Wilker, Dietwald Gruehn. 2017. The Potential of Contingent Valuation for Planning Practice. The Example of Dortmund Westpark. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 75:2, 171-185. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Dominique Ami, Frédéric Aprahamian, Stéphane Luchini. 2017. Stated Preferences and Decision-Making: Three Applications to Health. *Revue économique* Vol. 68:3, 327-333. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Paul Bartha, C. Tyler DesRoches. 2017. The Relatively Infinite Value of the Environment. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 95:2, 328-353. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Mohammad A. Alolayan, John S. Evans, James K. Hammitt. 2017. Valuing Mortality Risk in Kuwait: Stated-Preference with a New Consistency Test. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 66:4, 629-646. [[Crossref](#)]

314. Trine Mørk, Tino Bech-Larsen, Klaus G. Grunert, George Tsalis. 2017. Determinants of citizen acceptance of environmental policy regulating consumption in public settings: Organic food in public institutions. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **148**, 407-414. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Felipe Vásquez Lavín, Ricardo Flores, Verónica Ibarregaray. 2017. A Bayesian quantile binary regression approach to estimate payments for environmental services. *Environment and Development Economics* **22:2**, 156-176. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Vardges Hovhannisyan, Hayk Khachatryan. 2017. Ornamental Plants in the United States: An Econometric Analysis of a Household-Level Demand System. *Agribusiness* **33:2**, 226-241. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Eldad Yechiam, Taher Abofol, Thorsten Pachur. 2017. The Seller's Sense: Buying–Selling Perspective Affects the Sensitivity to Expected Value Differences. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **30:2**, 197-208. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Christine C. Huttin. 2017. Clinical judgment research on economic topics: Role of congruence of tasks in clinical practice. *Technology and Health Care* **25:2**, 353-365. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Hayato Nakanishi. 2017. Quasi-experimental evidence for the importance of accounting for fear when evaluating catastrophic events. *Empirical Economics* **52:2**, 869-894. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Joy Jarvie, Scott Arthur, Lindsay Beever. 2017. Valuing Multiple Benefits, and the Public Perception of SUDS Ponds. *Water* **9:2**, 128. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Felix Schläpfer. 2017. STATED PREFERENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICES: A CLASSIFICATION AND SURVEY OF APPROACHES. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **31:1**, 258-280. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Olivier Gergaud, Victor Ginsburgh. Measuring the Economic Effects of Events Using Google Trends 337-353. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Paul Ormerod. Economics 19-44. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Colin Price. Stated Preference Questionnaires 179-221. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Volker Then, Christian Schober, Olivia Rauscher, Konstantin Kehl. How Can Impacts Be Monetised? 229-284. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Kathleen Segerson. Valuing Environmental Goods and Services: An Economic Perspective 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Richard C. Bishop, Kevin J. Boyle. Reliability and Validity in Nonmarket Valuation 463-497. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Kevin J. Boyle. Contingent Valuation in Practice 83-131. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Colin Camerer, Dean Mobbs. 2017. Differences in Behavior and Brain Activity during Hypothetical and Real Choices. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **21:1**, 46-56. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Mark A. Cohen. 2017. The Social Cost of a Racially Targeted Police Encounter. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* **8:3**, 369-384. [[Crossref](#)]
331. David Andrew Keiser, Joseph S. Shapiro. 2017. Consequences of the Clean Water Act and the Demand for Water Quality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
332. James C. Cooper. 2017. Anonymity, Autonomy, and the Collection of Personal Data: Measuring the Privacy Impact of Google's 2012 Privacy Policy Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
333. Michael Grimm, Luciane Lenz, Jürg Peters, Maximiliane Sievert. 2017. Demand for Off-Grid Solar Electricity Experimental Evidence from Rwanda. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
334. Christoph M. Rheinberger, Felix Schläpfer, Michael Lobsiger. 2017. A Novel Approach to Estimating the Demand Value of Road Safety. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

335. Miranda A. Galvin, Thomas Loughran, Sally S Simpson, Mark A. Cohen. 2017. Victim Compensation Policy and White Collar Crime: Public Preferences in a National Willingness to Pay Survey. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
336. Mark A. Cohen. 2017. The Social Cost of a Racially Targeted Police Encounter. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
337. Emilio Picasso, Mark A. Cohen. 2017. Valuing the Public's Demand for Crime Prevention Programs: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
338. Sheillah Simiyu, Mark Swilling, Richard Rheingans, Sandy Cairncross. 2017. Estimating the Cost and Payment for Sanitation in the Informal Settlements of Kisumu, Kenya: A Cross Sectional Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **14**:1, 49. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Andrés Mauricio Vargas, David Díaz. 2017. Going along with the crowd? The importance of group effects for environmental deliberative monetary valuation. *Cuadernos de Economía* **36**:70, 75-94. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Pankaj Lal, Bernabas Wolde, Janaki Alavalapati, Pralhad Burli, John Munsell. 2016. Forestland owners' willingness to plant pine on non-forested land for woody bioenergy in Virginia. *Forest Policy and Economics* **73**, 52-57. [[Crossref](#)]
341. O. Sarobidy Rakotonarivo, Marije Schaafsma, Neal Hockley. 2016. A systematic review of the reliability and validity of discrete choice experiments in valuing non-market environmental goods. *Journal of Environmental Management* **183**, 98-109. [[Crossref](#)]
342. José L. Oviedo, Alejandro Caparrós, Itziar Ruiz-Gauna, Pablo Campos. 2016. Testing convergent validity in choice experiments: Application to public recreation in Spanish stone pine and cork oak forests. *Journal of Forest Economics* **25**, 130-148. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Leon A.G. Oerlemans, Kai-Ying Chan, Jako Volschenk. 2016. Willingness to pay for green electricity: A review of the contingent valuation literature and its sources of error. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **66**, 875-885. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Shashi Kant, Ilan Vertinsky, Bin Zheng. 2016. Valuation of First Nations peoples' social, cultural, and land use activities using life satisfaction approach. *Forest Policy and Economics* **72**, 46-55. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Gustavo Perez-Verdin, Enrique Sanjurjo-Rivera, Leopoldo Galicia, Jose Ciro Hernandez-Diaz, Victor Hernandez-Trejo, Marco Antonio Marquez-Linares. 2016. Economic valuation of ecosystem services in Mexico: Current status and trends. *Ecosystem Services* **21**, 6-19. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Cloé Garnache, Scott M. Swinton, Joseph A. Herriges, Frank Lupi, R. Jan Stevenson. 2016. Solving the Phosphorus Pollution Puzzle: Synthesis and Directions for Future Research. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:5, 1334-1359. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Heiner Schumacher, Iris Kesternich, Michael Kosfeld, Joachim Winter. 2016. One, Two, Many—Insensitivity to Group Size in Games with Concentrated Benefits and Dispersed Costs. *The Review of Economic Studies* **26**, rdw043. [[Crossref](#)]
348. James Carroll, Claudia Aravena, Eleanor Denny. 2016. Low energy efficiency in rental properties: Asymmetric information or low willingness-to-pay?. *Energy Policy* **96**, 617-629. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Francis Taale, Christian Kyeremeh. 2016. Households# willingness to pay for reliable electricity services in Ghana. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **62**, 280-288. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Aksel Sundström. 2016. Corruption and Violations of Conservation Rules: A Survey Experiment with Resource Users. *World Development* **85**, 73-83. [[Crossref](#)]
351. Lucas W. Davis, Gilbert E. Metcalf. 2016. Does Better Information Lead to Better Choices? Evidence from Energy-Efficiency Labels. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **3**:3, 589-625. [[Crossref](#)]

352. Felipe Vásquez-Lavín, Veronica Ibarnegaray, Roberto Ponce Oliva, José Hernández Hernández. 2016. Payment for Ecosystem Services in the Bolivian Sub-Andean Humid Forest. *The Journal of Environment & Development* **25**:3, 306-331. [[Crossref](#)]
353. John C. Whitehead. 2016. Plausible responsiveness to scope in contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* **128**, 17-22. [[Crossref](#)]
354. Gregory L. Poe. 2016. Behavioral Anomalies in Contingent Values and Actual Choices. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* **45**:2, 246-269. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Lisa A. Robinson, James K. Hammitt. 2016. Valuing Reductions in Fatal Illness Risks: Implications of Recent Research. *Health Economics* **25**:8, 1039-1052. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Sheila Ellwood, Margaret Greenwood. 2016. Accounting for heritage assets: Does measuring economic value 'kill the cat'?. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* **38**, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
357. David Cook, Brynhildur Davíðsdóttir, Daði Már Kristófersson. 2016. Energy projects in Iceland – Advancing the case for the use of economic valuation techniques to evaluate environmental impacts. *Energy Policy* **94**, 104-113. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Philippe C. Baveye, Jacques Baveye, John Gowdy. 2016. Soil “Ecosystem” Services and Natural Capital: Critical Appraisal of Research on Uncertain Ground. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
359. Hua Zhong, Ping Qing, Wuyang Hu. 2016. Farmers' willingness to participate in best management practices in Kentucky. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **59**:6, 1015-1039. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Lawrence W. Barnthouse, Matthew Bingham, Jason Kinnell. 2016. Quantifying nonuse and indirect economic benefits of impingement & entrainment reductions at U.S. power plants. *Environmental Science & Policy* **60**, 53-62. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Juan C. Trujillo, Bladimir Carrillo, Carlos A. Charris, Raul A. Velilla. 2016. Coral reefs under threat in a Caribbean marine protected area: Assessing divers' willingness to pay toward conservation. *Marine Policy* **68**, 146-154. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Christian Dustmann, Francesco Fasani. 2016. The Effect of Local Area Crime on Mental Health. *The Economic Journal* **126**:593, 978-1017. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Katja Schmidt, René Sachse, Ariane Walz. 2016. Current role of social benefits in ecosystem service assessments. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **149**, 49-64. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Jörg Peters, Annkathrin Schoofs, Maximiliane Sievert. 2016. Preferences over Bank and Family Loans in Rural Rwanda. *Journal of International Development* **28**:4, 623-630. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Stephanie F. Stefanski, Jay P. Shimshack. 2016. Valuing Marine Biodiversity in the Gulf of Mexico: Evidence from the Proposed Boundary Expansion of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. *Marine Resource Economics* **31**:2, 211-232. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Michael F. Pesko, Donald S. Kenkel, Hua Wang, Jenna M. Hughes. 2016. The effect of potential electronic nicotine delivery system regulations on nicotine product selection. *Addiction* **111**:4, 734-744. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Alvaro Durand-Morat, Eric J. Wailes, Rodolfo M. Nayga. 2016. Challenges of Conducting Contingent Valuation Studies in Developing Countries. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:2, 597-609. [[Crossref](#)]
368. William Desvousges, Kristy Mathews, Kenneth Train. 2016. From Curious to Pragmatically Curious: Comment on “From Hopeless to Curious? Thoughts on Hausman's ‘Dubious to Hopeless’ Critique of Contingent Valuation”. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **38**:1, 174-182. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Felix Schläpfer. 2016. Democratic valuation (DV): Using majority voting principles to value public services. *Ecological Economics* **122**, 36-42. [[Crossref](#)]

370. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Leandro García-Menéndez. 2016. Port expansion and negative externalities: a willingness to accept approach. *Maritime Policy & Management* **43**:1, 59-83. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Hayato Nakanishi. How the Change of Risk Announcement on Catastrophic Disaster Affects Property Prices? 577-595. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Ínigo Ortiz de Urbina Gimeno. Economics as a Tool in Legislative Evaluation: Cost-Analysis, Cost-Efficacy and Cost-Benefit 49-74. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Karine Lamiraud, Robert Oxoby, Cam Donaldson. 2016. Incremental willingness to pay: a theoretical and empirical exposition. *Theory and Decision* **80**:1, 101-123. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Henrik Andersson, Arne Risa Hole, Mikael Svensson. 2016. Valuation of small and multiple health risks: A critical analysis of SP data applied to food and water safety. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **75**, 41-53. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Patrick Jochem, Claus Doll, Wolf Fichtner. 2016. External costs of electric vehicles. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **42**, 60-76. [[Crossref](#)]
376. Ricky N. Lawton, Daniel Fujiwara. 2016. Living with aircraft noise: Airport proximity, aviation noise and subjective wellbeing in England. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **42**, 104-118. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Michael A. Clemens, Lant Pritchett. 2016. The New Economic Case for Migration Restrictions: An Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **37**. . [[Crossref](#)]
378. Hale Koo, Hans van Kippersluis. 2016. Thought for Food: Understanding Educational Disparities in Diet. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **112**. . [[Crossref](#)]
379. Mark A. Cohen. 2016. The 'Cost of Crime' and Benefit-Cost Analysis of Criminal Justice Policy: Understanding and Improving Upon the State-of-The-Art. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
380. Michael A. Clemens, Lant Pritchett. 2016. The New Case for Migration Restrictions: An Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **37**. . [[Crossref](#)]
381. Michael Grimm, Luciane Lenz, Jörg Ankel-Peters, Maximiliane Sievert. 2016. Demand for Off-Grid Solar Electricity: Experimental Evidence from Rwanda. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **118**. . [[Crossref](#)]
382. John C. Whitehead, Melissa S. Weddell, Peter A. Grootuis. 2016. MITIGATING HYPOTHETICAL BIAS IN STATED PREFERENCE DATA: EVIDENCE FROM SPORTS TOURISM. *Economic Inquiry* **54**:1, 605-611. [[Crossref](#)]
383. Laura Martínez-Carrasco, Margarita Brugarolas, Africa Martínez-Poveda, Juan J. Ruiz-Martínez. 2015. Comparing hypothetical versus non-hypothetical methods for measuring willingness to pay in a food context. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research* **13**:4, e0109. [[Crossref](#)]
384. James R. Meldrum. 2015. Comparing different attitude statements in latent class models of stated preferences for managing an invasive forest pathogen. *Ecological Economics* **120**, 13-22. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Maryam Tabatabaei, John B. Loomis, Daniel W. McCollum. 2015. Nonmarket Benefits of Reducing Environmental Effects of Potential Wildfires in Beetle-Killed Trees: A Contingent Valuation Study. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* **34**:8, 720-737. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Daniel K. Lew. 2015. Willingness to pay for threatened and endangered marine species: a review of the literature and prospects for policy use. *Frontiers in Marine Science* **2**. . [[Crossref](#)]
387. Nils Soguel, Julie Silberstein. 2015. Welfare Loss with Municipal Amalgamations and the Willingness-to-Pay for the Municipality Name. *Local Government Studies* **41**:6, 977-996. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Dale T. Manning, Peter Means, Daniel Zimmerle, Kathleen Galvin, John Loomis, Keith Paustian. 2015. Using contingent behavior analysis to measure benefits from rural electrification in developing countries: an example from Rwanda. *Energy Policy* **86**, 393-401. [[Crossref](#)]

389. Nik Sawe, Brian Knutson. 2015. Neural valuation of environmental resources. *NeuroImage* **122**, 87-95. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Patricio Domínguez, Steven Raphael. 2015. The Role of the Cost-of-Crime Literature in Bridging the Gap Between Social Science Research and Policy Making. *Criminology & Public Policy* **14**:4, 589-632. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Linda Ryen, Mikael Svensson. 2015. The Willingness to Pay for a Quality Adjusted Life Year: A Review of the Empirical Literature. *Health Economics* **24**:10, 1289-1301. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Sébastien Desbureaux, Laura Brimont. 2015. Between economic loss and social identity: The multi-dimensional cost of avoiding deforestation in Eastern Madagascar. *Ecological Economics* **118**, 10-20. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Frank Goetzke, Tilmann Rave. 2015. Regional Air Quality and Happiness in Germany. *International Regional Science Review* **38**:4, 437-451. [[Crossref](#)]
394. Jan Anne Annema, Carl Koopmans. 2015. The practice of valuing the environment in cost-benefit analyses in transport and spatial projects. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **58**:9, 1635-1648. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Stijn Neuteleers, Bart Engelen. 2015. Talking money: How market-based valuation can undermine environmental protection. *Ecological Economics* **117**, 253-260. [[Crossref](#)]
396. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Leandro García-Menéndez, Olaf Merk. 2015. Port–City Relationship and the Environment: Literature Survey and Methodological Approach for Project Appraisal in Presence of Environmental Externalities. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* **141**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
397. Julia Martín-Ortega, M. Azahara Mesa-Jurado, Julio Berbel. 2015. Revisiting the Impact of Order Effects on Sensitivity to Scope: A Contingent Valuation of a Common-Pool Resource. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **66**:3, 705-726. [[Crossref](#)]
398. Britta Uhde, W. Andreas Hahn, Verena C. Griess, Thomas Knoke. 2015. Hybrid MCDA Methods to Integrate Multiple Ecosystem Services in Forest Management Planning: A Critical Review. *Environmental Management* **56**:2, 373-388. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Andrea Tabi, Salvador del Saz-Salazar. 2015. Environmental damage evaluation in a willingness-to-accept scenario: A latent-class approach based on familiarity. *Ecological Economics* **116**, 280-288. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Mirka Laurila-Pant, Annukka Lehtikoinen, Laura Uusitalo, Riikka Venesjärvi. 2015. How to value biodiversity in environmental management?. *Ecological Indicators* **55**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Donald Vandegrift, Kristen Duke. 2015. Competitive behavior, impact on others, and the number of competitors. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **57**, 37-44. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Mel W. Khaw, Denise A. Grab, Michael A. Livermore, Christian A. Vossler, Paul W. Glimcher. 2015. The Measurement of Subjective Value and Its Relation to Contingent Valuation and Environmental Public Goods. *PLOS ONE* **10**:7, e0132842. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Francisco J. Bahamonde-Birke, Uwe Kunert, Heike Link. 2015. The Value of a Statistical Life in a Road Safety Context — A Review of the Current Literature. *Transport Reviews* **35**:4, 488-511. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Kevin Atkinson, John C. Whitehead. 2015. Predictive validity of stated preference data: evidence from mountain bike park visits before and after trail system expansion. *Applied Economics Letters* **22**:9, 730-733. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Semra Ozdemir. 2015. Improving the Validity of Stated-Preference Data in Health Research: The Potential of the Time-to-Think Approach. *The Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes Research* **8**:3, 247-255. [[Crossref](#)]

406. Sunida Piriapada, Erda Wang. 2015. Modeling Willingness to Pay for Coastal Tourism Resource Protection in Ko Chang Marine National Park, Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 20:5, 515-540. [[Crossref](#)]
407. David L. Dickinson, John C. Whitehead. 2015. DUBIOUS AND DUBIOUSER: CONTINGENT VALUATION AND THE TIME OF DAY. *Economic Inquiry* 53:2, 1396-1400. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Alex L. Marten, Elizabeth A. Kopits, Charles W. Griffiths, Stephen C. Newbold, Ann Wolverton. 2015. Incremental CH₄ and N₂O mitigation benefits consistent with the US Government's SC-CO₂ estimates. *Climate Policy* 15:2, 272-298. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Barbara Clucas, Sergey Rabotyagov, John M. Marzluff. 2015. How much is that birdie in my backyard? A cross-continental economic valuation of native urban songbirds. *Urban Ecosystems* 18:1, 251-266. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Octavian Carare, Chris McGovern, Raquel Noriega, Jay Schwarz. 2015. The willingness to pay for broadband of non-adopters in the U.S.: Estimates from a multi-state survey. *Information Economics and Policy* 30, 19-35. [[Crossref](#)]
411. R. Martínez-Espiñeira, T. Chopin, S. Robinson, A. Noce, D. Knowler, W. Yip. 2015. Estimating the biomitigation benefits of Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture: A contingent behavior analysis. *Aquaculture* 437, 182-194. [[Crossref](#)]
412. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Francisco González-Gómez, Jorge Guardiola. 2015. Willingness to pay to improve urban water supply: the case of Sucre, Bolivia. *Water Policy* 17:1, 112-125. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Steven E. Naranjo, Peter C. Ellsworth, George B. Frisvold. 2015. Economic Value of Biological Control in Integrated Pest Management of Managed Plant Systems. *Annual Review of Entomology* 60:1, 621-645. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Richard W. Dunford, William W. Locke. 2015. A Framework for Assessing Groundwater Damages from Contamination. *Environmental Claims Journal* 27:1, 19-39. [[Crossref](#)]
415. Vincent K. Smith. Environmental Economics 726-732. [[Crossref](#)]
416. Koen Decancq, Marc Fleurbaey, Erik Schokkaert. Inequality, Income, and Well-Being 67-140. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Lawrence Jin, Don Kenkel, Feng Liu, Hua Wang. 2015. Retrospective and Prospective Benefit-Cost Analyses of U.S. Anti-Smoking Policies. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 6:1, 154-186. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Hale Koo, Hans van Kippersluis. 2015. Thought for Food: Understanding Educational Disparities in Food Consumption. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 94. . [[Crossref](#)]
419. Nicolas Borzykowski, Andrea Baranzini, maradan david. 2015. On Scope Effects in Contingent Valuation: Does the Statistical Distributional Assumption Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
420. Karine Lamiraud, Robert J. Oxoby, Cam Donaldson. 2015. Incremental Willingness to Pay: A Theoretical and Empirical Exposition. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
421. Edward L. Glaeser, Scott Duke Kominers, Michael Luca, Nikhil Naik. 2015. Big Data and Big Cities: The Promises and Limitations of Improved Measures of Urban Life. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
422. Edward L. Glaeser, Scott Duke Kominers, Michael Luca, Nikhil Naik. 2015. Big Data and Big Cities: The Promises and Limitations of Improved Measures for Urban Life. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
423. Abbie A. Rogers, Marit E. Kragt, Fiona L. Gibson, Michael P. Burton, Elizabeth H. Petersen, David J. Pannell. 2015. Non-market valuation: usage and impacts in environmental policy and management in A ustralia. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 59:1, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]

424. Pernilla Ivehammar. 2014. Valuing environmental quality in actual travel time savings – The Haningeleden road project in Stockholm. *Research in Transportation Economics* 48, 349-356. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Fran Sussman, Christopher P. Weaver, Anne Grambsch. 2014. Challenges in applying the paradigm of welfare economics to climate change. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 5:03, 347-376. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Melville Saayman, Andrea Saayman. 2014. Who is Willing to Pay to See the Big 7?. *Tourism Economics* 20:6, 1181-1198. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Stephanie Kiefer. 2014. Are riding club members willing to pay or work for overall quality improvement?. *Managing Leisure* 34, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Trudy Ann Cameron. 2014. Valuing Morbidity in Environmental Benefit-Cost Analysis. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 6:1, 249-272. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Henrik Andersson, Mikael Svensson. 2014. Scale sensitivity and question order in the contingent valuation method. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 57:11, 1746-1761. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Agnieszka Zaleska-Jonsson. 2014. Stated WTP and rational WTP: Willingness to pay for green apartments in Sweden. *Sustainable Cities and Society* 13, 46-56. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Yue Che, Wen Li, Zhaoyi Shang, Chen Liu, Kai Yang. 2014. Residential Preferences for River Network Improvement: An Exploration of Choice Experiments in Zhujiyajiao, Shanghai, China. *Environmental Management* 54:3, 517-530. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Moisés Carrasco, Felipe Vásquez-Lavín, Sebasthian Valenzuela, Felipe Pérez. 2014. Estimación conjunta de la disposición a pagar y de la tasa de descuento intertemporal para la protección de la biodiversidad en la reserva marina de Choros-Damas. *Cuadernos de Economía* 33:63, 589-611. [[Crossref](#)]
433. Andriy Danyliv, Wim Groot, Irena Gryga, Milena Pavlova. 2014. Willingness and ability to pay for physician services in six Central and Eastern European countries. *Health Policy* 117:1, 72-82. [[Crossref](#)]
434. Shelby Gerking, Mark Dickie, Marcella Veronesi. 2014. Valuation of human health: An integrated model of willingness to pay for mortality and morbidity risk reductions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 68:1, 20-45. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Sunida Piriypada, Erda Wang. 2014. Quantifying the Costs and Benefits of Coastal Water Quality Improvements in the Ko Chang Marine National Park, Thailand. *Environmental Processes* 1:2, 149-169. [[Crossref](#)]
436. Lijia Shi, Zhifeng Gao, Xuqi Chen. 2014. The cross-price effect on willingness-to-pay estimates in open-ended contingent valuation. *Food Policy* 46, 13-21. [[Crossref](#)]
437. Paul Ormerod. 2014. Evolutionary Approaches to Privatisation. *Economic Affairs* 34:2, 156-168. [[Crossref](#)]
438. Tobias Börger, Nicola J. Beaumont, Linwood Pendleton, Kevin J. Boyle, Philip Cooper, Stephen Fletcher, Tim Haab, Michael Hanemann, Tara L. Hooper, S. Salman Hussain, Rosimeiry Portela, Mavra Stithou, Joanna Stockill, Tim Taylor, Melanie C. Austen. 2014. Incorporating ecosystem services in marine planning: The role of valuation. *Marine Policy* 46, 161-170. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Colin Jerolmack, Shamus Khan. 2014. Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Accounts and Action. *Sociological Methods & Research* 43:2, 236-247. [[Crossref](#)]
440. D. A. Robinson, I. Fraser, E. J. Dominati, B. Davíðsdóttir, J. O. G. Jónsson, L. Jones, S. B. Jones, M. Tuller, I. Lebron, K. L. Bristow, D. M. Souza, S. Banwart, B. E. Clothier. 2014. On the Value of Soil Resources in the Context of Natural Capital and Ecosystem Service Delivery. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 78:3, 685-700. [[Crossref](#)]
441. Jay E. Diffendorfer, John B. Loomis, Leslie Ries, Karen Oberhauser, Laura Lopez-Hoffman, Darius Semmens, Brice Semmens, Bruce Butterfield, Ken Bagstad, Josh Goldstein, Ruscena Wiederholt,

- Brady Mattsson, Wayne E. Thogmartin. 2014. National Valuation of Monarch Butterflies Indicates an Untapped Potential for Incentive-Based Conservation. *Conservation Letters* 7:3, 253-262. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Rex H. Caffey, Hua Wang, Daniel R. Petrolia. 2014. Trajectory economics: Assessing the flow of ecosystem services from coastal restoration. *Ecological Economics* 100, 74-84. [[Crossref](#)]
443. Neal Hockley. 2014. Cost-Benefit Analysis: A Decision-Support Tool or a Venue for Contesting Ecosystem Knowledge?. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 32:2, 283-300. [[Crossref](#)]
444. D. Blandford, J.B. Braden, J.S. Shortle. Economics of Natural Resources and Environment in Agriculture 18-34. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Maike Puhe. 2014. Integrated Urban E-ticketing Schemes – Conflicting Objectives of Corresponding Stakeholders. *Transportation Research Procedia* 4, 494-504. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Glenn C. Blomquist, Paul A. Coomes, Christopher Jepsen, Brandon C. Koford, Kenneth R. Troske. 2014. Estimating the social value of higher education: willingness to pay for community and technical colleges. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 5:1, 3-41. [[Crossref](#)]
447. Octavian Carare, Chris McGovern, Raquel Noriega, Jay A. Schwarz. 2014. The Willingness to Pay for Broadband of Non-Adopters in the U.S.: Estimates from a Multi-State Survey. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
448. Olivier Gergaud, Victor A. Ginsburgh. 2014. On the Economic Effects of Music and Opera Festivals. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
449. Michael A. Livermore, Richard L. Revesz. 2014. Environmental Law and Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
450. Inmaculada Guaita-Pradas, Baldomero Segura García del Río. 2014. Drivers' Roads as Environmental Assets: Use Value for Recreational Purposes of the Cañada Real del Reino de Valencia. *Journal of Environmental Protection* 05:16, 1495-1508. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Stéphane Luchini, Verity Watson. 2013. Uncertainty and framing in a valuation task. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 39, 204-214. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Timothy C. Haab, Matthew G. Interis, Daniel R. Petrolia, John C. Whitehead. 2013. From Hopeless to Curious? Thoughts on Hausman's "Dubious to Hopeless" Critique of Contingent Valuation. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 35:4, 593-612. [[Crossref](#)]
453. Philippe C. Baveye, Jacques Baveye, John Gowdy. 2013. Monetary valuation of ecosystem services: It matters to get the timeline right. *Ecological Economics* 95, 231-235. [[Crossref](#)]
454. Chris J. Kennedy, So-Min Cheong. 2013. Lost ecosystem services as a measure of oil spill damages: A conceptual analysis of the importance of baselines. *Journal of Environmental Management* 128, 43-51. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Luo Jing, Sonna Pelz, Jiang Tong. 2013. How do Beijing Residents Value Environmental Improvements in Remote Parts of China. *Advances in Climate Change Research* 4:3, 190-200. [[Crossref](#)]
456. Anwar Naseem, Saneliso Mhlanga, Aliou Diagne, Patrice Ygué Adegbola, Gnonna Soul-kifouly Midingoyi. 2013. Economic analysis of consumer choices based on rice attributes in the food markets of West Africa—the case of Benin. *Food Security* 5:4, 575-589. [[Crossref](#)]
457. Young Sook Eom, Jong Ho Hong. 2013. Measuring the economic benefits of an environmental monitoring satellite project: The value of information approach. *Space Policy* 29:3, 203-209. [[Crossref](#)]
458. Pei-Jung Lin, Thomas W Concannon, Dan Greenberg, Joshua T Cohen, Gregory Rossi, Jeffrey Hille, Hannah R Auerbach, Chi-Hui Fang, Eric S Nadler, Peter J Neumann. 2013. Does framing of cancer survival affect perceived value of care? A willingness-to-pay survey of US residents. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research* 13:4, 513-522. [[Crossref](#)]

459. Gregory Colson, Matthew C Rousu. 2013. What do consumer surveys and experiments reveal and conceal about consumer preferences for genetically modified foods?. *GM Crops & Food* 4:3, 158-165. [[Crossref](#)]
460. James K. Hammitt. 2013. Positive versus Normative Justifications for Benefit-Cost Analysis: Implications for Interpretation and Policy. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 7:2, 199-218. [[Crossref](#)]
461. Shelby Gerking, Mark Dickie. 2013. Valuing Reductions in Environmental Risks to Children's Health. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 5:1, 245-260. [[Crossref](#)]
462. Robert H. Nelson. 2013. Bringing Religion into Economic Policy Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]