

## **Contingent Valuation: Is Some Number Better than No Number?**

Peter A. Diamond and Jerry A. Hausman

**M**ost economic analyses aim at explaining market transactions. Data on transactions, or potentially collectible data on transactions, are the touchstone for recognizing interesting economic analyses. However loose the connection between a theoretical or empirical analysis and transactions, this connection is the basis of the methodology of judging the credibility and reliability of economic analyses. Generally, individuals do not purchase public goods directly. Lack of data on transactions implies that economists must find other methods to assess surveys asking for valuations of public goods.

To address this problem, we begin with a discussion of the methodology of evaluating contingent valuation surveys. While there is some experimental evidence about small payments for public goods, we work with the assumption that we do not have data on actual transactions for interesting environmental public goods to compare with survey responses of hypothetical willingness-to-pay. This situation creates the need for other standards for evaluating survey responses. Evaluation involves the credibility, bias (also referred to as reliability in the literature), and precision of responses. Credibility refers to whether survey respondents are answering the question the interviewer is trying to ask. If respondents are answering the right question, reliability refers to the size and direction of the biases that may be present in the answers. Precision refers to the variability in responses. Since precision can usually be increased by the simple expedient of increasing the sample size, we will not discuss precision further in this paper. Problems of credibility or of bias are not reduced by increases in sample size. Thus credibility and bias must be evaluated when

■ *Peter A. Diamond and Jerry A. Hausman are Professors of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

considering the use of such surveys—in benefit-cost analyses, in the determination of damages after a finding of liability, or as general information to affect the legislative process.<sup>1</sup>

We discuss how to judge the content in contingent valuation surveys together with evidence from surveys that have been done. Surveys designed to test for consistency between stated willingness-to-pay and economic theory have found that contingent valuation responses are not consistent with economic theory. The main contingent valuation anomaly that we discuss is called the “embedding effect,” and was first analyzed systematically by Kahneman and Knetsch (1992).<sup>2</sup> The embedding effect is the name given to the tendency of willingness-to-pay responses to be highly similar across different surveys, even where theory suggests (and sometimes requires) that the responses be very different.<sup>3</sup> An example of embedding would be a willingness-to-pay to clean up one lake roughly equal to that for cleaning up five lakes, including the one asked about individually. The embedding effect is usually thought to arise from the nonexistence of individual preferences for the public good in question and from the failure of survey respondents, in the hypothetical circumstances of the survey, to consider the effect of their budget constraints. Because of these embedding effects, different surveys can obtain widely variable stated willingness-to-pay amounts for the same public good, with no straightforward way for selecting one particular method as the appropriate one.

In short, we think that the evidence supports the conclusion that to date, contingent valuation surveys do not measure the preferences they attempt to measure. Moreover, we present reasons for thinking that changes in survey methods are not likely to change this conclusion. Viewed alternatively as opinion polls on possible government actions, we think that these surveys do not have much information to contribute to informed policy-making. Thus, we conclude that reliance on contingent valuation surveys in either damage assessments or in government decision making is basically misguided.

<sup>1</sup>With two estimates of an economic value, one can analyze directly whether one is a biased estimate of the other. With nonuse value, the lack of an alternative direct estimate of willingness-to-pay makes it relevant to consider credibility directly, as well as the differences between survey results and behavior in other contexts where transactions data are available.

<sup>2</sup>Another failure of contingent valuation surveys to be consistent with economic preferences is that stated willingness-to-pay is usually found to be much less than stated willingness-to-accept. From economic theory, willingness-to-pay differs from willingness-to-accept only by an income effect. Thus, their values should be extremely close in typical contingent valuation circumstances, where the stated willingness-to-pay is a small share of the consumer's overall budget, and willingness-to-pay amounts show a small income elasticity. For further discussion of this problem with contingent valuation surveys and other problems, see Diamond and Hausman (1993) and Milgrom (1993).

<sup>3</sup>The term embedding came from the research approach of “embedding” a particular good in a more inclusive good, and contrasting the stated willingness-to-pay for the good with that obtained by allocating the willingness-to-pay for the more inclusive good among its components (Kahneman, personal communication).

## **Judging Surveys of Willingness-to-Pay for Public Goods**

A number of bases exist for forming judgments about whether particular respondents are answering the right question and whether the response is roughly correct. One widely accepted basis is by reaching the conclusion that a particular response is simply not credible as an answer to the question the interviewer is trying to ask. It is standard practice in the contingent valuation literature to eliminate some responses as being unreasonably large to be the true willingness-to-pay. Thus trimming responses that are more than, say, 5 percent of income for an environmental public good that contains only nonuse value may be criticized for having an arbitrary cutoff, but not for omitting answers that are believed to be credible. Similarly, it is standard practice to eliminate some responses of zero on the basis that these are "protest zeros," that answers to other questions in the survey indicate that individuals do put a positive value on changes in the level of the public good, and thus zero is not a credible answer.

A widely accepted incredibility test indicates that it is not automatic that the response given is an answer to the question that the interviewer wants answered. But we need to go further in considering how to form a judgment on the survey responses; it is not adequate to assume that any response that is not obviously wrong is an accurate response to the question the survey designer had in mind.

A number of additional bases have been used by people arguing that responses are or are not acceptable. The methods we shall discuss include verbal protocol analysis, the patterns of willingness-to-pay responses across individuals, and across surveys.

In considering the relevance of this evidence for the question of whether survey responses are accurate measures of true preferences, it is useful to have in mind some possible alternative hypotheses of how people respond to such surveys, since the responses are not simply random numbers. Several hypotheses have been put forward as alternatives to the hypothesis that the responses are measures of true economic preferences. Individuals may be expressing an attitude toward a public good (or class of public goods), expressed in a dollar scale because they are asked to express it in a dollar scale (Kahneman and Ritov, 1993). Individuals may receive a "warm glow" from expressing support for good causes (Andreoni, 1989).<sup>4</sup> Individuals may be describing what they think is good for the country, in a sort of casual benefit-cost analysis (Diamond and Hausman, 1993). Individuals may be expressing a reaction to actions that have been taken (for example, allowing an oil spill) rather than evaluating the state of a resource.

<sup>4</sup>This approach was developed for actual charitable contributions, not survey responses. Kahneman and Knetsch (1992) call it the purchase of moral satisfaction.

Under all of these alternative hypotheses, responses are not an attempt by an individual to evaluate his or her own preference for a public good. For example, people doing casual benefit-cost analyses may be reflecting how much they think people generally care about the issue. We think that different hypotheses are likely to be appropriate for different people. Thus the question is not whether the hypothesis of an accurate measurement of preferences is the single best hypothesis, but whether the fraction of the population for whom the hypothesis of accuracy is reasonable is sufficiently large to make the survey as a whole useful for policy purposes.

All of these alternatives are based on what individuals are trying to do; there are further questions of standard survey biases (such as interviewer bias, framing bias, hypothetical bias) and whether people have enough information to express a preference with any accuracy, even if they are attempting to express a preference. Insofar as this understanding is faulty, expressed preferences are not an expression of true economic preferences.

### **Verbal Protocol Analysis**

For verbal protocol analysis, individuals are asked to “think aloud” as they respond to a questionnaire, reporting everything that goes through their minds. Everything the subjects say is recorded on audio tapes that are transcribed and coded for the types of considerations being mentioned. Schkade and Payne (1993) have done such an analysis using a contingent valuation survey that asks for willingness-to-pay to protect migratory waterfowl from drowning in uncovered waste water holding ponds from oil and gas operations.

The transcripts show the inherent difficulty in selecting a willingness-to-pay response and the extent to which people refer to elements that ought to be irrelevant to evaluating their own preferences. If people are trying to report a preference, we would expect them to consider inputs into the forming of their preferences, such as how much they care about birds, how important the number of killed birds are relative to the numbers in the species. Conversely, we would not expect them to report a willingness-to-pay just equal to what they think the program will cost. Respondents verbalized many diverse considerations. Perhaps the most common strategy involved first acknowledging that something should be done and then trying to figure out an appropriate amount. About one-fourth of the sample mentioned the idea that if everyone did his part then each household would not have to give all that much. About one-sixth of the sample made comparisons with donations to charities. About one-fifth of the sample said they just made up a number or guessed an answer. Many respondents seemed to wish to signal concern for a larger environmental issue. This pattern may reflect the unfamiliarity of the task the respondents faced.

These findings strongly suggest that people are not easily in touch with underlying preferences about the type of commodity asked about. The findings do not lend support to the hypothesis that responses are an attempt to measure and express personal preferences. To the extent that individuals consider costs

to everyone, the analysis supports the hypothesis of casual benefit-cost analysis. To the extent that individuals look to their own charitable contributions for a guide, the analysis is consistent with hypotheses that explain actual contributions, such as the warm glow hypothesis.

### **Variation in Willingness-To-Pay Across Individuals**

If stated willingness-to-pay is a reflection of true preferences, then we would expect certain patterns of answers across different individuals (other things equal). We would expect self-described environmentalists to have larger willingnesses-to-pay. We would expect individuals with higher incomes to have larger willingnesses-to-pay. Both results do occur. However, such results do not distinguish among the various hypotheses that were spelled out above since we would expect roughly similar results from any of them. Thus this potential basis for evaluation does not have much bite.<sup>5</sup> We do observe that the income effects that are measured in typical surveys are lower than we would expect if true preferences are measured, lower for example than measured income elasticities for charitable giving.<sup>6</sup>

### **Variation in Willingness-To-Pay Across Surveys**

Another approach to forming a judgment is to compare willingness-to-pay responses to different questions, whether in the same or in different surveys.

*Multiple Questions.* If a survey question reveals a true valuation, it should not matter whether the question is asked by itself or with other questions, nor if asked with any other questions, what the order of questioning is. However, when Tolley et al. (1983) asked for willingness-to-pay to preserve visibility at the Grand Canyon, the response was five times higher when this was the only question, as compared to its being the third such question. Attempts to claim this result to be consistent with preferences have relied on income effects and substitution effects. Neither of these rationalizations for the anomalous results is compelling, as we explain in a moment.

The importance of question order was also shown in a study by Samples and Hollyer (1990) asking for the values of preserving seals and whales. Some respondents were asked for willingness-to-pay to preserve seals first, followed by a question about whales. Others were asked for willingness-to-pay in the reverse order. Seal value tended to be lower when asked after whale value, while whale value was not affected by the sequence of questions.<sup>7</sup> Thus the sum

<sup>5</sup>The importance of the lack of bite of such considerations comes, in part, from the fact that the contingent valuation study of the Exxon Valdez spill that was done for the state of Alaska (Carson et al., 1992) included such analyses, but none of the more powerful split-sample consistency tests that we discuss below.

<sup>6</sup>The empirical finding of low income elasticities is also inconsistent with the typical finding of a large divergence between willingness-to-pay and willingness-to-accept, discussed in footnote 2.

<sup>7</sup>Samples and Hollyer used dichotomous choice surveys. They estimated that whales were valued at \$125 when asked about first, and \$142 when second. Seals were valued at \$103 when asked about first and \$62 when second. When they asked about both (together) in a single question, the estimated values were \$131 and \$146 in two surveys.

of willingness-to-pay depended on the sequence of the questions asked. The authors offer an explanation (p. 189) "based on debriefing sessions held with the interviewer."

Apparently, when respondents valued seals first, they used their behavior in this market situation to guide their responses to whale valuation questions. Since whales are generally more popular than seals, respondents were reluctant to behave more benevolently toward seals compared with humpback whales. Consequently, whale values were inflated in the S-W questionnaire version to maintain a relatively higher value for the humpbacks. This behavioral anchoring effect did not exist in the W-S version, where whales were valued first.

To have the value of preserving both seals and whales depend on the sequence in which the questions are asked is not consistent with the hypothesis that stated willingness-to-pay accurately measures preferences. These results can be interpreted in two ways. One interpretation is that contingent valuation studies that ask two questions rather than one are unreliable. The other interpretation is that the warm glow hypothesis is supported, since having expressed support for the environment in the first question permits a sharp fall in the second response. This effect is not present, however, when such a response would seem illogical to the respondent. More generally, one needs to decide whether a given pattern of responses is a result of survey design issues or a result of the underlying bases of response. This distinction is especially important when the pattern of results appears anomalous with or contradictory to the hypothesis that preferences are accurately measured.

*Single Questions and the Embedding Effect.* Alternatively, one can ask a single willingness-to-pay question each to different samples. For example, assume that one group is asked to evaluate public good  $X$ ; a second is asked to evaluate  $Y$ ; and a third is asked to evaluate  $X$  and  $Y$ . What interpretations could we make if the willingness-to-pay for  $X$  and  $Y$  (together) is considerably less than the sum of the willingness-to-pay for  $X$  and the willingness-to-pay for  $Y$ ?<sup>8</sup> One interpretation is that we are seeing an income effect at work. That is, having "spent" for  $X$ , one has less income left to purchase  $Y$ . Given that the stated willingness-to-pay amounts are very small relative to income and that measured income elasticities are very small, the attempted income effect argument does not explain the differences found.

A second interpretation is to assume that individual preferences have a large substitution effect between  $X$  and  $Y$ . In some settings the assumption on preferences needed to justify the results is implausible. For example, Diamond et al. (1993) asked for willingness-to-pay to prevent logging in one, two, and

<sup>8</sup>This approach is similar to the work that was initiated by Kahneman (1986) and done recently by Kahneman and Knetsch (1992), Kemp and Maxwell (1993), Desvousges et al. (1993), Diamond et al. (1993), McFadden and Leonard (1993), Loomis, Hoehn and Hanemann (1990).

three particular wilderness areas. Stated willingness-to-pay to preserve two (and three) areas was less than the sum of willingnesses-to-pay to preserve each of them separately.

At first look, this result appears to be an appropriate substitution effect, since protecting one area results in being less willing to protect another. However, preferences should be defined over wilderness remaining, not over proposals for development that are defeated. If preferences are concave over the amount of wilderness available (or, more generally, if different wilderness areas are substitutes), then willingness-to-pay is larger the smaller the quantity of wilderness remaining. This implies that the willingness-to-pay to preserve two threatened areas should be larger than the sum of willingness-to-pay to preserve each as the lone area threatened with development.<sup>9</sup> Instead, stated willingness-to-pay was roughly the same for preserving one, two or three threatened areas, making the amount for several areas together significantly less than the sum of the amounts for the areas separately. Note that these surveys vary both the number of areas threatened and the number to be preserved. Neither the income effect nor the substitution effect can plausibly explain the embedding effect in this experiment. The hypothesis that this survey is eliciting individual preferences is not consistent with individuals having reasonably behaved preferences. However, from the point of view of the warm glow hypothesis, this pattern makes sense. That is, the warm glow hypothesis is that individuals are primarily reporting an expression of support for the environment, an expression that does not vary much with small changes in the precise environmental change being described.

A similar variation in responses across surveys appears in the study of Desvousges et al. (1993). They described a problem killing 2000, 20,000 and 200,000 birds. The willingness-to-pay to solve this problem was roughly the same in all three cases. Since the number of surviving birds is smaller the larger the problem, concave preferences over surviving birds should have resulted in more than a 100-fold variation in willingness-to-pay across this range.<sup>10</sup> Thus

<sup>9</sup>For derivation of the convexity of willingness-to-pay when preferences are concave and the scenario is varied in this way, see Diamond (1993). That paper also contains a number of other implications of preferences for willingness-to-pay that can be used for internal consistency tests.

<sup>10</sup>Proponents of contingent valuation have made several critiques of this study. One critique is that it was a mall stop survey. But similar results followed when the questionnaire was used for the verbal protocol study cited above, which involved subjects coming to be interviewed. Another criticism is that in addition to the absolute numbers, the survey questions described the number of birds at risk as "much less than 1%" of the population, "less than 1%" and "about 2%." Thus, one can wonder whether respondents were paying attention to the absolute numbers which varied 100-fold or the percentages which varied from "much less than 1%" to "about 2%." Interpreting "much less than" as less than half, about 2% is at least a four-fold increase over less than half of 1%. If some people were paying attention to the percentages and some to the absolute numbers, the range should have been between four-fold and 100-fold. If, as Hanemann suggests, respondents did not perceive any real difference between "much less than 1%" and "about 2%," it is noteworthy that they perceived a large difference between zero and "much less than 1%." Moreover, these percentages were selected by the authors since they were the percentages in three actual oil spills: Arthur Kill, Nestucca, *Exxon Valdez*. This pattern of results is consistent with the responses being dominated by a "warm glow."

this study shows a contradiction between stated willingness-to-pay and the usual economic assumptions on preferences. Again, the study is consistent with the hypothesis that the responses are primarily warm glow, and so need not vary noticeably over moderate differences in the resource.

*Adding-up Test.* One difficulty in the approach described above is that the plausibility of the willingness-to-pay patterns depends on assumptions on the plausible (concave) structure of preferences. Another approach to tests of consistency that does not rely on an assumption of concave preferences is to attempt to measure the same preference in two different ways. This test can be constructed by varying the background scenario as well as varying the commodity to be purchased. For example, assume that one group is asked to evaluate public good  $X$ ; a second group is told that  $X$  will be provided and is asked to evaluate also having  $Y$ ; and a third is asked to evaluate  $X$  and  $Y$  (together). Now the willingness-to-pay for  $X$  and  $Y$  (together) should be the same as the sum of the willingness-to-pay for  $X$  and the willingness-to-pay for  $Y$ , having been given  $X$  (the same up to an income effect that can be measured in the survey and that empirically is small).<sup>11</sup> Thus, Diamond et al. (1993) varied the number of wilderness areas being developed as well as the number that could be protected. In this way the sum of two areas separately evaluated (with different degrees of development) should be the same as the value of preserving two areas (apart from a very small income effect). Again, the results of the survey are inconsistent with the responses being a measure of preferences.<sup>12</sup>

Embedding still infects even very recent work done by experienced contingent valuation analysts who were well aware of the problem. Schulze et al. (1993) asked for willingness-to-pay for partial and complete cleanup of contamination of the Clark Fork National Priorities List sites in Montana. After

<sup>11</sup>Willingness-to-pay is a function of the two vectors giving alternative levels of public goods and the level of income. Thus the willingness-to-pay to improve the environment from  $z$  to  $z''$  of someone with income  $I$  can be written  $WTP(z, z'', I)$ . The change from  $z$  to  $z''$  can be broken into two pieces, a change from  $z$  to  $z'$  and a change from  $z'$  to  $z''$ . From the definition of willingness-to-pay, one has  $WTP(z, z'', I) = WTP(z, z', I) + WTP(z', z'', I - WTP(z, z', I))$ .

This adding-up test makes no use of an assumption on the magnitude or sign of income or substitution effects. One could do an adding-up test without the adjustment of income shown in the equation by comparing  $WTP(z, z'', I)$  with  $WTP(z, z', I) + WTP(z, z'', I)$ . This comparison would involve a deviation from exact adding-up because of the income effect. With a willingness-to-pay on the order of \$30 and a household income level of \$30,000, even an income elasticity of one—higher than the elasticity typically measured in contingent valuation surveys—would lead to a \$.03 deviation from exact adding-up. For a formal derivation, see the revised version of Diamond (1993).

<sup>12</sup>In brief response to Hanemann's criticisms of our analysis, we note that he does not address this adding-up test and seems comfortable accepting the idea that the less wilderness preserved, the less people care about any particular area of wilderness. These two tests do not rely on any assumption of different wilderness areas being interchangeable, as indicated by the vector interpretation of  $z$  in the previous footnote. In terms of Hanemann's test mentioned in his note 25 of whether willingness-to-pay to protect each of the areas is the same, we note that he did not do the statistical test correctly. Moreover, this reference is an example of Hanemann's trait of ignoring the central criticism while attacking a side issue. In Diamond et al., the focus is on the adding-up test, not a scope test. The adding-up test was clearly rejected.



removing protest zeros and high responses, the mean stated willingness-to-pay for complete cleanup was \$72.46 (standard error of \$4.71) while the mean response for a considerably smaller partial cleanup was \$72.02 (s.e. \$5.10). As part of the survey, respondents were asked whether their responses were just for this cleanup or partly to cleanup other sites or basically as a contribution for all environmental or other causes (or other). Only 16.9 percent reported their answers as just for this cleanup; that is, a vast majority of respondents recognized an embedding effect in their own responses. These respondents were asked what percentage of their previous answer was for this cleanup, and the willingness-to-pay responses were adjusted by these percentages. After this adjustment, the mean stated willingness-to-pay for complete cleanup was \$40.00 (s.e. \$2.62) while the mean response for partial cleanup was \$37.15 (s.e. \$2.71).

These numbers (and the large fraction of people recognizing that they are embedding) support the hypothesis that the responses are dominated by a warm glow. No reason is offered by the authors for the conclusion that the adjustment they do removes the dominance of warm glow. Neither do they perform an adding-up test such as that described above. This adding-up test could have been done by asking a third sample for willingness-to-pay to extend a "planned" partial cleanup to a complete cleanup. In short, the embedding problem does not appear to be one that contingent valuation practitioners know how to solve.

With a pattern of results that are inconsistent with the usual economic assumptions, two interpretations are always possible: the surveys were defective or the contingent valuation method as currently practiced does not measure with accuracy. One should consider all the surveys that attempt to test for consistency in order to judge which interpretation is likely to be correct. The studies we have described have been criticized as not done well enough to be an adequate test.<sup>13</sup> However, they are the only quantitative tests we are aware of. No comparable comparison tests have been done by proponents of the accuracy of contingent valuation, although the embedding effect has long been recognized.

*Differing Payment Vehicles.* It is interesting to note what two contingent valuation proponents, Mitchell and Carson (1989), have written about the question that respondents are trying to answer. In discussing the sensitivity of responses to the payment vehicle (the way in which the hypothetical payment is to be collected), they write (pp. 123–24):

It was earlier assumed that only the nature and amount of the amenity being valued should influence the WTP [willingness-to-pay] amounts; all other scenario components, such as the payment vehicle and method of provision, should be neutral in effect... More recently, Arrow (1986),

<sup>13</sup>One can ask whether the patterns of thought reflected in the responses to the questions in any particular survey also occur in other survey settings. Cognitive psychology has found a number of such patterns that are robust. We think that the patterns reflected in these surveys are similarly robust.

Kahneman (1986), and Randall (1986) have argued against that view, holding that important conditions of a scenario, such as the payment vehicle, should be expected to affect the WTP amounts. In their view, which we accept, respondents in a CV [contingent valuation] study are not valuing levels of provision of an amenity in the abstract; they are valuing a policy which includes the conditions under which the amenity will be provided, and the way the public is likely to be asked to pay for it.

In other words, Mitchell and Carson appear to accept the idea (consistent with the findings about some respondents by Schkade and Payne, 1993) that individuals' responses arise from casual benefit-cost analyses, not solely from an examination of their own preferences over resources. For welfare analysis and damage measurement, benefit-cost studies may be different from preferences. We will return to this issue.

### **Evaluation of Bias: Calibration**

Surveys about behavior often have systematic biases relative to the behavior they ask about. Thus, it is common to "calibrate" the responses—that is, adjust for the biases—as part of using them for predictive purposes. In particular, when using surveys to estimate demand for new products, it is standard practice to use a calibration factor to adjust survey responses in order to produce an estimate of actual demand (Urban, Katz, Hatch, and Silk, 1983). As Mitchell and Carson (1989, p. 178) have written: "Such 'calibration' is common in marketing designed to predict purchases. If a systematic divergence between actual and CV [contingent valuation] survey behavior existed and could be quantified, calibration of CV results could be undertaken."

As some evidence on the need for calibration, comparisons of hypothetical surveys and actual offers often find large and significant differences. These comparisons have been done for private goods (Bishop and Heberlein, 1979; Dickie, Fisher and Gerking, 1987; Neill et al., 1993).<sup>14</sup> Comparisons have also been done for charitable donations (Duffield and Patterson, 1992; Seip and Strand, 1992). These studies find a need to calibrate, with calibration factors involving dividing stated willingness-to-pay by a number ranging from 1.5 to 10.

How this calibration should be extended to the public good context is unclear, since the public good context includes both unfamiliar commodities and unfamiliar transactions. But the lack of study of appropriate calibration factors is not a basis for concluding that the best calibration is one-for-one.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup>On the Dickie, Fisher and Gerking (1987) study, see also the critique by Hausman and Leonard (1992).

<sup>15</sup>In its proposed rules for damage assessment, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (1994) has proposed a default calibration of dividing by two, in the absence of direct arguments by trustees of natural resources for a different calibration factor.

## Welfare Analysis

If an accurate measure of willingness-to-pay for the pure public good of the existence of an environmental amenity were available, the measured willingness-to-pay would belong in benefit-cost analysis, just like a pure public good based on resource use. Similarly, the measure should be included in the incentives government creates (through fines and damage payments) to avoid damaging an environmental amenity. As we know from the pure theory of public goods, we would simply add individual willingness-to-pay across the population.<sup>16</sup> In this section, we consider the welfare implications of using stated willingness-to-pay as if it were an accurate measure of preferences in the case that the responses are generated by the alternative hypotheses given above.

One set of problems arises even if willingness-to-pay is being measured accurately, if measured willingness-to-pay contains an altruism component. That is, individuals may be willing to pay to preserve an environmental amenity because of their concerns for others (who may be users or also nonusers). Consider what happens if society adds up everyone's willingness-to-pay and compares the sum with the cost of some action. As a matter of social welfare evaluation we might conclude that such altruistic externalities are double counting, since a utility benefit shows up in the willingness-to-pay of both the person enjoying the public good and the people who care about that person. For example, consider the income distribution problem in a three-person economy. If two of the people start to care about each other, is this change in preferences a reason for a government to increase the level of incomes allocated to the two of them? Similarly, we can ask if the government should devote more taxes to cleaning up lakes where neighbors are friendly with each other than to lakes where neighbors do not know (or care about) each other.

Moreover, if altruistic externalities are thought to be appropriately included in the analysis, it is necessary to include all such externalities for accurate evaluation. In particular, if people care about each other's utilities, they care about the costs borne by others as well as the benefits received by others. An adjustment for altruism must include external costs as well as external benefits if we are to avoid the possibility of a Pareto worsening from an action based on a calculation that appears to be a Pareto improvement (Milgrom, 1993).

A second general problem arises when stated willingness-to-pay may be a poor guess, even though it may be the best guess individuals have of their true willingness-to-pay. Individuals often face the problem of trying to form judgments about the gains from a purchase in settings where the link between the

<sup>16</sup>For the correct use of a benefit-cost calculation, we need to be considering the marginal project for finding the optimum. With many projects under consideration, and a nonoptimal starting point, one does not get the right answer by asking about many projects independently and carrying out all that pass the test (Hoehn and Randall, 1989).

commodity and utility is hard to evaluate. One example is the grade of gasoline to buy, assuming that one wants to minimize cost per mile. In the case of environmental amenities, individuals may have a derived demand based on their beliefs about the relationship between the amenity and variables they really care about. For example, they may care about the survival of a species and not know about the range of natural variation in population size, about the probability of survival as a function of population size, nor about the effect of environmental damage on population size. Such derived preferences may be a poor guide to policy; it may be more informative to have expert evaluation of the consequences of an environmental change than to consult the public directly about environmental damage.

The issues just discussed were based on the hypothesis that stated willingness-to-pay is a measure of an individual preference over an outcome. Under the hypothesis that responses reflect casual benefit-cost evaluations rather than preferences, it would be inappropriate to add any other benefits to those coming from a contingent valuation survey since such benefits are presumably included by the respondents, however imperfectly, in their benefit-cost analyses. But if contingent valuation is just a survey of benefit-cost estimates, rather than preferences, it might be better to have a more careful analysis done by people knowing more about environmental issues and about the principles of benefit-cost analysis. Moreover, if responses are benefit-cost estimates rather than preferences, they do not measure a compensable loss in damage suits.

The embedding effect is supportive of the hypothesis that responses are primarily determined by warm glow. If respondents get pleasure from thinking of themselves as supportive of the environment, the willingness-to-pay for this warm glow is not part of the gain from a *particular* environmental project—unless there are no cheaper ways of generating the warm glow. That is, if an individual wants to see the government do at least one environmental project (or  $n$  projects) a year in order to feel “environmentally supportive,” the person would support one project, but not any particular project. Moreover, if different samples are asked about different projects, the responses will appear to support many projects, even though the warm glow comes from the desire to support a single project.

An illustration of this view comes from the fact that when individuals are asked simultaneously about many projects, stated willingness-to-pay is far below the sum of stated willingnesses-to-pay from asking about the projects separately. For example, Kemp and Maxwell (1993) asked one group for willingness-to-pay to minimize the risk of oil spills off the coast of Alaska, and found a mean stated willingness-to-pay of \$85 (with a 95 percent confidence interval of  $\pm \$44$ ). Then they asked a different sample for willingness-to-pay for a broad group of government programs, followed by asking these people to divide and subdivide their willingness-to-pay among the separate programs. By the time they reached minimizing the risk of oil spills off the coast of Alaska,

they found a mean of \$0.29 (with a 95 percent confidence interval of  $\pm \$0.21$ ).

These findings make little sense if responses are measures of preferences, and considerable sense if the response is primarily a warm glow effect from a desire to express support for protecting the environment. In the latter circumstance, we would expect little warm glow for any single project in a context where respondents are asked about many government projects affecting the environment. Therefore warm glow may need to be purged from stated willingness-to-pay even if (as witnessed by charitable contributions) people really are willing to pay for some warm glow.<sup>17</sup>

A different complication arises if people do not really care about the resource, but care about the activity that might harm a resource. For example, the stated willingness-to-pay to clean up a natural oil seepage might be zero while the stated willingness-to-pay to clean up a man-made oil spill is positive. This outcome is the flip side of the "protest zero," where people state no willingness-to-pay to repair environmental damage that they feel is someone else's responsibility. As noted earlier, it is standard practice to consider this zero not to be an accurate measure of preferences, on the assumption that people care about the resource.

Survey results suggest that many answers are heavily influenced by concern about actions, not resources. For example, Desvousges et al. (1993) find a large stated willingness-to-pay to save small numbers of common birds. The finding seems much more likely to reflect a feeling that it is a shame that people do things that kill birds rather than a preference over the number of birds. Concern over the actions of others is different from concern about the state of the environment. Concern about actions is conventionally part of the basis of punitive damages, but not compensatory damages. That is, deliberately or recklessly destroying the property of others opens one up to liability for compensatory damages for the value of the property destroyed and also punitive damages. On the other hand, the legal system does not compensate people who are upset that others engage in actions such as reading *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. When and how such concerns should affect public policy is a complex issue, one not explored here.

One complication from the perspective of benefit-cost analysis is that preferences over acts (as opposed to states of the world) do not provide the consistency that is necessary for consistent economic policy. For example, if people are willing to pay to offset an act, then proposing and not doing an act appears to generate a welfare gain. For example, consider the warm glow from blocking development of a wilderness area. If one proposes two projects and

<sup>17</sup>In the context of the bird study by Desvousges et al. (1993), Kahneman (personal communication) has proposed to purge the warm glow by extrapolating willingness-to-pay as a function of birds saved back to zero and then subtracting this amount from the estimate of willingness-to-pay at any particular level of birds. This approach involves a curve-fitting extrapolation and the assumption that warm glow is totally insensitive to the magnitude of the problem, an assumption that is probably not completely correct.

has one blocked, are people better off (from the warm glow) than if one project is proposed and happens? Does this imply that the government would do good by proposing projects that it does not mind seeing blocked? More generally, the relationship of benefit-cost analysis and Pareto optimality has been developed and is understood in a setting where preferences are defined over resources.

We note that under the hypothesis of Kahneman and Ritov (1993), responses to contingent valuation surveys are expressions of attitudes toward public goods that the respondents are required to state in dollar terms. Responses are then not measures of willingness-to-pay and provide no quantitative basis for estimates of environmental damages, although like polls generally, they do alert the government about concerns of the public.

### **The “Some Number is Better than No Number” Fallacy**

We began this essay by arguing that stated willingnesses-to-pay from contingent valuation surveys are not measures of nonuse preferences over environmental amenities. We then considered some of the welfare implications of treating the responses as if they were a measure of nonuse preferences when they were generated by different considerations. We concluded that such welfare analysis would not be a guide to good policy. Our conclusion is often challenged by the common Washington fallacy that even if stated willingness-to-pay is inaccurate, it should be used because no alternative estimate exists for public policy purposes. Put more crudely, one hears the argument that “some number is better than no number.”<sup>18</sup> This argument leads to the claim that it is better to do benefit-cost studies with stated willingness-to-pay numbers, despite inaccuracy and bias, rather than use zero in the benefit-cost analysis and adjust for this omission somewhere else in the decision-making process.

To evaluate this argument, one needs a model of the determination of government policy.<sup>19</sup> Ideally, one would like to carry out a number of government decisions twice: once using zero in the benefit-cost study, and a second time using stated willingness-to-pay, with associated adjustments of the decision process in recognition of the inclusion or omission of a contingent valuation number. Such a comparison would recognize that much more input goes into government decisions than just the benefit-cost study. That is, the comparison is not between relying on contingent valuation and relying on Congress, but between relying on Congress after doing a contingent valuation study and

<sup>18</sup>The history of economic policy awaits an investigation, similar to the famous study of the sociologist R. K. Merton on the history of Newton’s “on the shoulders of giants” remark, to trace the lineage of the “some number is better than no number” fallacy.

<sup>19</sup>One can also consider how a social welfare maximizing planner might use the information in contingent valuation surveys. There is useful information if people are expressing preferences that are not otherwise accessible to the planner. However, if the other hypotheses are the correct description of the bases of willingness-to-pay responses, then the planner would not be receiving useful information. Treating the responses as measures of what they do not measure would mislead such a planner.

relying on Congress without doing a contingent valuation study.<sup>20</sup> Thus one is asking whether inclusion of such survey results tends to improve the allocation process, even if the numbers are not reliable estimates of the preferences called for by the theory. Similarly, one can ask whether the combination of fines and damage payments will result in more efficient decisions to avoid accidents with or without a contingent valuation estimate of nonuse value.

Judge Stephen Breyer (1993) has recently reviewed government responses to public perceptions of risk. Since he feels that public perceptions of risk are inaccurate and that Congress is responsive to these public perceptions, Breyer wants to increase the role of administrative expertise in designing public policy to deal with risks. A similar situation seems to exist with respect to contingent valuations of nonuse value. If we conclude that contingent valuation is really an opinion poll on concern about the environment in general, rather than a measure of preferences about specific projects, public policy is likely to do better if the concern is noted but expert opinion is used to evaluate specific projects and to set financial incentives to avoid accidents. One could hope for a more consistent relative treatment of alternative natural resources in this way.

In both economic logic and politics, we expect that using contingent valuation in decision making about the environment would soon be extended to other policy arenas where existence values are equally plausible. We do not expect that policy would be improved by using contingent valuation to affect the levels and patterns of spending for elementary school education, foreign aid, Medicaid, Medicare, AFDC, construction of safer highways, medical research, airline safety, or police and fire services. Yet people have concerns for others in all of these areas that parallel their concern for the environment.

Concern for other people naturally includes concern about their jobs. Thus, in considering rules that limit economic activity to protect the environment, it is as appropriate to include a contingent valuation of existence value for destroyed jobs as the one for protection of the environment. The fact that jobs may be created elsewhere in the economy does not rule out concern about job destruction *per se*. These possible extensions of the use of contingent valuation increase the importance of considering the "some number is better than no number" fallacy.

## Referenda

We have heard the argument that if referenda are legitimate, so too is contingent valuation. That is, one can consider a contingent valuation survey to be a forecast of how voters would respond to a binding referendum. This

<sup>20</sup>The results of a contingent valuation survey are not binding. Thus a respondent who was behaving strategically would select a response that reflected his or her belief in how the results of the survey would affect actual outcomes. Thus we do not understand how the NOAA Panel could conclude that with a dichotomous choice question there is no strategic reason for the respondent to do otherwise than answer truthfully.

perspective raises the same issues considered above. How should we decide how to interpret the bases of how people vote in referenda? Since different bases imply different appropriate uses of the responses, how should voting responses be used for economic analysis? Moreover, the necessity of calibration remains, since no obvious reason exists for people necessarily to vote the same in binding and nonbinding referenda. And, as in the previous section, we can ask whether we think we get better policies with or without such surveys.

It is interesting to consider issues raised by polls about actual referenda, as well as by the referenda themselves. Sometimes polls are accurate predictors of voting outcomes; sometimes, they are not, even when they are taken close to election day. Sometimes, repeated polls about the same referendum find very large changes in expressed intentions as a referendum campaign proceeds.

Magleby (1984) has analyzed statewide polls in California and Massachusetts for which at least three separate surveys were done. In some cases, the polls show roughly the same margin over time. Magleby calls these "standing opinions" and believes that this stability comes from the deep attachment to their opinions that voters hold on some controversial issues such as the death penalty and the equal rights amendment. In some cases, the polls show significant changes in the margin of preferences, but no change in the side that is ahead. Magleby calls these "uncertain opinions." Examples of such votes involve handgun registration and homosexual teachers. In some cases, significant changes in voting intentions occur as the campaign proceeds, with victory in the actual election going to the side that had at one time been far behind. Magleby calls these outcomes "opinion reversals." For example, in a referendum for flat rate electricity, a February poll showed 71 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed, and 12 percent undecided. The actual vote was 23 percent in favor, 69 percent opposed and 7 percent skipping this question. Other examples of such votes are a state lottery and a tax reduction measure. In his analysis of 36 propositions in California, Magleby found that on 28 percent of the issues, voters held standing opinions, on 19 percent voters had uncertain opinions, and on 53 percent he found opinion reversals. That is, in a majority of cases, early opinion polls were not good predictors of election outcomes. Moreover, they were not even good predictors of later opinion polls, after the campaign had run for some time.

It seems to us that responses to contingent valuation questionnaires for a single environmental issue are likely to be based on little information, since there is limited time for presentation and digestion of information during a contingent valuation survey. This conclusion suggests that the results of such surveys are unlikely to be accurate predictors of informed opinions on the same issues if respondents had more information and further time for reflection, including learning of the opinions of others. Such surveys are therefore unlikely to be a good basis for either informed policy-making or accurate damage assessment.

Even if a contingent valuation survey were a good predictor of an actual referendum, one can also question the use of actual referenda to obtain



economic values. Considerable skepticism exists about the extent to which voting on a referendum represents informed decision making (see, for example, Magleby, 1984). In the functioning of a democracy, it may be more important to place some powers directly with the voters, rather than with their elected representatives, than to worry about the quality of decision making by voters.<sup>21</sup> However, incorporating contingent valuation survey responses in benefit-cost analyses or judicial proceedings does not seem to have a special role in enhancing democracy. In the looser context of legislative debate, such opinion polls may have a role to play, although the net value of that role is unclear.

### **NOAA Panel Evaluation of Contingent Valuation**

In light of the controversy and the stakes involved, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration recently appointed a prestigious panel to consider the reliability of contingent valuation studies of nonuse values in damage suits.<sup>22</sup> The panel's Report (NOAA, 1993) begins with criticisms of contingent valuation. In discussing the alleged inconsistency of some results with rational choice, the Report states (p. 4604) that: "some form of internal consistency is the least we would need to feel some confidence that the verbal answers correspond to some reality." The Report also addresses the need for rationality (p. 4604).

It could be asked whether rationality is indeed needed. Why not take the values found as given? There are two answers. One is that we do not know yet how to reason about values without some assumption of rationality, if indeed it is possible at all. Rationality requirements impose a constraint on the possible values, without which damage judgments would be arbitrary. A second answer is that, as discussed above, it is difficult to find objective counterparts to verify the values obtained in the response to questionnaires.

In discussing "warm glow" effects, the Report recognizes the claim that contingent valuation responses include a warm glow. They write (p. 4605): "If this is so, CV [contingent valuation] responses should not be taken as reliable estimates of true willingness to pay."

The Report states that the burden of proof of reliability must rest on the survey designers. It states (p. 4609) that a survey would be unreliable if there were "[i]nadequate responsiveness to the scope of the environmental insult," as

<sup>21</sup>The allocation of a decision directly to the voters, rather than indirectly through the choice of elected representatives, and the form in which referenda are put to voters are both methods of agenda control. In many settings, design of the agenda has large effects on voting outcomes.

<sup>22</sup>Kenneth Arrow (co-chair), Robert Solow (co-chair), Edward Leamer, Paul Portney, Roy Radner, and Howard Schuman.

occurred in the embedding examples we have discussed. Unfortunately, the Panel did not elaborate on how to test for reliability.<sup>23</sup> We interpret the view they express to call for testing of the internal consistency of responses to the same survey instrument with different levels of environmental problem and policy successes. The Report cites no existing study that has passed such internal consistency tests.

The Report presents a set of guidelines which would define an “ideal” contingent valuation survey (and are summarized in Portney’s paper in this issue). The Report asserts (p. 4610) that studies meeting such guidelines can produce estimates “reliable enough to be the starting point” of a judicial process of damage assessment. The Report offers no reason for reaching this conclusion, although the finding that surveys that do not meet their guidelines may be biased is not a basis for concluding that surveys that do meet their guidelines are not biased. In particular, they state no reason for reaching the conclusion that following their guidelines implies that responses are not dominated by a “warm glow.” The Panel does not explicitly call for testing whether a survey done according to their guidelines is reliable. In particular, they do not mention a need to check the internal consistency of responses. Nor do they explain their conclusion that the inconsistencies between stated willingness-to-pay and economic theory come from survey design issues and would go away if the survey had followed their guidelines.

## Conclusion

We believe that contingent valuation is a deeply flawed methodology for measuring nonuse values, one that does not estimate what its proponents claim to be estimating. The absence of direct market parallels affects both the ability to judge the quality of contingent valuation responses and the ability to calibrate responses to have usable numbers. It is precisely the lack of experience both in markets for environmental commodities and in the consequences of such decision that makes contingent valuation questions so hard to answer and the responses so suspect.

We have argued that internal consistency tests (particularly adding-up tests) are required to assess the reliability and validity of such surveys. When these tests have been done, contingent valuation has come up short. Contingent valuation proponents typically claim that the surveys used for these tests were not done well enough. Yet they have not subjected their own surveys to such tests. (We note that Hanemann does not address the question of which split-sample internal consistency tests, if any, he thinks a contingent valuation survey needs to pass.) There is a history of anomalous results in contingent valuation surveys that seems closely tied to the embedding problem. Although

<sup>23</sup> Nor, we add, do Portney or Hanemann in this symposium.

this problem has been recognized in the literature for over a decade, it has not been solved. Thus, we conclude that current contingent valuation methods should not be used for damage assessment or for benefit cost analysis.

It is impossible to conclude definitely that surveys with new methods (or the latest survey that has been done) will not pass internal consistency tests. Yet, we do not see much hope for such success. This skepticism comes from the belief that the internal consistency problems come from an absence of preferences, not a flaw in survey methodology. That is, we do not think that people generally hold views about individual environmental sites (many of which they have never heard of); or that, within the confines of the time available for survey instruments, people will focus successfully on the identification of preferences, to the exclusion of other bases for answering survey questions. This absence of preferences shows up as inconsistency in responses across surveys and implies that the survey responses are not satisfactory bases for policy.

■ *The authors want to thank Bernard Saffran and four editors for helpful comments.*

## References

- Andreoni, James**, "Giving with Impure Altruism: Applications to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence," *Journal of Political Economy*, December 1989, 97, 1447-58.
- Bishop, R. C., and T. A. Heberlein**, "Measuring Values of Extramarket Goods: Are Indirect Measures Biased?," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, December 1979, 61, 926-30.
- Breyer, Stephen**, *Breaking the Vicious Circle: Toward Effective Risk Regulation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Carson, Richard T., et al.**, "A Contingent Valuation Study of Lost Passive Use Values Resulting From the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill," A Report to the Attorney General of the State of Alaska, 1992.
- Desvousges, W. H., et al.**, "Measuring Natural Resource Damages with Contingent Valuation: Tests of Validity and Reliability. In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993, 91-164.
- Diamond, P. A.**, "Testing the Internal Consistency of Contingent Valuation Surveys," working paper, MIT, 1993.
- Diamond, P. A., and J. A. Hausman**, "On Contingent Valuation Measurement of Non-use Values" In Hausman, J., Ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993, 3-38.
- Diamond, P. A., J. A. Hausman, G. K. Leonard, and M. A. Denning**, "Does Contingent Valuation Measure Preferences? Experimental Evidence." In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993.
- Dickie, Mark, Ann Fisher, and Shelby Gerking**, "Market Transactions and Hypothetical Demand Data: A Comparative Study," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, March 1987, 82, 69-75.
- Duffield, John W., and David A. Patterson**, "Field Testing Existence Values: An Instream Flow Trust Fund for Montana Rivers," mimeo, University of Montana, 1992.
- Hausman, J. A.**, *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993.
- Hausman, J. A., and G. Leonard**, *Contingent Valuation and the Value of Marketed Commodities*. Cambridge: Cambridge Economics, 1982.
- Hoehn, John, and Alan Randall**, "Too Many Proposals Pass the Benefit Cost Test," *American Economic Review*, June 1989, 79, 544-51.
- Kahneman, Daniel**, "Comments on the Contingent Valuation Method." In Cummings, Ronald G., David S. Brookshire, and William D. Schulze, eds., *Valuing Environmental Goods: A State of the Arts Assessment of the Contingent Valuation Method*. Totowa: Rowman and Allanheld, 1986, 185-94.

**Kahneman, Daniel, and Jack L. Knetsch**, "Valuing Public Goods: The Purchase of Moral Satisfaction," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, January 1992, 22, 57-70.

**Kahneman, Daniel and Ilana Ritov**, "Determinants of Stated Willingness to Pay for Public Goods: A Study in the Headline Method," mimeo, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, 1993.

**Kemp, M. A. and Maxwell**, "Exploring a Budget Context for Contingent Valuation Estimates," In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*, Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993, 217-70.

**Loomis, John, John Hoehn, and Michael Hanemann**, "Testing the Fallacy of Independent Valuation and Summation in Multi-part Policies: An Empirical Test of Whether 'Too Many Proposals Pass the Benefit Cost Test,'" mimeo, University of California, Davis, 1990.

**Magleby, David B.**, *Direct Legislation, Voting on Ballot Propositions in the United States*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

**McFadden, Daniel, and Gregory K. Leonard**, "Issues in the Contingent Valuation of Environmental Goods: Methodologies for Data Collection and Analysis." In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993.

**Milgrom, P.**, "Is Sympathy an Economic Value?," In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993, 417-42.

**Mitchell, Robert Cameron and Richard T. Carson**, *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods*. Washington D. C.: Resources for the Future, 1989.

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**, 1993, "Report of the NOAA Panel on Contingent Valuation," *Federal Register*, 1993, 58, 10, 4602-14.

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**, "Natural Resource Damage Assessments; Proposed Rules," *Federal Register*, 1994, 59, 5, 1062-191.

**Neill, Helen, R., et al.**, "Hypothetical Surveys and Real Economic Commitments," Economics Working Paper B-93-01, Department of Economics, College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina, 1993.

**Samples, Karl C., and James R. Hollyer**, "Contingent Valuation of Wildlife Resources in the Presence of Substitutes and Complements." In Johnson, Rebecca L., and Gary V. Johnson, eds., *Economic Valuation of Natural Resources: Issues, Theory and Applications*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1990, 177-192.

**Schkade, D. A., and J. W. Payne**, "Where do the numbers come from? How people respond to Contingent Valuation Questions." In Hausman, J., ed., *Contingent Valuation: A Critical Assessment*. Amsterdam: North Holland Press, 1993, 271-304.

**Schulze, William, D., et al.**, "Contingent Valuation of Natural Resource Damages Due to Injuries to the Upper Clark Fork River Basin," State of Montana, Natural Resource Damage Program, 1993.

**Seip, Kalle, and Jon Strand**, "Willingness to Pay For Environmental Goods in Norway: A Contingent Valuation Study With Real Payment," *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 1992, 2, 91-106.

**Tolley, George S., et al.**, "Establishing and Valuing the Effects of Improved Visibility in the Eastern United States," Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., 1983.

**Urban, Glen L., Gerald M. Katz, Thomas E. Hatch, and Alvin J. Silk**, "The ASSESSOR Pre-Test Market Evaluation System," *Interfaces*, 1983 13, 38-59.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Victor Gómez-Valenzuela, Francisco Alpízar, Solhanlle Bonilla, Carol Franco-Billini. 2020. Mining conflict in the Dominican Republic: The case of Loma Miranda. *Resources Policy* **66**, 101614. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Ilaria Rodella, Fabio Madau, Massimiliano Mazzanti, Corinne Corbau, Donatella Carboni, Umberto Simeoni, Luigi Parente. 2020. Carrying capacity as tool for beach economic value assessment (case studies of Italian beaches). *Ocean & Coastal Management* **189**, 105130. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Jacqueline G. Lee, Daren Fisher. 2020. The Influence of Scope, Frames, and Extreme Willingness to Pay Responses on Cost of Crime Estimates. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* **45:2**, 236-272. [[Crossref](#)]
4. A. Banerji, Jeevant Rampal. 2020. Reverse Endowment Effect for a New Product. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Bart Neuts. 2020. Mixed pricing strategies in museums: Examining the potential of voluntary contributions for capturing consumer surplus. *Tourism Economics* **26:1**, 115-136. [[Crossref](#)]
6. M. Cristina Layana, Jacqueline G. Lee. 2020. Respondent Fatigue in Estimates of the Cost of White-Collar Crime: Implications From Willingness-to-Pay Surveys. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* **2**, 088740341990024. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Minhaj Mahmud, Italo A Gutierrez, Krishna B Kumar, Shanthi Nataraj. 2020. What Aspects of Formality Do Workers Value? Evidence from a Choice Experiment in Bangladesh. *The World Bank Economic Review* **24**. . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Brian Vander Naald. 2020. Examining tourist preferences to slow glacier loss: evidence from Alaska. *Tourism Recreation Research* **45:1**, 107-117. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Svetla Bratanova-Doncheva, Kremena Gocheva. Climate Change and Ecosystem Services in Bulgaria, or What We Lose When We Win 331-355. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Robert Hahn, Robert Metcalfe, Florian Rundhammer. 2020. Promoting customer engagement: A new trend in utility regulation. *Regulation & Governance* **14:1**, 121-149. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Apurba Shee, Carlo Azzarri, Beliyou Haile. 2020. Farmers' Willingness to Pay for Improved Agricultural Technologies: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Tanzania. *Sustainability* **12:1**, 216. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Sofia M. Lourenço. 2020. Do self-reported motivators really motivate higher performance?. *Management Accounting Research* 100676. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Giobertti 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](#)]
14. Tom Ndebele. 2020. Assessing the potential for consumer-driven renewable energy development in deregulated electricity markets dominated by renewables. *Energy Policy* **136**, 111057. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Anthony Amoah, Silvia Ferrini, Marije Schaafsma. 2019. Electricity outages in Ghana: Are contingent valuation estimates valid?. *Energy Policy* **135**, 110996. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Jeffrey R. Wall, Taner Okan, Coşkun Köse, Nesibe Köse, Elif Başak Aksoy. 2019. Folk Biological Value and Chestnut Conservation in Turkey. *Economic Botany* **73:4**, 461-476. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Sofia 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](#)]
18. Verena Otter, Josef Langenberg. 2019. Willingness to pay for environmental effects of agroforestry systems: a PLS-model of the contingent evaluation from German taxpayers' perspective. *Agroforestry Systems* **29**. . [[Crossref](#)]

19. Ricky N. Lawton, Susana Mourato, Daniel Fujiwara, Hasan Bakhshi. 2019. Comparing the effect of oath commitments and cheap talk entreaties in contingent valuation surveys: a randomised field experiment. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **60**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Paul Hudson, W. J. Wouter Botzen. 2019. Cost-benefit analysis of flood-zoning policies: A review of current practice. *WIREs Water* **6**:6. . [[Crossref](#)]
21. Thea Vinnicombe, Joey Pek U Sou. 2019. How can we correct for contingent valuation bias? A case study of the Macau Orchestra. *Economic Affairs* **39**:3, 346-362. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Ambika Markanday, Ibon Galarraga, Aline Chiabai, Elisa Sainz de Murieta, Bosco Lliso, Anil Markandya. 2019. Determining discount rates for the evaluation of natural assets in land-use planning: An application of the Equivalency Principle. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **230**, 672-684. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Jonathan A. Parker, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2019. Reported Effects versus Revealed-Preference Estimates: Evidence from the Propensity to Spend Tax Rebates. *American Economic Review: Insights* **1**:3, 273-290. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
24. 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](#)]
25. 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](#)]
26. Alexandra K. Shannon, Faraz Usmani, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak, Marc Jeuland. 2019. The Price of Purity: Willingness to Pay for Air and Water Purification Technologies in Rajasthan, India. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **73**:4, 1073-1100. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Na-na Wang, Liang-guo Luo, Ya-ru Pan, Xue-mei Ni. 2019. Use of discrete choice experiments to facilitate design of effective environmentally friendly agricultural policies. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **21**:4, 1543-1559. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Makiko Omura. 2019. Why Can't I keep my Surname? The Fairness and Welfare of the Japanese Legal System. *Feminist Economics* **25**:3, 171-200. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Kavita Sardana. 2019. Tourists' Willingness to Pay for Restoration of Traditional Agro-forest Ecosystems Providing Biodiversity: Evidence from India. *Ecological Economics* **159**, 362-372. [[Crossref](#)]
30. 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](#)]
31. Ulrich J. Frey. 2019. Crowdfunding – revealing preferences for environmental goods. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* **30**:3, 538-556. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Camila Balbontin, David A. Hensher, Chinh Ho, Corinne Mulley. 2019. Do preferences for BRT and LRT change as a voter, citizen, tax payer, or self-interested resident?. *Transportation* **30**. . [[Crossref](#)]
33. 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](#)]
34. Ilaria Rodella, Fabio Madau, Massimiliano Mazzanti, Corinne Corbau, Donatella Carboni, Kizzi Utizi, Umberto Simeoni. 2019. Willingness to pay for management and preservation of natural, semi-urban and urban beaches in Italy. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **172**, 93-104. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Rosa Marina González, Concepción Román, Juan de Dios Ortúzar. 2019. Preferences for sustainable mobility in natural areas: The case of Teide National Park. *Journal of Transport Geography* **76**, 42-51. [[Crossref](#)]

36. Sarah A. Janzen, Michael R. Carter. 2019. After the Drought: The Impact of Microinsurance on Consumption Smoothing and Asset Protection. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **101**:3, 651-671. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Matto Mildenberger, Mark Lubell, Michelle Hummel. 2019. Personalized risk messaging can reduce climate concerns. *Global Environmental Change* **55**, 15-24. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Charisma Acey, Joyce Kisiangani, Patrick Ronoh, Caroline Delaire, Evelyn Makena, Guy Norman, David Levine, Ranjiv Khush, Rachel Peletz. 2019. Cross-subsidies for improved sanitation in low income settlements: Assessing the willingness to pay of water utility customers in Kenyan cities. *World Development* **115**, 160-177. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Gavin Nicholson, Ross Skelton, Julie-Anne Tarr. 2019. An Exploratory Study of Regulatory Failure in the Australian Home Mortgage Market. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* **53**:1, 126-166. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Blair Fix. 2019. The Aggregation Problem: Implications for Ecological and Biophysical Economics. *BioPhysical Economics and Resource Quality* **4**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
41. Peir Peir Woon, Bikram Chatterjee, Carolyn J. Cordery. 2019. Heritage reporting by the Australian public sector. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* **32**:2, 612-631. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Richard C. Bishop, Kevin J. Boyle. 2019. Reliability and Validity in Nonmarket Valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **72**:2, 559-582. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Christiaan Hummel, Dimitris Poursanidis, Daniel Orenstein, Michael Elliott, Mihai Cristian Adamescu, Constantin Cazacu, Guy Ziv, Nektarios Chrysoulakis, Jaap van der Meer, Herman Hummel. 2019. Protected Area management: Fusion and confusion with the ecosystem services approach. *Science of The Total Environment* **651**, 2432-2443. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Solomon Hsiang, Paulina Oliva, Reed Walker. 2019. The Distribution of Environmental Damages. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* **13**:1, 83-103. [[Crossref](#)]
45. 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](#)]
46. 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](#)]
47. Mayam Moeeni, Shirin Nosratnejad. 2019. Never will I give advice till you please to ask me thrice: Estimating willingness to pay for health insurance using 3 different methods with evidence from Iran. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* **34**:1, e594-e601. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Wolfgang Buchholz, Dirk Rübelke. Monetary Valuation of the Environment 37-66. [[Crossref](#)]
49. S. Niggol Seo. Economics and Evaluations of the Green Climate Fund 179-221. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Oscar Alfranca. Efficient Desalinated Water Pricing in Wetlands 255-268. [[Crossref](#)]
51. M Lobovikov, Tran Thi Thanh Nga. 2019. Economic criteria of forest management. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* **226**, 012033. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Jeffrey A. Friedman. 2019. Priorities for Preventive Action: Explaining Americans' Divergent Reactions to 100 Public Risks. *American Journal of Political Science* **63**:1, 181-196. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Stefania Tonin. 2018. Citizens' perspectives on marine protected areas as a governance strategy to effectively preserve marine ecosystem services and biodiversity. *Ecosystem Services* **34**, 189-200. [[Crossref](#)]
54. 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](#)]

55. Levison S. Chiwaula, Gowokani Chijere Chirwa, Lucy S. Binauli, James Banda, Joseph Nagoli. 2018. Gender differences in willingness to pay for capital-intensive agricultural technologies: the case of fish solar tent dryers in Malawi. *Agricultural and Food Economics* 6:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
56. 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](#)]
57. Lyle Scruggs. 2018. Public opinion and economic human rights: Patterns of support in 22 countries. *Journal of Human Rights* 17:5, 568-588. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Neelu Seetaram, Haiyan Song, Shun Ye, Stephen Page. 2018. Estimating willingness to pay air passenger duty. *Annals of Tourism Research* 72, 85-97. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Naghmeh Niroomand, Glenn P. Jenkins. 2018. A comparison of stated preference methods for the valuation of improvement in road safety. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 59, 138-149. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Eric English, Roger H. von Haefen, Joseph Herriges, Christopher Leggett, Frank Lupi, Kenneth McConnell, Michael Welsh, Adam Domanski, Norman Meade. 2018. Estimating the value of lost recreation days from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 91, 26-45. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Zike Cao, Kai-Lung Hui, Hong Xu. 2018. When Discounts Hurt Sales: The Case of Daily-Deal Markets. *Information Systems Research* 29:3, 567-591. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Benedetto Manganelli, Marco Vona, Pierfrancesco De Paola. 2018. Evaluating the cost and benefits of earthquake protection of buildings. *Journal of European Real Estate Research* 11:2, 263-278. [[Crossref](#)]
63. James O'Brien. 2018. Age, autos, and the value of a statistical life. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 57:1, 51-79. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Fan Yang, Brenda Gannon, Andrew Weightman. 2018. Public's Willingness to Pay Towards a Medical Device for Detecting Foot Ulceration in People with Diabetes. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* 16:4, 559-567. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Andrej Angelovski, Daniela Di Cagno, Werner Güth, Francesca Marazzi, Luca Panaccione. 2018. Behavioral spillovers in local public good provision: An experimental study. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 67, 116-134. [[Crossref](#)]
66. SÈNAKPON E. HAROLL KOKOYE, CURTIS M. JOLLY, JOSEPH J. MOLNAR, DENNIS A. SHANNON, GOBENA HULUKA. 2018. FARMER WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR SOIL TESTING SERVICES IN NORTHERN HAITI. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 50:3, 429-451. [[Crossref](#)]
67. 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](#)]
68. Cass R. Sunstein. 2018. On preferring A to B, while also preferring B to A. *Rationality and Society* 30:3, 305-331. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Theodore Chao Lim. 2018. An empirical study of spatial-temporal growth patterns of a voluntary residential green infrastructure program. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 61:8, 1363-1382. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Roger Bennett, Rohini Vijaygopal. 2018. An assessment of UK drivers' attitudes regarding the forthcoming ban on the sale of petrol and diesel vehicles. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 62, 330-344. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Sana AKHTAR, Sarah DEAN, Faiza ANJUM, Maryam JAVED. 2018. Determination of Willingness to Pay for Improved Water Supply in Selected Areas of Lahore. *Chinese Journal of Urban and Environmental Studies* 06:02, 1850013. [[Crossref](#)]



72. Linn-Brit Bakkenbüll, Alexander Dilger. 2018. The willingness to pay for a German win of the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil. *Managing Sport and Leisure* **23**:3, 174-188. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Claudia Cerda, Juan Pablo Fuentes, Gabriel Mancilla. 2018. Can conservation in protected areas and visitor preferences converge? An empirical study in Central Chile. *Biodiversity and Conservation* **27**:6, 1431-1451. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Jordana Viotto da Cruz. 2018. Beyond financing: crowdfunding as an informational mechanism. *Journal of Business Venturing* **33**:3, 371-393. [[Crossref](#)]
75. 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](#)]
76. 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](#)]
77. Douglas L. Bessette, Joseph L. Arvai. 2018. Engaging attribute tradeoffs in clean energy portfolio development. *Energy Policy* **115**, 221-229. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Robert Baumann, Victor Matheson. 2018. MEGA-EVENTS AND TOURISM: THE CASE OF BRAZIL. *Contemporary Economic Policy* **36**:2, 292-301. [[Crossref](#)]
79. 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](#)]
80. Sanjib Saha, Ulf-G. Gerdtham, Faiza Siddiqui, Louise Bennet. 2018. Valuing a Lifestyle Intervention for Middle Eastern Immigrants at Risk of Diabetes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **15**:3, 413. [[Crossref](#)]
81. 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](#)]
82. D. Lavee, O. Menachem. 2018. Economic valuation of the existence of the southwestern basin of the Dead Sea in Israel. *Land Use Policy* **71**, 160-169. [[Crossref](#)]
83. O. Ashton Morgan, John C. Whitehead. 2018. Willingness to Pay for Soccer Player Development in the United States. *Journal of Sports Economics* **19**:2, 279-296. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Boyke R. Purnomo, Stein Kristiansen. 2018. Economic reasoning and creative industries progress. *Creative Industries Journal* **11**:1, 3-21. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Pierluigi Barrotta. Values, Transactional Relationships and the Autonomy of Science 107-143. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Colin Price. Stated Willingness to Pay for Tree Health Protection: Perceptions and Realities 235-267. [[Crossref](#)]
87. 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](#)]
88. Hendrigo Batista da Silva, Leonardo P. Santiago. 2018. On the trade-off between real-time pricing and the social acceptability costs of demand response. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **81**, 1513-1521. [[Crossref](#)]
89. 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](#)]

90. Cass R. Sunstein. 2018. On Preferring A to B, While Also Preferring B to A. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
91. Matthew Wibbenmeyer, Sarah Anderson, Andrew Plantinga. 2018. Salience and the Government Provision of Public Goods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
92. Franziska Heinicke. 2018. Self-Image and Hypothetical Bias in Willingness to Pay Elicitation: The Case of a Private Good. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
93. Jonathan A. Parker, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2018. Reported Effects vs. Revealed-Preference Estimates: Evidence From the Propensity to Spend Tax Rebates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
94. Alexandre Mas, Amanda Pallais. 2017. Valuing Alternative Work Arrangements. *American Economic Review* **107**:12, 3722-3759. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
95. Linn-Brit Bakkenbüll, Alexander Dilger. 2017. Zahlungsbereitschaften für deutsche Erfolge bei den Olympischen Winterspielen 2014 in Sotschi. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research* **47**:4, 360-370. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Zorzeta Bakaki, Thomas Bernauer. 2017. Citizens show strong support for climate policy, but are they also willing to pay?. *Climatic Change* **145**:1-2, 15-26. [[Crossref](#)]
97. A. Botelho, I. Dinis, L. Lourenço-Gomes, J. Moreira, L. Costa Pinto, O. Simões. 2017. The effect of sequential information on consumers' willingness to pay for credence food attributes. *Appetite* **118**, 17-25. [[Crossref](#)]
98. 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](#)]
99. F. M. Resende, G. W. Fernandes, D. C. Andrade, H. D. Néder. 2017. Economic valuation of the ecosystem services provided by a protected area in the Brazilian Cerrado: application of the contingent valuation method. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* **77**:4, 762-773. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Ewa Zawojcka, Mikołaj Czajkowski. 2017. Re-examining empirical evidence on stated preferences: importance of incentive compatibility. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **6**:4, 374-403. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Syed A. Shah, Dana L. K. Hoag, John Loomis. 2017. Is willingness to pay for freshwater quality improvement in Pakistan affected by payment vehicle? Donations, mandatory government payments, or donations to NGO's. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* **19**:4, 807-818. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Ioannis M. Kourtis, Vassilios A. Tsihrintzis. 2017. Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by the Restoration of an Irrigation Canal to a Riparian Corridor. *Environmental Processes* **4**:3, 749-769. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Tom Ndebele, Vicky Forgie. 2017. Estimating the economic benefits of a wetland restoration programme in New Zealand: A contingent valuation approach. *Economic Analysis and Policy* **55**, 75-89. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Naghmeh Niroomand, Glenn P. Jenkins. 2017. Estimating the value of life and injury for pedestrians using a stated preference framework. *Journal of Safety Research* **62**, 81-87. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Steven M. Sheffrin. 2017. Behavioral Law and Economics Is Not Just a Refinement of Law and Economics. *OEconomia* :7-3, 331-352. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Samah Mokhtari, Mebarek Djebabra, Djamel Bellaala, Wafa Boulagouas. 2017. Contribution to the investment evaluation in terms of the forest fires prevention using the cost-benefit analysis method. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* **28**:5, 651-663. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Bryan G. Norton. 2017. A Situational Understanding of Environmental Values and Evaluation. *Ecological Economics* **138**, 242-248. [[Crossref](#)]

108. Merlin M. Hanauer, John Reid. 2017. Valuing urban open space using the travel-cost method and the implications of measurement error. *Journal of Environmental Management* **198**, 50-65. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Michael Rushton. 2017. Thinking outside the empathy box. *Cultural Trends* **26**:3, 260-271. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Nicolas Jacquemet, Alexander James, Stéphane Luchini, Jason F. Shogren. 2017. Referenda Under Oath. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **67**:3, 479-504. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Lauriane Mouysset. 2017. Reconciling agriculture and biodiversity in European public policies: a bio-economic perspective. *Regional Environmental Change* **17**:5, 1421-1428. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Katrin Rehdanz, Carsten Schröder, Daiju Narita, Toshihiro Okubo. 2017. Public preferences for alternative electricity mixes in post-Fukushima Japan. *Energy Economics* **65**, 262-270. [[Crossref](#)]
113. 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](#)]
114. Eline Jongmans, Alain Jolibert. 2017. How preference measurement between products impacts the estimated weight of their attributes?. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)* **32**:2, 98-118. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Kees Vringer, Eline van der Heijden, Daan van Soest, Herman Vollebergh, Frank Dietz. 2017. Sustainable Consumption Dilemmas. *Sustainability* **9**:6, 942. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Renuka Mahadevan. 2017. Going beyond the economic impact of a regional folk festival for tourism. *Tourism Economics* **23**:4, 744-755. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Andrej Srakar, Marilena Vecco. 2017. Ex-ante versus ex-post: comparison of the effects of the European Capital of Culture Maribor 2012 on tourism and employment. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **41**:2, 197-214. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Douglas S. Noonan, Ilde Rizzo. 2017. Economics of cultural tourism: issues and perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **41**:2, 95-107. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Nik Sawe. 2017. Using neuroeconomics to understand environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* **135**, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Matthias Bösch, Peter Elsasser, Joachim Rock, Sebastian Rüter, Holger Weimar, Matthias Dieter. 2017. Costs and carbon sequestration potential of alternative forest management measures in Germany. *Forest Policy and Economics* **78**, 88-97. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Paul Bartha, C. Tyler DesRoches. 2017. The Relatively Infinite Value of the Environment. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* **95**:2, 328-353. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Christopher Barrington-Leigh, Fatemeh Behzadnejad. 2017. Evaluating the short-term cost of low-level local air pollution: a life satisfaction approach. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* **19**:2, 269-298. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Juan Gabriel Brida, Marta Meleddu, Oksana Tokarchuk. 2017. Use value of cultural events: The case of the Christmas markets. *Tourism Management* **59**, 67-75. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Eline Jongmans, Alain Jolibert. 2017. Comment la mesure de la préférence entre produits influence-t-elle le poids estimé de leurs attributs ?. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)* **32**:2, 105-128. [[Crossref](#)]
125. 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](#)]
126. Limor Dina Gonen. 2017. The willingness to pay for in vitro fertilization-related information and its attributes: a cross-sectional study in Israel. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* **17**:1, 56-83. [[Crossref](#)]

127. Peter Tait, Caroline Saunders, Graham Nugent, Paul Rutherford. 2017. Valuing conservation benefits of disease control in wildlife: A choice experiment approach to bovine tuberculosis management in New Zealand's native forests. *Journal of Environmental Management* **189**, 142-149. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Andrea R. Haas, Tony Fedler, Edward J. Brooks. 2017. The contemporary economic value of elasmobranchs in The Bahamas: Reaping the rewards of 25 years of stewardship and conservation. *Biological Conservation* **207**, 55-63. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Nir Becker, Yanay Farja. 2017. The Cattle-Wolf Dilemma: Interactions among Three Protected Species. *Environmental Management* **59**:2, 175-188. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Felix Schläpfer. 2017. STATED PREFERENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICES: A CLASSIFICATION AND SURVEY OF APPROACHES. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **31**:1, 258-280. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Olivier Gergaud, Victor Ginsburgh. Measuring the Economic Effects of Events Using Google Trends 337-353. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Joanna Coast, Paul Mitchell, Ilias Goranitis. Ethics and Values in Welfarism and Extra-Welfarism 163-178. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Richard C. Bishop, Kevin J. Boyle. Reliability and Validity in Nonmarket Valuation 463-497. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Nicholas E. Flores. Conceptual Framework for Nonmarket Valuation 27-54. [[Crossref](#)]
135. S. Niggol Seo. The Theory of Public Goods and Their Efficient Provisions 33-64. [[Crossref](#)]
136. O. Al-Ubaydli, J.A. List. Field Experiments in Markets 271-307. [[Crossref](#)]
137. H. Spencer Banzhaf. 2017. Constructing Markets. *History of Political Economy* **49**:Supplement, 213-239. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Jonathan A. Parker, Nicholas S. Souleles. 2017. Reported Preference vs. Revealed Preference: Evidence from the Propensity to Spend Tax Rebates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
139. 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](#)]
140. Moritz A. Drupp, Jasper N. Meya, Stefan Baumgärtner, Martin F. Quaas. 2017. Economic Inequality and the Value of Nature. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
141. Phoebe Koundouri, Amerissa Giannouli, Ioannis Souliotis. An Integrated Approach for Sustainable Environmental and Socio-Economic Development Using Offshore Infrastructure 1581-1601. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Takehisa Kumakawa. 2017. Altruism and Willingness to Pay for Environmental Goods: A Contingent Valuation Study. *Journal of Geoscience and Environment Protection* **05**:06, 61-66. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Antonia Hadjimichael, Serni Morera, Lorenzo Benedetti, Tony Flameling, Lluís Corominas, Stefan Weijers, Joaquim Comas. 2016. Assessing Urban Wastewater System Upgrades Using Integrated Modeling, Life Cycle Analysis, and Shadow Pricing. *Environmental Science & Technology* **50**:23, 12548-12556. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Morris Altman. 2016. Is there a co-operative advantage? Experimental evidence on the economic and non-economic determinants of demand. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management* **4**:2, 66-75. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Joshua Farley, Alexey Voinov. 2016. Economics, socio-ecological resilience and ecosystem services. *Journal of Environmental Management* **183**, 389-398. [[Crossref](#)]

146. 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](#)]
147. Scott Farrow. 2016. Residual Risk Accounting: A Pilot Study. *Review of Income and Wealth* **62**:4, 775-784. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Lars Hein, Pete Roberts, Lucia Gonzalez. 2016. Valuing a Statistical Life Year in Relation to Clean Air. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management* **18**:04, 1650025. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Takehisa Kumakawa. 2016. Contingent valuation of scenic lakes. *Tourism Economics* **22**:5, 1121-1125. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Michael Jakob, Jan Christoph Steckel. 2016. Implications of climate change mitigation for sustainable development. *Environmental Research Letters* **11**:10, 104010. [[Crossref](#)]
151. 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](#)]
152. Dorte Gyrd-Hansen, Trine Kjær, Jytte Seested Nielsen. 2016. The value of mortality risk reductions. Pure altruism – a confounder?. *Journal of Health Economics* **49**, 184-192. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Niek Mouter, Caspar Chorus. 2016. Value of time – A citizen perspective. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **91**, 317-329. [[Crossref](#)]
154. C.D. Pérez-Blanco, G. Delacámara, C.M. Gómez. 2016. Revealing the willingness to pay for income insurance in agriculture. *Journal of Risk Research* **19**:7, 873-893. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Shannon K. Brewer, Ryan A. McManamay, Andrew D. Miller, Robert Mollenhauer, Thomas A. Worthington, Tom Arsuffi. 2016. Advancing Environmental Flow Science: Developing Frameworks for Altered Landscapes and Integrating Efforts Across Disciplines. *Environmental Management* **58**:2, 175-192. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Felix Arnold, Ronny Freier, Magdalena Pallauf, David Stadelmann. 2016. Voting for direct democratic participation: evidence from an initiative election. *International Tax and Public Finance* **23**:4, 716-740. [[Crossref](#)]
157. John C. Whitehead. 2016. Plausible responsiveness to scope in contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* **128**, 17-22. [[Crossref](#)]
158. 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](#)]
159. Erik Persson. 2016. What are the core ideas behind the Precautionary Principle?. *Science of The Total Environment* **557-558**, 134-141. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Matthew J. Beck, Simon Fifer, John M. Rose. 2016. Can you ever be certain? Reducing hypothetical bias in stated choice experiments via respondent reported choice certainty. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* **89**, 149-167. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Dani Aoun. 2016. Assessing the economic sustainability of managing protected areas using the CVM and CBA approaches. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* **27**:4, 374-389. [[Crossref](#)]
162. 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](#)]
163. 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](#)]
164. Naghmeh Niroomand, Glenn P. Jenkins. 2016. Estimating the Value of Life, Injury, and Travel Time Saved Using a Stated Preference Framework. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* **91**, 216-225. [[Crossref](#)]

165. Hans Peter Grüner, Daniel Muller. 2016. Measuring political information rents: Evidence from the European agricultural reform. *European Journal of Political Economy* **43**, 107-126. [[Crossref](#)]
166. M. Furno, F. Verneau, G. Sannino. 2016. Assessing hypothetical bias: An analysis beyond the mean of functional food. *Food Quality and Preference* **50**, 15-26. [[Crossref](#)]
167. 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](#)]
168. Malisa Djukic, Iljcho Jovanoski, Olja Munitlak Ivanovic, Milena Lazic, Dusko Bodroza. 2016. Cost-benefit analysis of an infrastructure project and a cost-reflective tariff: A case study for investment in wastewater treatment plant in Serbia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **59**, 1419-1425. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Dimitris Damigos, Maria Menegaki, Dimitris Kaliampakos. 2016. Monetizing the social benefits of landfill mining: Evidence from a Contingent Valuation survey in a rural area in Greece. *Waste Management* **51**, 119-129. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Susan Rose-Ackerman. 2016. The Limits of Cost/Benefit Analysis When Disasters Loom. *Global Policy* **7**, 56-66. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Abrar S. Chaudhury, Ariella Helfgott, Thomas F. Thornton, Chase Sova. 2016. Participatory adaptation planning and costing. Applications in agricultural adaptation in western Kenya. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* **21**:3, 301-322. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Stein T. Holden, Sosina Bezu. 2016. Preferences for land sales legalization and land values in Ethiopia. *Land Use Policy* **52**, 410-421. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Sheikh Mohammed Shariful Islam, Andreas Lechner, Uta Ferrari, Jochen Seissler, Rolf Holle, Louis W. Niessen. 2016. Mobile phone use and willingness to pay for SMS for diabetes in Bangladesh. *Journal of Public Health* **38**:1, 163-169. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Dereje Teklemariam, Hossein Azadi, Jan Nyssen, Mitiku Haile, Frank Witlox. 2016. How Sustainable Is Transnational Farmland Acquisition in Ethiopia? Lessons Learned from the Benishangul-Gumuz Region. *Sustainability* **8**:3, 213. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Karine Lamiraud, Robert Oxoby, Cam Donaldson. 2016. Incremental willingness to pay: a theoretical and empirical exposition. *Theory and Decision* **80**:1, 101-123. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Bradley J. Butterfield, Ashley L. Camhi, Rachel L. Rubin, Christopher R. Schwalm. Tradeoffs and Compatibilities Among Ecosystem Services 207-243. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Chuanwang Sun, Xiang Yuan, Meilian Xu. 2016. The public perceptions and willingness to pay: from the perspective of the smog crisis in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **112**, 1635-1644. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Monika Gupta. 2016. Willingness to pay for carbon tax: A study of Indian road passenger transport. *Transport Policy* **45**, 46-54. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Patrick Jochem, Claus Doll, Wolf Fichtner. 2016. External costs of electric vehicles. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **42**, 60-76. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Samuel Berlinski, Matias Busso. 2016. HOW MUCH ARE WE WILLING TO CONTRIBUTE FOR BETTER EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES? EVIDENCE FROM A SURVEY EXPERIMENT. *Economic Inquiry* **54**:1, 63-75. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Michael A. Clemens, Lant Pritchett. 2016. The New Economic Case for Migration Restrictions: An Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
182. Andrej Angelovski, Daniela Di Cagno, Werner GGth, Francesca Marazzi, Luca Panaccione. 2016. Voluntary Cooperation in Local Public Goods Provision: An Experimental Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]



183. Karine Lamiraud, Robert J. Oxoby, Cam Donaldson. 2016. Reference Dependence and Incremental WTP. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
184. Alexandre Mas, Amanda Pallais. 2016. Valuing Alternative Work Arrangements. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
185. Michael A. Clemens, Lant Pritchett. 2016. The New Case for Migration Restrictions: An Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
186. Dorte Gyrd-Hansen, Trine Kjaer, Jytte Seested Nielsen. 2016. The Value of Mortality Risk Reductions. Pure Altruism – A Confounder?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
187. LinnBrit Bakkenbll. 2016. Willingness to Pay and Accept for Hosting Olympic Games in Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
188. H. Spencer Banzhaf. 2016. Constructing Markets: Environmental Economics and the Contingent Valuation Controversy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
189. Billingsley Kaambwa, Stirling Bryan, Emma Frew, Emma Bray, Sheila Greenfield, Richard J McManus. 2016. What Drives Responses to Willingness-to-pay Questions? A Methodological Inquiry in the Context of Hypertension Self-management. *Journal of Health Economics and Outcomes Research* 4:2, 158-171. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Phoebe Koundouri, Amerissa Giannouli, Ioannis Souliotis. An Integrated Approach for Sustainable Environmental and Socio-Economic Development Using Offshore Infrastructure 44-64. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Anne E. Smith, Philip M. Wheeler, Magnus L. Johnson. 2016. Artificial reefs and marine protected areas: a study in willingness to pay to access Folkestone Marine Reserve, Barbados, West Indies. *PeerJ* 4, e2175. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Marcello Basili, Filippo Belloc. 2015. HOW TO MEASURE THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF VECTOR-BORNE DISEASES AT COUNTRY LEVEL. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 29:5, 896-916. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Luciana Londero Brandli, Pedro Domingos Marques Prietto, Alcindo Neckel. 2015. Estimating the Willingness to Pay for Improvement of an Urban Park in Southern Brazil Using the Contingent Valuation Method. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 141:4, 05014027. [[Crossref](#)]
194. 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](#)]
195. 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](#)]
196. André Monaco, Patrick Prouzet. Socio-Economic Evaluation of Marine Protected Areas 203-234. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Erwin Dekker. 2015. Two approaches to study the value of art and culture, and the emergence of a third. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 39:4, 309-326. [[Crossref](#)]
198. 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](#)]
199. Anthony Heyes, Steve Martin. 2015. NGO mission design. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 119, 197-210. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Nik Sawe, Brian Knutson. 2015. Neural valuation of environmental resources. *NeuroImage* 122, 87-95. [[Crossref](#)]
201. 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](#)]

202. Dani Aoun. 2015. Who pays more to preserve a natural reserve, visitors or locals? A confidence analysis of a contingent valuation application. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 17:4, 471-486. [[Crossref](#)]
203. 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](#)]
204. Ram Pandit, Maheshwar Dhakal, Maksym Polyakov. 2015. Valuing access to protected areas in Nepal: The case of Chitwan National Park. *Tourism Management* 50, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
205. 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](#)]
206. Stijn Neuteleers, Bart Engelen. 2015. Talking money: How market-based valuation can undermine environmental protection. *Ecological Economics* 117, 253-260. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Julia Martin-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](#)]
208. Anneleen Vandeplas, Bart Minten. 2015. Food quality in domestic markets of developing economies: a comparative study of two countries. *Agricultural Economics* 46:5, 617-628. [[Crossref](#)]
209. 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](#)]
210. 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](#)]
211. Henry M. Levin, Clive Belfield. 2015. Guiding the Development and Use of Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in Education. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* 8:3, 400-418. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Dorina Grazhdani. 2015. Contingent Valuation of Residents' Attitudes and Willingness-to-Pay for Non-point Source Pollution Control: A Case Study in AL-Prespa, Southeastern Albania. *Environmental Management* 56:1, 81-93. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Bruno Lanz, Allan Provins. 2015. Using discrete choice experiments to regulate the provision of water services: do status quo choices reflect preferences?. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 47:3, 300-324. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Paul M. Brown, Linda D. Cameron, Steven Ramondt. 2015. Sustainability of Behavioral Interventions: Beyond Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 22:3, 425-433. [[Crossref](#)]
215. 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](#)]
216. Ekin Birol, Bhushana Karandikar, Devesh Roy, Maximo Torero. 2015. Information, Certification and Demand for Food Safety: Evidence from an In-store Experiment in Mumbai. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 66:2, 470-491. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Linhai Wu, Hongsha Wang, Dian Zhu. 2015. Analysis of consumer demand for traceable pork in China based on a real choice experiment. *China Agricultural Economic Review* 7:2, 303-321. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Daowei Zhang, Anne Stenger. 2015. Value and valuation of forest ecosystem services. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 4:2, 129-140. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Raj Chetty. 2015. Behavioral Economics and Public Policy: A Pragmatic Perspective. *American Economic Review* 105:5, 1-33. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]



220. Luis Filipe Gomes Lopes, João Manuel R. dos Santos Bento, Artur F. Arede Correia Cristovão, Fernando Oliveira Baptista. 2015. Exploring the effect of land use on ecosystem services: The distributive issues. *Land Use Policy* **45**, 141-149. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Boaz Barak, David Katz. 2015. Valuing instream and riparian aspects of stream restoration – A willingness to tax approach. *Land Use Policy* **45**, 204-212. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Jonathan Anomaly. 2015. Public goods and government action. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* **14**:2, 109-128. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Kimberley Scharf, Sarah Smith. 2015. The price elasticity of charitable giving: does the form of tax relief matter?. *International Tax and Public Finance* **22**:2, 330-352. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Eric McDuffie, Nate Mallari, Dusty Pate, Becky Smith, Liseth Manrique Zeder. 2015. A Study of Ecosystem Services Provided by a Storm Water Retrofit System on a Public School Campus in Orange County, North Carolina. *Sustainability: The Journal of Record* **8**:2, 85-94. [[Crossref](#)]
225. David L. Dickinson, John C. Whitehead. 2015. DUBIOUS AND DUBIOUSER: CONTINGENT VALUATION AND THE TIME OF DAY. *Economic Inquiry* **53**:2, 1396-1400. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Bénédicte Rulleau, Hélène Rey-Valette, Cécile Hérivaux. 2015. Valuing welfare impacts of climate change in coastal areas: a French case study. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **58**:3, 482-494. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Juha Siikamäki, Douglas M. Larson. 2015. Finding Sensitivity to Scope in Nonmarket Valuation. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **30**:2, 333-349. [[Crossref](#)]
228. 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](#)]
229. Rex Baleña. 2015. Priority responses to the 2006 Guimaras oil spill, Philippines: Will history repeat itself?. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **103**, 42-55. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Nicolas Borzykowski, Andrea Baranzini, maradan david. 2015. On Scope Effects in Contingent Valuation: Does the Statistical Distributional Assumption Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
231. Karine Lamiraud, Robert J. Oxoby, Cam Donaldson. 2015. Incremental Willingness to Pay: A Theoretical and Empirical Exposition. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
232. Helene Naegele. 2015. Offset Credits in the EU ETS: A Quantile Estimation of Firm-Level Transaction Costs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
233. 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](#)]
234. 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](#)]
235. LinnBrit Bakkenbll, Alexander Dilger. 2015. The Willingness to Pay for a German Win of the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
236. Harold Levrel, Pedro Cabral, Océane Marcone, Rémi Mongrue. The Services Provided by Marine Ecosystems: Economic Assessments and Their Usages 1-51. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Basu Sudevi, K S Lokesh. 2014. Critical analysis of existing economic tools available for assessing river water quality. *International Journal of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering* **6**:11, 287-294. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Trudy Ann Cameron. 2014. Valuing Morbidity in Environmental Benefit-Cost Analysis. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **6**:1, 249-272. [[Crossref](#)]

239. 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](#)]
240. S. McDonough, W. Gallardo, H. Berg, N.V. Trai, N.Q. Yen. 2014. Wetland ecosystem service values and shrimp aquaculture relationships in Can Gio, Vietnam. *Ecological Indicators* **46**, 201-213. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Xiaohua Yu, Binjian Yan, Zhifeng Gao. 2014. Can willingness-to-pay values be manipulated? Evidence from an organic food experiment in China. *Agricultural Economics* **45**:S1, 119-127. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Agnieszka Zalejska-Jonsson. 2014. Stated WTP and rational WTP: Willingness to pay for green apartments in Sweden. *Sustainable Cities and Society* **13**, 46-56. [[Crossref](#)]
243. 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](#)]
244. Wendy Y. Chen, Joris Aertsens, Inge Liekens, Steven Broekx, Leo De Nocker. 2014. Impact of Perceived Importance of Ecosystem Services and Stated Financial Constraints on Willingness to Pay for Riparian Meadow Restoration in Flanders (Belgium). *Environmental Management* **54**:2, 346-359. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Marcus Sheaves, Justin Brookes, Rob Coles, Marnie Freckelton, Paul Groves, Ross Johnston, Pia Winberg. 2014. Repair and revitalisation of Australia's tropical estuaries and coastal wetlands: Opportunities and constraints for the reinstatement of lost function and productivity. *Marine Policy* **47**, 23-38. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Annika Batel, Jelena Basta, Peter Mackelworth. 2014. Valuing visitor willingness to pay for marine conservation – The case of the proposed Cres-Lošinj Marine Protected Area, Croatia. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **95**, 72-80. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Susanne Hoffmann, Francis G. Caro, Alison S. Gottlieb, Iris Kesternich, Joachim K. Winter. 2014. Contributions of Second Opinions, Outcome Forecasts, and Testimonials to Patient Decisions about Knee Replacement Surgery. *Medical Decision Making* **34**:5, 603-614. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Erling Moxnes. 2014. Discounting, climate and sustainability. *Ecological Economics* **102**, 158-166. [[Crossref](#)]
249. 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](#)]
250. Paul Ormerod. 2014. Evolutionary Approaches to Privatisation. *Economic Affairs* **34**:2, 156-168. [[Crossref](#)]
251. 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](#)]
252. Regis Terpend, Thomas F. Gattiker, Scott E. Lowe. 2014. Electronic Textbooks: Antecedents of Students' Adoption and Learning Outcomes. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education* **12**:2, 149-173. [[Crossref](#)]
253. L. MOUYSET, L. DOYEN, F. JIGUET. 2014. From Population Viability Analysis to Coviability of Farmland Biodiversity and Agriculture. *Conservation Biology* **28**:1, 187-201. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Emmanouil Mentzakis, Mandy Ryan, Paul McNamee. 2014. Modelling Heterogeneity and Uncertainty in Contingent Valuation: an Application to the Valuation of Informal Care. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **61**:1, 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
255. John B. Loomis. Economic Valuation: Concepts and Empirical Methods 973-992. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Eirik Romstad. The Economics of Eutrophication 45-53. [[Crossref](#)]

257. D. Blandford, J.B. Braden, J.S. Shortle. Economics of Natural Resources and Environment in Agriculture 18-34. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Siyuan Yang, Bin Chen. 2014. Environmental Impact of Manwan Hydropower Plant on River Ecosystem Service. *Energy Procedia* **61**, 2721-2724. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Ulrich Frey. Value Assignments in Experimental Environmental Ethics 112-129. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Jens Hainmueller, Daniel J. Hopkins, Teppei Yamamoto. 2014. Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments. *Political Analysis* **22**:1, 1-30. [[Crossref](#)]
261. 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](#)]
262. Olivier Gergaud, Victor A. Ginsburgh. 2014. On the Economic Effects of Music and Opera Festivals. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
263. Thierry Kalisa. 2014. Rural Electrification in Rwanda: A Measure of Willingness to Contribute Time and Money. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
264. Felix Arnold, Ronny Freier, Magdalena Pallauf, David Stadelmann. 2014. Voting for Direct Democracy: Evidence from a Unique Popular Initiative in Bavaria. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
265. Sander Van Cranenburgh, Caspar G. Chorus, Bert van Wee. 2014. Simulation Study on Impacts of High Aviation Carbon Taxes on Tourism. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* **2449**:1, 64-71. [[Crossref](#)]
266. 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](#)]
267. Mary Riddel. 2014. How Do Long-Shot Outcomes Affect Preferences for Climate-Change Mitigation?. *Southern Economic Journal* **80**:3, 752-771. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Vincent Banos, Bénédicte Rulleau. 2014. Regards croisés sur l'évaluation économique du patrimoine naturel : de la ressource d'autorité à la petite fabrique des valeurs ?. *Annales de géographie* **699**:5, 1193. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Stefan Gelcich, Francisca Amar, Abel Valdebenito, Juan Carlos Castilla, Miriam Fernandez, Cecilia Godoy, Duan Biggs. 2013. Financing Marine Protected Areas Through Visitor Fees: Insights from Tourists Willingness to Pay in Chile. *AMBIO* **42**:8, 975-984. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Stefanie Engel, Marleen Schaefer. 2013. Ecosystem services—a useful concept for addressing water challenges?. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **5**:6, 696-707. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Stéphane Luchini, Verity Watson. 2013. Uncertainty and framing in a valuation task. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **39**, 204-214. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Godstime K. James, Jimmy O. Adegoke, Sylvester Osagie, Saba Ekechukwu, Peter Nwilo, Joseph Akinyede. 2013. Social valuation of mangroves in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* **9**:4, 311-323. [[Crossref](#)]
273. 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](#)]
274. Matthew Tyler James Brownlee, Jeffrey C. Hallo, Brett A. Wright, Dewayne Moore, Robert B. Powell. 2013. Visiting a Climate-Influenced National Park: The Stability of Climate Change Perceptions. *Environmental Management* **52**:5, 1132-1148. [[Crossref](#)]
275. 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](#)]

276. Francisco Javier Amador, Rosa Marina González, Francisco Javier Ramos-Real. 2013. Supplier choice and WTP for electricity attributes in an emerging market: The role of perceived past experience, environmental concern and energy saving behavior. *Energy Economics* **40**, 953-966. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Philip Roscoe. 2013. On the Possibility of Organ Markets and the Performativity of Economics. *Journal of Cultural Economy* **6**:4, 386-401. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Kevin Griffith, Lawrence Scheier. 2013. Did We Get Our Money's Worth? Bridging Economic and Behavioral Measures of Program Success in Adolescent Drug Prevention. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **10**:11, 5908-5935. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Ingrid Woolard, Murray Leibbrandt, Jane Fortson. Social Programs and Transfers: Are We Learning? 361-389. [[Crossref](#)]
280. V. Lantz, Peter C. Boxall, Mike Kennedy, Jeff Wilson. 2013. The valuation of wetland conservation in an urban/peri urban watershed. *Regional Environmental Change* **13**:5, 939-953. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Clifford P. Hutt, Kevin M. Hunt, J. Warren Schlechte, David L. Buckmeier. 2013. Effects of Catfish Angler Catch-Related Attitudes on Fishing Trip Preferences. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* **33**:5, 965-976. [[Crossref](#)]
282. David Stevenson. 2013. Reaching a 'legitimate' value? A contingent valuation study of the National Galleries of Scotland. *Museum Management and Curatorship* **28**:4, 377-393. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Panji Fortuna Hadisoemarto, Marcia C. Castro. 2013. Public Acceptance and Willingness-to-Pay for a Future Dengue Vaccine: A Community-Based Survey in Bandung, Indonesia. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* **7**:9, e2427. [[Crossref](#)]
284. W. Douglass Shaw, Marta Wlodarz. 2013. Ecosystems, Ecological Restoration, and Economics: Does Habitat or Resource Equivalency Analysis Mean Other Economic Valuation Methods Are Not Needed?. *AMBIO* **42**:5, 628-643. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Alan B. Krueger, Ilyana Kuziemko. 2013. The demand for health insurance among uninsured Americans: Results of a survey experiment and implications for policy. *Journal of Health Economics* **32**:5, 780-793. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Angela Robinson, Dorte Gyrd-Hansen, Philomena Bacon, Rachel Baker, Mark Pennington, Cam Donaldson. 2013. Estimating a WTP-based value of a QALY: The 'chained' approach. *Social Science & Medicine* **92**, 92-104. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Leonardo Becchetti, Stefano Castriota, Melania Michetti. 2013. The effect of fair trade affiliation on child schooling: evidence from a sample of Chilean honey producers. *Applied Economics* **45**:25, 3552-3563. [[Crossref](#)]
288. David Hoyos, Pere Riera. 2013. Convergent validity between revealed and stated recreation demand data: Some empirical evidence from the Basque Country, Spain. *Journal of Forest Economics* **19**:3, 234-248. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Cass R. Sunstein. 2013. The value of a statistical life: some clarifications and puzzles. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* **4**:2, 237-261. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Yves Schneider, Peter Zweifel. 2013. Spatial effects in willingness to pay for avoiding nuclear risks. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics* **149**:3, 357-379. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Knut Veisten, Stefan Flügel, Luis I. Rizzi, Juan de Dios Ortúzar, Rune Elvik. 2013. Valuing casualty risk reductions from estimated baseline risk. *Research in Transportation Economics* **43**:1, 50-61. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Alexander Sarris. 2013. Weather index insurance for agricultural development: introduction and overview. *Agricultural Economics* **44**:4-5, 381-384. [[Crossref](#)]

293. Ruth Vargas Hill, John Hoddinott, Neha Kumar. 2013. Adoption of weather-index insurance: learning from willingness to pay among a panel of households in rural Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics* 44:4-5, 385-398. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Leonardo Becchetti, Alessandra Pelloni. 2013. What are we learning from the life satisfaction literature?. *International Review of Economics* 60:2, 113-155. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Jeroen F. Admiraal, Ada Wossink, Wouter T. de Groot, Geert R. de Snoo. 2013. More than total economic value: How to combine economic valuation of biodiversity with ecological resilience. *Ecological Economics* 89, 115-122. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Martin Halla, Friedrich G. Schneider, Alexander F. Wagner. 2013. Satisfaction with democracy and collective action problems: the case of the environment. *Public Choice* 155:1-2, 109-137. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Gwen Arnold. 2013. Use of monetary wetland value estimates by EPA Clean Water Act Section 404 regulators. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* 21:2, 117-129. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Matthew J. Kotchen, Kevin J. Boyle, Anthony A. Leiserowitz. 2013. Willingness-to-pay and policy-instrument choice for climate-change policy in the United States. *Energy Policy* 55, 617-625. [[Crossref](#)]
299. BENJAMIN SHILLER, JOEL WALDFOGEL. 2013. THE CHALLENGE OF REVENUE SHARING WITH BUNDLED PRICING: AN APPLICATION TO MUSIC. *Economic Inquiry* 51:2, 1155-1165. [[Crossref](#)]
300. KRISTEN L. KOVALSKY, JAYSON L. LUSK. 2013. Do Consumers Really Know How Much They Are Willing to Pay?. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 47:1, 98-127. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Ronaldo Seroa da Motta, Ramon Arigoni Ortiz. 2013. Uma análise de custo-benefício do museu da imagem e do som da cidade do Rio de Janeiro. *Revista de Economia Contemporânea* 17:1, 177-194. [[Crossref](#)]
302. James N. Sanchirico, Daniel K. Lew, Alan C. Haynie, David M. Kling, David F. Layton. 2013. Conservation values in marine ecosystem-based management. *Marine Policy* 38, 523-530. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Douglas MacLean. Life, Value of . [[Crossref](#)]
304. Paul A. Raschky, Reimund Schwarze, Manijeh Schwindt, Ferdinand Zahn. 2013. Uncertainty of Governmental Relief and the Crowding out of Flood Insurance. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 54:2, 179-200. [[Crossref](#)]
305. David Harvey, Carmen Hubbard. 2013. Reconsidering the political economy of farm animal welfare: An anatomy of market failure. *Food Policy* 38, 105-114. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Ryan Trenholm, Van Lantz, Roberto Martínez-Españeira, Shawn Little. 2013. Cost-benefit analysis of riparian protection in an eastern Canadian watershed. *Journal of Environmental Management* 116, 81-94. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Konstantinos Pouliakas, Ioannis Theodossiou. 2013. THE ECONOMICS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW OF THE THEORY AND POLICY. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 27:1, 167-208. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Choong-Ki Lee, James W. Mjelde, Tae-Kyun Kim. 2013. Estimating the Effects of Different Admission Fees on Revenues for a Mega-Event Using a Contingent Valuation Method. *Tourism Economics* 19:1, 147-159. [[Crossref](#)]
309. J.C. Whitehead, T.C. Haab. Contingent Valuation Method 334-341. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Robert Mendelsohn, Seth Binder. Economic Value of Biodiversity, Measurements of 55-58. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Marc N. Conte. Valuing Ecosystem Services 314-326. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Matthias Schündeln. 2013. Ethnic Heterogeneity and the Private Provision of Public Goods. *Journal of Development Studies* 49:1, 36-55. [[Crossref](#)]

313. L. Mouysset, L. Doyen, F. Jiguet. 2013. How does economic risk aversion affect biodiversity?. *Ecological Applications* **23**:1, 96-109. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Jonathan Anomaly. 2013. Public Goods and Government Action. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
315. Corey Allan, Arthur Grimes, Suzi Kerr. 2013. Value and Culture. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
316. Anna Alberini, Silvia Banfi, Celine Ramseier. 2013. Energy Efficiency Investments in the Home: Swiss Homeowners and Expectations about Future Energy Prices. *The Energy Journal* **34**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
317. Jon R. Neill. 2012. Implications of a Weaker Form of Complementarity. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* **3**:4, 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Joanna Burger, Michael Gochfeld, Christian Jeitner, Taryn Pittfield, Meredith Marchioni. 2012. Frequency and Rates of Outdoor Activities, and Perceptions of Places to Perform these Activities by Native Americans and Caucasians Interviewed in Tennessee. *EcoHealth* **9**:4, 399-410. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Quoc Tuan Vo, C. Kuenzer, Quang Minh Vo, F. Moder, N. Oppelt. 2012. Review of valuation methods for mangrove ecosystem services. *Ecological Indicators* **23**, 431-446. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Sonja Fagernäs, Panu Pelkonen. 2012. Preferences and skills of Indian public sector teachers. *IZA Journal of Labor & Development* **1**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
321. Catherine L. Kling,, Daniel J. Phaneuf,, Jinhua Zhao. 2012. From Exxon to BP: Has Some Number Become Better than No Number?. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **26**:4, 3-26. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
322. Jerry Hausman. 2012. Contingent Valuation: From Dubious to Hopeless. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **26**:4, 43-56. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
323. Christian A. Vossler,, Maurice Doyon,, Daniel Rondeau. 2012. Truth in Consequentiality: Theory and Field Evidence on Discrete Choice Experiments. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **4**:4, 145-171. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
324. Andrea Báez-Montenegro, Ana María Bedate, Luis César Herrero, Jose Ángel Sanz. 2012. Inhabitants' Willingness to Pay for Cultural Heritage: A Case Study in Valdivia, Chile, Using Contingent Valuation. *Journal of Applied Economics* **15**:2, 235-258. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Ivan Diaz-Rainey, Dionisia Tzavara. 2012. Financing the decarbonized energy system through green electricity tariffs: A diffusion model of an induced consumer environmental market. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **79**:9, 1693-1704. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Ivo Vlaev. 2012. How different are real and hypothetical decisions? Overestimation, contrast and assimilation in social interaction. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **33**:5, 963-972. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Scott Doyle, Andrew Lloyd, Julie Birt, Bradley Curtis, Shehzad Ali, Kecia Godbey, Justo Sierra-Johnson, Jason C.G. Halford. 2012. Willingness to Pay for Obesity Pharmacotherapy. *Obesity* **20**:10, 2019-2026. [[Crossref](#)]
328. KRISTY WALLMO, DANIEL K. LEW. 2012. Public Willingness to Pay for Recovering and Downlisting Threatened and Endangered Marine Species. *Conservation Biology* **26**:5, 830-839. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Luis César Herrero, José Ángel Sanz, Ana Bedate, María José Barrio. 2012. Who Pays More for a Cultural Festival, Tourists or Locals? A Certainty Analysis of a Contingent Valuation Application. *International Journal of Tourism Research* **14**:5, 495-512. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Kyriaki Remoundou, Yiannis Kountouris, Phoebe Koundouri. 2012. Is the value of an environmental public good sensitive to the providing institution?. *Resource and Energy Economics* **34**:3, 381-395. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Nick K T Yip. 2012. Making qualitative decisions from quantitative cues: Understanding the customers' willingness to pay. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management* **11**:5, 562-566. [[Crossref](#)]



332. Qian Zhang, Shi-you Qu. Ecological value assessment and compensation in the process of coal resources development 1658-1665. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Andrea Báez, Luis César Herrero. 2012. Using contingent valuation and cost-benefit analysis to design a policy for restoring cultural heritage. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* **13**:3, 235-245. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Kris A. Johnson, Stephen Polasky, Erik Nelson, Derric Pennington. 2012. Uncertainty in ecosystem services valuation and implications for assessing land use tradeoffs: An agricultural case study in the Minnesota River Basin. *Ecological Economics* **79**, 71-79. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Eduard Ariza, Ramon Ballester, Ricard Rigall-I-Torrent, Albert Saló, Elisabet Roca, Miriam Villares, José A. Jiménez, Rafael Sardá. 2012. On the relationship between quality, users' perception and economic valuation in NW Mediterranean beaches. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **63**, 55-66. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Anna Alberini. 2012. Repeated questioning in choice experiments: are we improving statistical efficiency or getting respondents confused?. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **1**:2, 216-233. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Stefania Tonin, Anna Alberini, Margherita Turvani. 2012. The Value of Reducing Cancer Risks at Contaminated Sites: Are More Knowledgeable People Willing to Pay More?. *Risk Analysis* **32**:7, 1157-1182. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Joanna Burger. 2012. Perceptions of goods, services and eco-cultural attributes of Native Americans and Caucasians in Idaho. *Remediation Journal* **22**:3, 105-121. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Lorenz Probst, Elysée Houedjofonon, Hayford Mensah Ayerakwa, Rainer Haas. 2012. Will they buy it? The potential for marketing organic vegetables in the food vending sector to strengthen vegetable safety: A choice experiment study in three West African cities. *Food Policy* **37**:3, 296-308. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Elena Ojea, Julia Martin-Ortega, Aline Chiabai. 2012. Defining and classifying ecosystem services for economic valuation: the case of forest water services. *Environmental Science & Policy* **19-20**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Nikita Lyssenko, Roberto Martínez-Espiñeira. 2012. Respondent uncertainty in contingent valuation: the case of whale conservation in Newfoundland and Labrador. *Applied Economics* **44**:15, 1911-1930. [[Crossref](#)]
342. C. Almansa, J. Calatrava, J.M. Martínez-Paz. 2012. Extending the framework of the economic evaluation of erosion control actions in Mediterranean basins. *Land Use Policy* **29**:2, 294-308. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Jessica E. Lamond, Ian Bateman. Methods for Valuing Preferences for Environmental and Natural Resources: An Overview 87-98. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Alfred Endres, Bianca Rundshagen. 2012. Escalating penalties: a supergame approach. *Economics of Governance* **13**:1, 29-49. [[Crossref](#)]
345. M. Fleurbaey. 2012. Beyond GDP: The Quest for a Measure of Social Welfare. Part I. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :2, 67-93. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Wendy Y. Chen, C.Y. Jim. 2012. Contingent valuation of ecotourism development in country parks in the urban shadow. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* **19**:1, 44-53. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Stefan Åström, Maria Lindblad, Jenny Westerdahl, Tomas Rydberg. Are Chemicals in Products Good or Bad for the Society? – An Economic Perspective 109-136. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Maria Iannario, Domenico Piccolo. Investigating and modelling the perception of economic security in the Survey of Household Income and Wealth 237-244. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Georgios Tentes, Dimitrios Damigos. 2012. The Lost Value of Groundwater: The Case of Asopos River Basin in Central Greece. *Water Resources Management* **26**:1, 147-164. [[Crossref](#)]

350. Michael Schmidthaler, Johannes Reichl, Friedrich Schneider. 2012. Der volkswirtschaftliche Verlust durch Stromausfälle: Eine empirische Analyse für Haushalte, Unternehmen und den öffentlichen Sektor. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 13:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
351. Alicia S. T. Robbins, Jean M. Daniels. 2012. Restoration and Economics: A Union Waiting to Happen?. *Restoration Ecology* 20:1, 10-17. [[Crossref](#)]
352. W. Douglass Shaw, Marta Wlodarz. 2012. Ecosystems, Ecological Restoration and Economics: Does Habitat and Resource Equivalency Analysis Mean Other Economic Valuation Methods Are Not Needed?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
353. Lapo Filistrucchi, Damien Geradin, Eric E.C. van Damme. 2012. Identifying Two-Sided Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
354. Daniel R. Petrolia, Matthew G. Interis, Michael K. Hidrue, Joonghyun Hwang, Ross G. Moore, GwanSeon Kim. 2012. America's Wetland? A National Survey of Willingness to Pay for Restoration of Louisiana's Coastal Wetlands. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
355. Min Jeong Kang, Colin F. Camerer. 2012. fMRI Evidence of a Hot-Cold Empathy Gap in Hypothetical and Real Aversive Choices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
356. Emanuela Randon. 2012. Measuring Consumption Externalities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
357. Leonardo Becchetti, Stefano Castriota, Melania Michetti. 2012. The Effect of Fair Trade Affiliation on Child Schooling: Evidence from a Sample of Chilean Honey Producers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
358. Nathalie Dumax, Anne Rozan. 2011. Using an adapted HEP to assess environmental cost. *Ecological Economics* 72, 53-59. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Ben Shiller, Joel Waldfogel. 2011. Music for a Song: An Empirical Look at Uniform Pricing and Its Alternatives. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* 59:4, 630-660. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Joanna Burger, Michael Gochfeld, Christian Jeitner, Taryn Pittfield. 2011. Comparing perceptions of the important environmental characteristics of the places people engage in consumptive, non-consumptive and spiritual activities. *Journal of Risk Research* 14:10, 1219-1236. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Yiannis Kountouris, Kyriaki Remoundou. 2011. Valuing the Welfare Cost of Forest Fires: a Life Satisfaction Approach. *Kyklos* 64:4, 556-578. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Mark S. Rosentraub, John F. Brennan. 2011. Contingent Valuation and Estimates of Residents' Support for Revitalization Plans. *The American Review of Public Administration* 41:6, 654-669. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Lisa Wainger, Marisa Mazzotta. 2011. Realizing the Potential of Ecosystem Services: A Framework for Relating Ecological Changes to Economic Benefits. *Environmental Management* 48:4, 710-733. [[Crossref](#)]
364. O. Coulibaly, T. Nouhoheflin, C. C. Aitchedji, A. J. Cherry, P. Adegbola. 2011. Consumers' Perceptions and Willingness to Pay for Organically Grown Vegetables. *International Journal of Vegetable Science* 17:4, 349-362. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Elena Ojea, Maria L. Loureiro. 2011. Identifying the scope effect on a meta-analysis of biodiversity valuation studies. *Resource and Energy Economics* 33:3, 706-724. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Cheryl C. Cusiwan-Launio, Teruyuki Shinbo, Yoshinori Morooka. 2011. Island Villagers' Willingness to Work or Pay for Sustainability of a Marine Fishery Reserve: Case of San Miguel Island, Philippines. *Coastal Management* 39:5, 459-477. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Felix Oberender. 2011. Organ donation in Australia. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health* 47:9, 637-641. [[Crossref](#)]



368. LEONARDO BECCHETTI, MARIA MELODY GARCIA, GIOVANNI TROVATO. 2011. Credit Rationing and Credit View: Empirical Evidence from an Ethical Bank in Italy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 43:6, 1217-1245. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Roberto D. Ponce, Felipe Vásquez, Alejandra Stehr, Patrick Debels, Carlos Orihuela. 2011. Estimating the Economic Value of Landscape Losses Due to Flooding by Hydropower Plants in the Chilean Patagonia. *Water Resources Management* 25:10, 2449-2466. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Kristy Wallmo, Daniel K. Lew. 2011. Valuing improvements to threatened and endangered marine species: An application of stated preference choice experiments. *Journal of Environmental Management* 92:7, 1793-1801. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Christos Vlachokostas, Charisios Achillas, Theodora Slini, Nicolas Moussiopoulos, Georgios Baniyas, Ioannis Dimitrakis. 2011. Willingness to pay for reducing the risk of premature mortality attributed to air pollution: a contingent valuation study for Greece. *Atmospheric Pollution Research* 2:3, 275-282. [[Crossref](#)]
372. . References 551-579. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Agha Ali Akram, Sheila M. Olmstead. 2011. The Value of Household Water Service Quality in Lahore, Pakistan. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 49:2, 173-198. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Luis César Herrero, José ángel Sanz, María Devesa. 2011. Measuring the Economic Value and Social Viability of a Cultural Festival as a Tourism Prototype. *Tourism Economics* 17:3, 639-653. [[Crossref](#)]
375. William L. Huth, O. Ashton Morgan. 2011. Measuring the Willingness to Pay for Cave Diving. *Marine Resource Economics* 26:2, 151-166. [[Crossref](#)]
376. Matthew Walker, Bob Heere. 2011. Consumer Attitudes toward Responsible Entities in Sport (CARES): Scale development and model testing. *Sport Management Review* 14:2, 153-166. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Marion Fourcade. 2011. Cents and Sensibility: Economic Valuation and the Nature of "Nature". *American Journal of Sociology* 116:6, 1721-77. [[Crossref](#)]
378. David Lehrer, Nir Becker, Pua Bar (Kutiel). 2011. The economic impact of the invasion of *Acacia saligna* in Israel. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* 18:2, 118-127. [[Crossref](#)]
379. Andreia C. Santos, Jennifer A. Roberts, Mauricio L. Barreto, Sandy Cairncross. 2011. Demand for sanitation in Salvador, Brazil: A hybrid choice approach. *Social Science & Medicine* 72:8, 1325-1332. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Sandra Notaro, Alessandro Paletto. 2011. Links between Mountain Communities and Environmental Services in the Italian Alps. *Sociologia Ruralis* 51:2, 137-157. [[Crossref](#)]
381. Ye Li, Eric J. Johnson, Lisa Zaval. 2011. Local Warming. *Psychological Science* 22:4, 454-459. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Nigel Haggan. "You don't know what you've got 'Til it's Gone" 224-246. [[Crossref](#)]
383. Therese Lindahl, Tore Söderqvist. 2011. Who wants to save the Baltic Sea when the success is uncertain?. *Regional Environmental Change* 11:1, 133-147. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Nicolas Jacquemet, Alexander G. James, Stéphane Luchini, Jason F. Shogren. 2011. Social Psychology and Environmental Economics: A New Look at ex ante Corrections of Biased Preference Evaluation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 48:3, 413-433. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Peter Grösche, Carsten Schröder. 2011. Eliciting public support for greening the electricity mix using random parameter techniques. *Energy Economics* 33:2, 363-370. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Tom Wilkenning. 2011. Experimental Economics: Rethinking the Rules. *Economic Record* 87:276, 178-180. [[Crossref](#)]

387. David B. Montgomery, Catherine A. Ramus. 2011. Calibrating MBA Job Preferences for the 21st Century. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 10:1, 9-26. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Xuewang Dong, Jie Zhang, Ruizhi Zhi, Shi'en Zhong, Min Li. 2011. Measuring recreational value of world heritage sites based on contingent valuation method: A case study of Jiuzhaigou. *Chinese Geographical Science* 21:1, 119-128. [[Crossref](#)]
389. L. Mouysset, L. Doyen, F. Jiguet, G. Allaire, F. Leger. 2011. Bio economic modeling for a sustainable management of biodiversity in agricultural lands. *Ecological Economics* 70:4, 617-626. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Robert Metcalfe, Nattavudh Powdthavee, Paul Dolan. 2011. Destruction and Distress: Using a Quasi-Experiment to Show the Effects of the September 11 Attacks on Mental Well-Being in the United Kingdom. *The Economic Journal* 121:550, F81-F103. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Anthony Heyes, Sandeep Kapur. 2011. Regulating altruistic agents. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* 44:1, 227-246. [[Crossref](#)]
392. John B. Loomis. 2011. Incorporating Distributional Issues into Benefit Cost Analysis: Why, How, and Two Empirical Examples Using Non-market Valuation. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 2:1, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Wallace E. Huffman, Matthew Rousu, Jason F. Shogren, Abebayehu Tegene. The Effects of Prior Beliefs and Learning on Consumers' Acceptance of Genetically Modified Foods: Implications for Diet and Behavior 725-739. [[Crossref](#)]
394. Joanna Burger. Science and Stakeholders: A Synthesis 427-442. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Ekin Birol, Phoebe Koundouri, Yiannis Koundouris. Water Resources Management and Wetland Conservation: The Case of Akrotiri Wetland in Cyprus 141-155. [[Crossref](#)]
396. María Molinos-Senante, Francesc Hernández-Sancho, Ramón Sala-Garrido. Feasibility Studies for Water Reuse Projects: Economic Valuation of Environmental Benefits 181-190. [[Crossref](#)]
397. Gili Koniak, Imanuel Noy-Meir, Avi Perevolotsky. 2011. Modelling dynamics of ecosystem services basket in Mediterranean landscapes: a tool for rational management. *Landscape Ecology* 26:1, 109-124. [[Crossref](#)]
398. A. Ahuja, M. Kremer, A.P. Zwane. Providing Clean Water: Evidence from Randomized Evaluations 67-77. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Jytte Seested Nielsen. 2011. Use of the Internet for willingness-to-pay surveys. *Resource and Energy Economics* 33:1, 119-129. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Tyron J. Venn, David E. Calkin. 2011. Accommodating non-market values in evaluation of wildfire management in the United States: challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 20:3, 327. [[Crossref](#)]
401. PHILIP H. BROWN, THOMAS HUFF. 2011. WILLINGNESS TO PAY IN CHINA'S NEW COOPERATIVE MEDICAL SYSTEM. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 29:1, 88-100. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Peter Grösche, Carsten Schröder. 2011. Eliciting Public Support for Greening the Electricity Mix Using Random Parameter Techniques. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
403. Sonja Fagnäs, Panu Pelkonen. 2011. Whether to Hire Local Contract Teachers? Trade-Off between Skills and Preferences in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
404. Sangamitra Ramachander. 2011. The Price Sensitivity of Mobile Use Among Low Income Households in Six Countries of Asia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
405. Anneleen Vandeplas, Bart Minten. 2011. Food Quality in Domestic Markets of Developing Economies: A Comparative Study of Two Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

406. Edward Mabaya, Danie Jordaan, Patrick Malope, Milly Monkhei, Jose Jackson. 2010. Attribute preferences and willingness to pay for fortified cereal foods in Botswana. *Agrekon* 49:4, 459-483. [[Crossref](#)]
407. Uta Sauer, Anke Fischer. 2010. Willingness to pay, attitudes and fundamental values — On the cognitive context of public preferences for diversity in agricultural landscapes. *Ecological Economics* 70:1, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Ty Henderson, Neeraj Arora. 2010. Promoting Brands across Categories with a Social Cause: Implementing Effective Embedded Premium Programs. *Journal of Marketing* 74:6, 41-60. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Joanna Burger, Michael Gochfeld. 2010. Gender Differences in Resource Use and Evaluation of Attributes of Places of Resource Use by Native Americans and Caucasians from Western Idaho: Relevance to Risk Evaluations. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A* 73:24, 1655-1664. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Bruno S. Frey, Simon Luechinger, Alois Stutzer. 2010. The Life Satisfaction Approach to Environmental Valuation. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 2:1, 139-160. [[Crossref](#)]
411. María Molinos-Senante, Francesc Hernández-Sancho, Ramón Sala-Garrido. 2010. Economic feasibility study for wastewater treatment: A cost-benefit analysis. *Science of The Total Environment* 408:20, 4396-4402. [[Crossref](#)]
412. David Blandford. 2010. Presidential Address: The Visible or Invisible Hand? The Balance Between Markets and Regulation in Agricultural Policy. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 61:3, 459-479. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Harvey Goldstein, Gunther Maier. 2010. The Use and Valuation of Journals in Planning Scholarship: Peer Assessment versus Impact Factors. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 30:1, 66-75. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Beilei Cai, Trudy Ann Cameron, Geoffrey R. Gerdes. 2010. Distributional Preferences and the Incidence of Costs and Benefits in Climate Change Policy. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 46:4, 429-458. [[Crossref](#)]
415. David A. Dana. 2010. Valuing Foreign Lives and Settlements. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 1:1, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
416. Mikael Svensson, Maria Vredin Johansson. 2010. Willingness to pay for private and public road safety in stated preference studies: Why the difference?. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 42:4, 1205-1212. [[Crossref](#)]
417. David A. Hensher. 2010. Hypothetical bias, choice experiments and willingness to pay. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 44:6, 735-752. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Arnaud Dupuy, Wendy Smits. 2010. How large is the compensating wage differential for R&D workers?. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 19:5, 423-436. [[Crossref](#)]
419. Xuewang Dong, Ruizhi Zhi. Valuing recreational benefits of environmental amenity based on contingent valuation method: A case study of Jiuzhaigou 91-94. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Anni Huhtala. 2010. Income effects and the inconvenience of private provision of public goods for bads: The case of recycling in Finland. *Ecological Economics* 69:8, 1675-1681. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Jiřina Jílková, Robert Holländer, Linda Kochmann, Jan Slavík, Lenka Slavíková. 2010. Economic Valuation of Environmental Resources and its Use in Local Policy Decision-Making: A Comparative Czech-German Border Study. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 12:3, 299-309. [[Crossref](#)]
422. James Francis Casey, Christopher Brown, Peter Schuhmann. 2010. Are tourists willing to pay additional fees to protect corals in Mexico?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18:4, 557-573. [[Crossref](#)]

423. Thomas Broberg. 2010. Income Treatment Effects in Contingent Valuation: The Case of the Swedish Predator Policy. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 46:1, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Peter Howley, Stephen Hynes, Cathal O'Donoghue. 2010. The citizen versus consumer distinction: An exploration of individuals' preferences in Contingent Valuation studies. *Ecological Economics* 69:7, 1524-1531. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Robert Hahn, Peter Passell. 2010. The economics of allowing more U.S. oil drilling. *Energy Economics* 32:3, 638-650. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Elena Ojea, Maria L. Loureiro. 2010. Valuing the recovery of overexploited fish stocks in the context of existence and option values. *Marine Policy* 34:3, 514-521. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Pieter Serneels, Jose G Montalvo, Gunilla Pettersson, Tomas Lievens, Jean Damascene Butera, Aklilu Kidanu. 2010. Who wants to work in a rural health post? The role of intrinsic motivation, rural background and faith-based institutions in Ethiopia and Rwanda. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 88:5, 342-349. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Nir Becker, Yael Choreshe, Ofer Bahat, Moshe Inbar. 2010. Cost benefit analysis of conservation efforts to preserve an endangered species: The Griffon Vulture (*Gyps fulvus*) in Israel. *Journal of Bioeconomics* 12:1, 55-70. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Susana Ferreira, Louise Gallagher. 2010. Protest responses and community attitudes toward accepting compensation to host waste disposal infrastructure. *Land Use Policy* 27:2, 638-652. [[Crossref](#)]
430. W. David Bradford, James Zoller, Gerard A. Silvestri. 2010. Estimating the Effect of Individual Time Preferences on the Use of Disease Screening. *Southern Economic Journal* 76:4, 1005-1031. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Paolo Rosato, Anna Alberini, Valentina Zanatta, Margaretha Breil. 2010. Redeveloping derelict and underused historic city areas: evidence from a survey of real estate developers. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 53:2, 257-281. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Adam Abramson, Alon Tal, Nir Becker, Nader El-Khateeb, Lior Asaf, Amjad Assi, Eilon Adar. 2010. Stream restoration as a basis for Israeli-Palestinian cooperation: a comparative analysis of two transboundary streams. *International Journal of River Basin Management* 8:1, 39-53. [[Crossref](#)]
433. Rajiv K. Sinha, Fernando S. Machado, Collin Sellman. 2010. Don't Think Twice, It's All Right: Music Piracy and Pricing in a DRM-Free Environment. *Journal of Marketing* 74:2, 40-54. [[Crossref](#)]
434. Pasquale L. Scandizzo, Marco Ventura. 2010. Estimating the value of natural resources under legal constraints: an application to marine resources in Sicily. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:4, 317-323. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Lint Barrage, Min Sok Lee. 2010. A penny for your thoughts: Inducing truth-telling in stated preference elicitation. *Economics Letters* 106:2, 140-142. [[Crossref](#)]
436. Martin J. Osborne, Matthew A. Turner. 2010. Cost Benefit Analyses versus Referenda. *Journal of Political Economy* 118:1, 156-187. [[Crossref](#)]
437. Eirik Romstad. 2010. Multifunctional Rural Land Management: Economics and Policies. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 61:1, 202-204. [[Crossref](#)]
438. C. Martijn Heide, Neil A. Powe, Ståle Navrud. Economic Principles of Monetary Valuation in Evaluation Studies 295-317. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Jeff Dominitz, Arthur van Soest. Survey Data, Analysis of 314-322. [[Crossref](#)]
440. Rama Mohana R. Turaga, Richard B. Howarth, Mark E. Borsuk. 2010. Pro-environmental behavior. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1185:1, 211-224. [[Crossref](#)]
441. Shuang Liu, Robert Costanza, Stephen Farber, Austin Troy. 2010. Valuing ecosystem services. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1185:1, 54-78. [[Crossref](#)]

442. Bodo Aretz, Sebastian Kube. 2010. Choosing Your Object of Benevolence – A Field Experiment on Donation Options. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
443. Kimberley A. Scharf, Sarah Smith. 2010. The Price Elasticity of Charitable Giving: Does the Form of Tax Relief Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
444. Richard Friberg, Mark Sanctuary. 2010. Does Stated Purchasing Behavior Predict Actual Behavior?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
445. David Hoyos, Petr Mariel. 2010. Contingent Valuation: Past, Present and Future. *Prague Economic Papers* 19:4, 329-343. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Fleurbacy Marc. 2009. Beyond GDP: The Quest for a Measure of Social Welfare. *Journal of Economic Literature* 47:4, 1029-1075. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
447. Gili Koniak, Imanuel Noy-Meir, Avi Perevolotsky. 2009. Estimating multiple benefits from vegetation in mediterranean ecosystems. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 18:13, 3483-3501. [[Crossref](#)]
448. Mikołaj Czajkowski, Nick Hanley. 2009. Using Labels to Investigate Scope Effects in Stated Preference Methods. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 44:4, 521-535. [[Crossref](#)]
449. Nir Becker, Yael Choresch, Ofer Bahat, Moshe Inbar. 2009. Economic analysis of feeding stations as a means to preserve an endangered species: The case of Griffon Vulture (*Gyps fulvus*) in Israel. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 17:4, 199-211. [[Crossref](#)]
450. David Comerford, Liam Delaney, Colm Harmon. 2009. Experimental Tests of Survey Responses to Expenditure Questions\*. *Fiscal Studies* 30:3-4, 419-433. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Irina Klytchnikova, Michael Lokshin. 2009. Measuring Welfare Gains from Better Quality Infrastructure. *Journal of Infrastructure Development* 1:2, 87-109. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Choong-Ki Lee, Jin-Hyung Lee, James W. Mjelde, David Scott, Tae-Kyun Kim. 2009. Assessing the economic value of a public birdwatching interpretative service using a contingent valuation method. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 11:6, 583-593. [[Crossref](#)]
453. Robert Mendelsohn, Sheila Olmstead. 2009. The Economic Valuation of Environmental Amenities and Disamenities: Methods and Applications. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 34:1, 325-347. [[Crossref](#)]
454. Arun Kansal, Mukesh Khare, Chandra Shekhar Sharma. 2009. Health benefits valuation of regulatory intervention for air pollution control in thermal power plants in Delhi, India. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 52:7, 881-899. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Troy Bowman, Jan Thompson. 2009. Barriers to implementation of low-impact and conservation subdivision design: Developer perceptions and resident demand. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 92:2, 96-105. [[Crossref](#)]
456. Carolina González, Nancy Johnson, Matin Qaim. 2009. Consumer Acceptance of Second-Generation GM Foods: The Case of Biofortified Cassava in the North-east of Brazil. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 60:3, 604-624. [[Crossref](#)]
457. Frank Ackerman, Stephen J. DeCanio, Richard B. Howarth, Kristen Sheeran. 2009. Limitations of integrated assessment models of climate change. *Climatic Change* 95:3-4, 297-315. [[Crossref](#)]
458. Kelly B. Maguire. 2009. Does mode matter? A comparison of telephone, mail, and in-person treatments in contingent valuation surveys. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:11, 3528-3533. [[Crossref](#)]
459. David A. Hensher, John M. Rose, Juan de Dios Ortúzar, Luis I. Rizzi. 2009. Estimating the willingness to pay and value of risk reduction for car occupants in the road environment. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 43:7, 692-707. [[Crossref](#)]
460. Jung-Eun Ku, Sang-Woo Lee. Number portability to internet phone: Consumer demand and welfare 3315-3325. [[Crossref](#)]

461. Kyriaki Remoundou, Phoebe Koundouri. 2009. Environmental Effects on Public Health: An Economic Perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 6:8, 2160-2178. [[Crossref](#)]
462. Michele Bernasconi, Luca Corazzini, Sebastian Kube, Michel André Maréchal. 2009. Two are better than one!. *Economics Letters* 104:1, 31-33. [[Crossref](#)]
463. Aju J. Fenn, John R. Crooker. 2009. Estimating Local Welfare Generated by an NFL Team under Credible Threat of Relocation. *Southern Economic Journal* 76:1, 198-223. [[Crossref](#)]
464. V. Kerry Smith, Carol Mansfield, Laurel Clayton. 2009. Valuing a homeland security policy: Countermeasures for the threats from shoulder mounted missiles. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 38:3, 215-243. [[Crossref](#)]
465. R.C. Bett, H.K. Bett, A.K. Kahi, K.J. Peters. 2009. Evaluation and effectiveness of breeding and production services for dairy goat farmers in Kenya. *Ecological Economics* 68:8-9, 2451-2460. [[Crossref](#)]
466. Diana Kutzner, Pamela A. Wright, Amelia Stark. 2009. Identifying tourists' preferences for Aboriginal tourism product features: implications for a northern First Nation in British Columbia. *Journal of Ecotourism* 8:2, 99-114. [[Crossref](#)]
467. Albert N. Link, Donald S. Siegel. Evaluating the social returns to innovation: An application to university technology transfer 171-187. [[Crossref](#)]
468. Mikael Svensson. 2009. The value of a statistical life in Sweden: Estimates from two studies using the "Certainty Approach" calibration. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 41:3, 430-437. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Soo-Il Kim, Timothy C. Haab. 2009. Temporal insensitivity of willingness to pay and implied discount rates. *Resource and Energy Economics* 31:2, 89-102. [[Crossref](#)]
470. I. Diaz-Rainey, D. Tzavara. A Diffusion Model of an Induced Environmental Market: Reconciling WTP to actual adoption of green energy tariffs 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
471. J.D.W.E. Mulder. 2009. How do We Compensate a Victim's Losses?. *International Review of Victimology* 16:1, 67-87. [[Crossref](#)]
472. Mandy Ryan, Verity Watson. 2009. Comparing welfare estimates from payment card contingent valuation and discrete choice experiments. *Health Economics* 18:4, 389-401. [[Crossref](#)]
473. Daniel McFadden. 2009. The human side of mechanism design: a tribute to Leo Hurwicz and Jean-Jacque Laffont. *Review of Economic Design* 13:1-2, 77-100. [[Crossref](#)]
474. Andrew E. Stivers. 2009. Regulating Market Language: Market Failure in Descriptive Signals. *Journal of Consumer Policy* 32:1, 23-41. [[Crossref](#)]
475. Stephane Hess, John M. Rose. 2009. Should Reference Alternatives in Pivot Design SC Surveys be Treated Differently?. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 42:3, 297-317. [[Crossref](#)]
476. Paola Gatto, Alessia Zocca, Andrea Battisti, Maria João Barrento, Manuela Branco, Maria Rosa Paiva. 2009. Economic assessment of managing processionary moth in pine forests: A case-study in Portugal. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:2, 683-691. [[Crossref](#)]
477. Anna Alberini, Alberto Longo. 2009. Valuing the Cultural Monuments of Armenia: Bayesian Updating of Prior Beliefs in Contingent Valuation. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 41:2, 441-460. [[Crossref](#)]
478. Ahmed Khwaja, Frank Sloan, Yang Wang. 2009. Do Smokers Value Their Health and Longevity Less?. *The Journal of Law and Economics* 52:1, 171-196. [[Crossref](#)]
479. Elina Lampi, Matilda Orth. 2009. Who Visits the Museums? A Comparison between Stated Preferences and Observed Effects of Entrance Fees. *Kyklos* 62:1, 85-102. [[Crossref](#)]
480. Minhaj Mahmud. 2009. On the contingent valuation of mortality risk reduction in developing countries. *Applied Economics* 41:2, 171-181. [[Crossref](#)]



481. Joachim Weimann. DELEGATIONSPROBLEME IN REPRÄSENTATIVEN DEMOKRATIEN 439-451. [[Crossref](#)]
482. Nir Becker, David L. Katz. An Economic Assessment of Dead Sea Preservation and Restoration 275-296. [[Crossref](#)]
483. J.R. Corrigan, K.J. Egan, J.A. Downing. Aesthetic Values of Lakes and Rivers 14-24. [[Crossref](#)]
484. A. Damodaran. 2009. Risk management instruments for debt driven conservation efforts: The case of India's Project Tiger. *Ecological Economics* **68**:3, 625-633. [[Crossref](#)]
485. Diwakar Poudel, Fred H. Johnsen. 2009. Valuation of crop genetic resources in Kaski, Nepal: Farmers' willingness to pay for rice landraces conservation. *Journal of Environmental Management* **90**:1, 483-491. [[Crossref](#)]
486. Anna Alberini, Stefania Tonin, Margherita Turvani. 2009. The Value of Reducing Cancer Risks at Contaminated Sites: Are More Heavily Exposed People Willing to Pay More?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
487. Rafael Di Tella, Ernesto Schargrodsky. 2009. Happiness, Ideology and Crime in Argentine Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
488. Mitsuyasu YABE. 2009. Supply of Domestic Bio-ethanol and the Relative Value of Public Subsidy. *Studies in Regional Science* **39**:3, 567-583. [[Crossref](#)]
489. Marc Prieto, Assen Slim. 2009. Évaluation des actifs environnementaux : quels prix pour quelles valeurs ?. *Management & Avenir* **28**:8, 18. [[Crossref](#)]
490. E. S. Chung, K. S. Lee. 2009. A social-economic-engineering combined framework for decision making in water resources planning. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **13**:5, 675-686. [[Crossref](#)]
491. Martin Linde-Rahr. 2008. Willingness to Pay for Forest Property Rights and the Value of Increased Property Rights Security. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **41**:4, 465-478. [[Crossref](#)]
492. Michael Rushton. 2008. Who pays? Who benefits? Who decides?. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **32**:4, 293-300. [[Crossref](#)]
493. Ravi Bapna, Wolfgang Jank, Galit Shmueli. 2008. Consumer Surplus in Online Auctions. *Information Systems Research* **19**:4, 400-416. [[Crossref](#)]
494. Giles Atkinson, Susana Mourato. 2008. Environmental Cost-Benefit Analysis. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **33**:1, 317-344. [[Crossref](#)]
495. Daniel W. Bromley. 2008. Epistemic Flagpoles: Economics Journals as Instrumental Rhetoric. *The American Economist* **52**:2, 33-41. [[Crossref](#)]
496. Kamran Zendehdel, Michael Rademaker, Bernard De Baets, Guido Van Huylenbroeck. 2008. Qualitative valuation of environmental criteria through a group consensus based on stochastic dominance. *Ecological Economics* **67**:2, 253-264. [[Crossref](#)]
497. Stefan Hajkiewicz, Rachel Spencer, Andrew Higgins, Oswald Marinoni. 2008. Evaluating water quality investments using cost utility analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management* **88**:4, 1601-1610. [[Crossref](#)]
498. Roy Brouwer. 2008. The potential role of stated preference methods in the Water Framework Directive to assess disproportionate costs. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **51**:5, 597-614. [[Crossref](#)]
499. Robyn Stevens, Alex Winter-Nelson. 2008. Consumer acceptance of provitamin A-biofortified maize in Maputo, Mozambique. *Food Policy* **33**:4, 341-351. [[Crossref](#)]
500. George Loewenstein, Peter A. Ubel. 2008. Hedonic adaptation and the role of decision and experience utility in public policy. *Journal of Public Economics* **92**:8-9, 1795-1810. [[Crossref](#)]

501. Clem Tisdell, Clevo Wilson, Hemanath Swarna Nantha. 2008. Contingent valuation as a dynamic process. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37:4, 1443-1458. [[Crossref](#)]
502. Tatiana Borisova, Alan Collins, Gerard D'Souza, Matthew Benson, Mary Leigh Wolfe, Brian Benham. 2008. A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation 1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 44:4, 1009-1023. [[Crossref](#)]
503. Michael Greenstone, Justin Gallagher. 2008. Does Hazardous Waste Matter? Evidence from the Housing Market and the Superfund Program \*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123:3, 951-1003. [[Crossref](#)]
504. Jorge E. Araña, Carmelo J. León. 2008. Do emotions matter? Coherent preferences under anchoring and emotional effects. *Ecological Economics* 66:4, 700-711. [[Crossref](#)]
505. Gürkan Kumbaroğlu, Nihan Karali, Yıldız Arıkan. 2008. CO<sub>2</sub>, GDP and RET: An aggregate economic equilibrium analysis for Turkey. *Energy Policy* 36:7, 2694-2708. [[Crossref](#)]
506. Bruno De Borger, Mogens Fosgerau. 2008. The trade-off between money and travel time: A test of the theory of reference-dependent preferences. *Journal of Urban Economics* 64:1, 101-115. [[Crossref](#)]
507. Nabin Baral, Marc J. Stern, Ranju Bhattacharai. 2008. Contingent valuation of ecotourism in Annapurna conservation area, Nepal: Implications for sustainable park finance and local development. *Ecological Economics* 66:2-3, 218-227. [[Crossref](#)]
508. Galina Ivanova, Bruce Tranter. 2008. Paying for Environmental Protection in a Cross-national Perspective. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 43:2, 169-188. [[Crossref](#)]
509. Vijesh V. Krishna, Matin Qaim. 2008. Consumer Attitudes toward GM Food and Pesticide Residues in India. *Review of Agricultural Economics* 30:2, 233-251. [[Crossref](#)]
510. Harry Walton, Alberto Longo, Peter Dawson. 2008. A Contingent Valuation of the 2012 London Olympic Games. *Journal of Sports Economics* 9:3, 304-317. [[Crossref](#)]
511. Nicolao Bonini, Ilana Ritov, Michele Graffeo. 2008. When does a referent public problem affect financial and political support for public action?. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 21:2, 169-182. [[Crossref](#)]
512. Henrik Andersson, Mikael Svensson. 2008. Cognitive ability and scale bias in the contingent valuation method. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 39:4, 481-495. [[Crossref](#)]
513. Zhi Li, Yuh-Shan Ho. 2008. Use of citation per publication as an indicator to evaluate contingent valuation research. *Scientometrics* 75:1, 97-110. [[Crossref](#)]
514. Joan Costa-Font, Joan Rovira-Forns. 2008. Who is willing to pay for long-term care insurance in Catalonia?. *Health Policy* 86:1, 72-84. [[Crossref](#)]
515. Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch. 2008. Gross national happiness as an answer to the Easterlin Paradox?. *Journal of Development Economics* 86:1, 22-42. [[Crossref](#)]
516. J. Barkmann, K. Glenk, A. Keil, C. Leemhuis, N. Dietrich, G. Gerold, R. Marggraf. 2008. Confronting unfamiliarity with ecosystem functions: The case for an ecosystem service approach to environmental valuation with stated preference methods. *Ecological Economics* 65:1, 48-62. [[Crossref](#)]
517. Salvador del Saz-Salazar, Pau Rausell-Köster. 2008. A Double-Hurdle model of urban green areas valuation: Dealing with zero responses. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 84:3-4, 241-251. [[Crossref](#)]
518. L. Crase, R. Gillespie. 2008. The impact of water quality and water level on the recreation values of Lake Hume. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management* 15:1, 21-29. [[Crossref](#)]
519. Mauricio Fuks, Lata Chatterjee. 2008. Estimating the Willingness to Pay for a Flood Control Project in Brazil Using the Contingent Valuation Method. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 134:1, 42-52. [[Crossref](#)]



520. Felix Schläpfer. 2008. Contingent valuation: A new perspective. *Ecological Economics* 64:4, 729-740. [[Crossref](#)]
521. Giles Atkinson, Susana Mourato, Stefan Szymanski, Ece Ozdemiroglu. 2008. Are We Willing to Pay Enough to 'Back the Bid'? Valuing the Intangible Impacts of London's Bid to Host the 2012 Summer Olympic Games. *Urban Studies* 45:2, 419-444. [[Crossref](#)]
522. Brett R. Gelso, John A. Fox, Jeffrey M. Peterson. 2008. Farmers' Perceived Costs of Wetlands: Effects of Wetland Size, Hydration, and Dispersion. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90:1, 172-185. [[Crossref](#)]
523. Ekin Birol, Phoebe Koundouri, Yiannis Kountouris. Using Economic Valuation Techniques to Inform Water Resources Management in the Southern European, Mediterranean and Developing Countries: A Survey and Critical Appraisal of Available Techniques 135-155. [[Crossref](#)]
524. C. Patrick Heidkamp. 2008. A theoretical framework for a 'spatially conscious' economic analysis of environmental issues. *Geoforum* 39:1, 62-75. [[Crossref](#)]
525. Trudy Ann Cameron. Contingent Valuation 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
526. Jeff Dominitz, Arthur van Soest. Survey Data, Analysis of 1-7. [[Crossref](#)]
527. Karen Blumenschein, Glenn C. Blomquist, Magnus Johannesson, Nancy Horn, Patricia Freeman. 2008. Eliciting Willingness to Pay Without Bias: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *The Economic Journal* 118:525, 114-137. [[Crossref](#)]
528. Obinna Onwujekwe, Julia Fox-Rushby, Kara Hanson. 2008. Construct Validity of the Bidding Game, Binary with Follow-up, and a Novel Structured Haggling Question Format in Determining Willingness to Pay for Insecticide-Treated Mosquito Nets. *Medical Decision Making* 28:1, 90-101. [[Crossref](#)]
529. Arturo Vargas Bustamante, Gilbert Ojeda, Xochitl Castaneda. 2008. Willingness To Pay For Cross-Border Health Insurance Between The United States And Mexico. *Health Affairs* 27:1, 169-178. [[Crossref](#)]
530. Peter Zander, Jeroen C.J. Groot, Etienne Josien, Isabella Karpinski, Andrea Knierim, Burghard C. Meyer, Livia Madureira, Mbolatiana Rambonilaza, Walter A.H. Rossing. 2008. Farm models and economic valuation in the context of multifunctionality: a review of approaches from France, Germany, The Netherlands and Portugal. *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology* 7:4/5, 339. [[Crossref](#)]
531. Robert W. Hahn, Peter Passell. 2008. The Economics of Allowing More Domestic Oil Drilling. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
532. Kai Hüschelrath. 2008. Detection of Anticompetitive Horizontal Mergers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
533. Melania Michetti, Leonardo Becchetti, Stefano Castriota. 2008. Child Labour and Consumer Responsibility: An Impact Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
534. E. S. Chung, K. S. Lee. 2008. A social-economic-engineering combined framework for decision making in water resources planning. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* 5:5, 2817-2857. [[Crossref](#)]
535. Wei Zhang, Taylor H. Ricketts, Claire Kremen, Karen Carney, Scott M. Swinton. 2007. Ecosystem services and dis-services to agriculture. *Ecological Economics* 64:2, 253-260. [[Crossref](#)]
536. Raul Brey, Pere Riera, Joan Mogas. 2007. Estimation of forest values using choice modeling: An application to Spanish forests. *Ecological Economics* 64:2, 305-312. [[Crossref](#)]
537. S. G. Hosking. 2007. An Economic Approach to Allocating River Water to Estuaries in South Africa. *Coastal Management* 36:1, 35-46. [[Crossref](#)]

538. Joshua Lipton, Norman Meade, Alan Randall, Richard Bishop, George Peterson, Michael Margolis. Integrating Economics And Ecological Assessment 45-57. [[Crossref](#)]
539. Dean Karlan, John A. List. 2007. Does Price Matter in Charitable Giving? Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment. *American Economic Review* 97:5, 1774-1793. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
540. Felix Schlöpfer, Marcel Schmitt. 2007. Anchors, endorsements, and preferences: A field experiment. *Resource and Energy Economics* 29:3, 229-243. [[Crossref](#)]
541. Benno Torgler, María A. García-Valiñas. 2007. The determinants of individuals' attitudes towards preventing environmental damage. *Ecological Economics* 63:2-3, 536-552. [[Crossref](#)]
542. Roland K. Cheo. 2007. Adopting Shapley values to address embedding biases in contingent valuation studies. *Applied Economics Letters* 14:10, 765-768. [[Crossref](#)]
543. Tran Huu Tuan, Stale Navrud. 2007. Valuing cultural heritage in developing countries: comparing and pooling contingent valuation and choice modelling estimates. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 38:1, 51-69. [[Crossref](#)]
544. Femida Handy, Joyce Gleason. 2007. Rent-seeking and economic valuation of environmental quality. *International Journal of Social Economics* 34:7, 436-448. [[Crossref](#)]
545. Jeffrey S. Smith, Michael McKee. 2007. 'PEOPLE OR PRAIRIE CHICKENS' REVISITED: STATED PREFERENCES WITH EXPLICIT NON-MARKET TRADE-OFFS. *Defence and Peace Economics* 18:3, 223-244. [[Crossref](#)]
546. R. Martínez-Espíñeira. 2007. 'Adopt a Hypothetical Pup': A Count Data Approach to the Valuation of Wildlife. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 37:2, 335-360. [[Crossref](#)]
547. Frank J. Convery. 2007. Making a difference — how environmental economists can influence the policy process — a case study of David W Pearce. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 37:1, 7-32. [[Crossref](#)]
548. Felix Schlöpfer, Ingo Bräuer. 2007. Theoretical incentive properties of contingent valuation questions: Do they matter in the field?. *Ecological Economics* 62:3-4, 451-460. [[Crossref](#)]
549. Wallace E. Huffman, Matthew Rousu, Jason F. Shogren, Abeyayehu Tegene. 2007. The effects of prior beliefs and learning on consumers' acceptance of genetically modified foods. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 63:1, 193-206. [[Crossref](#)]
550. Armando González-Cabán, John B. Loomis, Andrea Rodriguez, Hayley Hesseln. 2007. A comparison of CVM survey response rates, protests and willingness-to-pay of Native Americans and general population for fuels reduction policies. *Journal of Forest Economics* 13:1, 49-71. [[Crossref](#)]
551. Leonardo Becchetti, Furio Camillo Rosati. 2007. Global Social Preferences and the Demand for Socially Responsible Products: Empirical Evidence from a Pilot Study on Fair Trade Consumers. *The World Economy* 30:5, 807-836. [[Crossref](#)]
552. Min Ding. 2007. An Incentive-Aligned Mechanism for Conjoint Analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research* 44:2, 214-223. [[Crossref](#)]
553. Craig E. Landry, John A. List. 2007. Using Ex Ante Approaches to Obtain Credible Signals for Value in Contingent Markets: Evidence from the Field. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 89:2, 420-429. [[Crossref](#)]
554. David L. Stokes. 2007. Things We Like: Human Preferences among Similar Organisms and Implications for Conservation. *Human Ecology* 35:3, 361-369. [[Crossref](#)]
555. Timo Kuosmanen, Mika Kortelainen. 2007. Valuing environmental factors in cost-benefit analysis using data envelopment analysis. *Ecological Economics* 62:1, 56-65. [[Crossref](#)]
556. Knut Veisten. 2007. Contingent valuation controversies: Philosophic debates about economic theory. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 36:2, 204-232. [[Crossref](#)]

557. Tyron J. Venn, John Quiggin. 2007. Accommodating indigenous cultural heritage values in resource assessment: Cape York Peninsula and the Murray–Darling Basin, Australia. *Ecological Economics* **61**:2-3, 334-344. [[Crossref](#)]
558. Barry Schwartz. 2007. There Must Be An Alternative. *Psychological Inquiry* **18**:1, 48-51. [[Crossref](#)]
559. Stefan Hajkowitz. 2007. Can We Put a Price Tag on Nature? Rethinking Approaches to Environmental Valuation. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management* **14**:1, 22-26. [[Crossref](#)]
560. Mousumi Dutta, Sarmila Banerjee, Zakir Husain. 2007. Untapped demand for heritage: A contingent valuation study of Prinsep Ghat, Calcutta. *Tourism Management* **28**:1, 83-95. [[Crossref](#)]
561. Tiziana Cuccia, Roberto Cellini. 2007. Is cultural heritage really important for tourists? A contingent rating study. *Applied Economics* **39**:2, 261-271. [[Crossref](#)]
562. Bruno S. Frey, Simon Luechinger, Alois Stutzer. 2007. CALCULATING TRAGEDY: ASSESSING THE COSTS OF TERRORISM. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **21**:1, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
563. Dipika Sur, Joseph Cook, Susmita Chatterjee, Jacqueline Deen, Dale Whittington. 2007. Increasing the transparency of stated choice studies for policy analysis: Designing experiments to produce raw response graphs. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **26**:1, 189-199. [[Crossref](#)]
564. Rudolf de Groot, Lars Hein. Concept and valuation of landscape functions at different scales 15-36. [[Crossref](#)]
565. Roger A. Sedjo, R. David Simpson. Chapter 59 Land Use: Forest, Agriculture, and Biodiversity Competition 2979-3007. [[Crossref](#)]
566. Richard L. Revesz, Robert N. Stavins. Chapter 8 Environmental Law 499-589. [[Crossref](#)]
567. W. Kip Viscusi. Chapter 9 Regulation of Health, Safety, and Environmental Risks 591-645. [[Crossref](#)]
568. Bruce K. Johnson, Michael J. Mondello, John C. Whitehead. 2007. The Value of Public Goods Generated by a National Football League Team. *Journal of Sport Management* **21**:1, 123-136. [[Crossref](#)]
569. Alistair Munro. 2007. Optimal Decision Processes: On the Choice Between Environmental Valuation Methods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
570. Yael Meroz, Andrea Morone, Piergiuseppe Morone. 2007. Eliciting Environmental Preferences of Ghanaians: An Experimental Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
571. Stéphane Robin, Anne Rozan, Bernard Ruffieux. 2007. Using Experimental Method to Elicit Consumer Preferences for Public Decision. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
572. Vania Paccagnan. 2007. On Combining Stated Preferences and Revealed Preferences Approaches to Evaluate Environmental Resources Having a Recreational Use. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
573. Leonardo Becchetti, Furio C. Rosati. 2007. Global Social Preferences and the Demand for Socially Responsible Products: Empirical Evidence from a Pilot Study on Fair Trade Consumers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
574. Paolo Figini, Massimiliano Castellani, Laura Vici. 2007. Estimating Tourist Externalities on Residents: A Choice Modeling Approach to the Case of Rimini. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
575. Angheluta Vadineanu. THE ECOSYSTEM APPROACH APPLIED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COASTAL SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS 199-224. [[Crossref](#)]
576. Agénor Lahatte, Sylvain Lassarre, Anne Rozan. 2007. Évaluation économique des conséquences d'un accident de la route non mortel. *Revue d'économie politique* **117**:2, 225. [[Crossref](#)]
577. Clive L. Spash, Arild Vatn. 2006. Transferring environmental value estimates: Issues and alternatives. *Ecological Economics* **60**:2, 379-388. [[Crossref](#)]

578. Estelle Biénabe, Robert R. Hearne. 2006. Public preferences for biodiversity conservation and scenic beauty within a framework of environmental services payments. *Forest Policy and Economics* 9:4, 335-348. [[Crossref](#)]
579. Amy K. Donahue, Joanne M. Miller. 2006. Experience, Attitudes, and Willingness to Pay for Public Safety. *The American Review of Public Administration* 36:4, 395-418. [[Crossref](#)]
580. Athanasios Ragkos, Asimakis Psychoudakis, Argiro Christofi, Alexandros Theodoridis. 2006. Using a functional approach to wetland valuation: the case of Zazari-Cheimaditida. *Regional Environmental Change* 6:4, 193-200. [[Crossref](#)]
581. Siqi Zheng, Yuming Fu, Hongyu Liu. 2006. Housing-choice hindrances and urban spatial structure: Evidence from matched location and location-preference data in Chinese cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* 60:3, 535-557. [[Crossref](#)]
582. Gloria E. Helfand, Joon Sik Park, Joan I. Nassauer, Sandra Kosek. 2006. The economics of native plants in residential landscape designs. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 78:3, 229-240. [[Crossref](#)]
583. N.J.A. van Exel, W.B.F. Brouwer, B. van den Berg, M.A. Koopmanschap. 2006. With a little help from an anchor. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 35:5, 836-853. [[Crossref](#)]
584. Kevin J. Krizek. 2006. Two Approaches to Valuing Some of Bicycle Facilities' Presumed Benefits: Propose a session for the 2007 National Planning Conference in the City of Brotherly Love. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72:3, 309-320. [[Crossref](#)]
585. Kjartan Sælensminde. 2006. Causes and consequences of lexicographic choices in stated choice studies. *Ecological Economics* 59:3, 331-340. [[Crossref](#)]
586. X. J. Wang, W. Zhang, Y. Li, K. Z. Yang, M. Bai. 2006. Air Quality Improvement Estimation and Assessment Using Contingent Valuation Method, A Case Study in Beijing. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 120:1-3, 153-168. [[Crossref](#)]
587. David Aadland, Arthur J. Caplan. 2006. Cheap talk reconsidered: New evidence from CVM. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 60:4, 562-578. [[Crossref](#)]
588. Young-Sook Eom, Douglas M. Larson. 2006. Improving environmental valuation estimates through consistent use of revealed and stated preference information. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 52:1, 501-516. [[Crossref](#)]
589. Ekin Birol, Katia Karousakis, Phoebe Koundouri. 2006. Using economic valuation techniques to inform water resources management: A survey and critical appraisal of available techniques and an application. *Science of The Total Environment* 365:1-3, 105-122. [[Crossref](#)]
590. Maria Vredin Johansson, Tobias Heldt, Per Johansson. 2006. The effects of attitudes and personality traits on mode choice. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 40:6, 507-525. [[Crossref](#)]
591. Luis I. Rizzi, Juan de Dios Ortúzar. 2006. Estimating the Willingness-to-Pay for Road Safety Improvements. *Transport Reviews* 26:4, 471-485. [[Crossref](#)]
592. Bodo Sturm, Joachim Weimann. 2006. Experiments in Environmental Economics and Some Close Relatives. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 20:3, 419-457. [[Crossref](#)]
593. Mark Griffin Smith. 2006. Dam Removal: A Taxonomy with Implications for Economic Analysis. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research & Education* 134:1, 34-38. [[Crossref](#)]
594. Roberto Martínez-Espíñeira. 2006. A Box-Cox Double-Hurdle model of wildlife valuation: The citizen's perspective. *Ecological Economics* 58:1, 192-208. [[Crossref](#)]
595. Richard O. Zerbe, Yoram Bauman, Aaron Finkle. 2006. An aggregate measure for benefit-cost analysis. *Ecological Economics* 58:3, 449-461. [[Crossref](#)]
596. Brian Roach, William W. Wade. 2006. Policy evaluation of natural resource injuries using habitat equivalency analysis. *Ecological Economics* 58:2, 421-433. [[Crossref](#)]

597. Lars Hein, Kris van Koppen, Rudolf S. de Groot, Ekko C. van Ierland. 2006. Spatial scales, stakeholders and the valuation of ecosystem services. *Ecological Economics* 57:2, 209-228. [[Crossref](#)]
598. Jianjun Jin, Zhishi Wang, Shenghong Ran. 2006. Comparison of contingent valuation and choice experiment in solid waste management programs in Macao. *Ecological Economics* 57:3, 430-441. [[Crossref](#)]
599. Jiehan Guo, Cameron J. Hepburn, Richard S.J. Tol, David Anthoff. 2006. Discounting and the social cost of carbon: a closer look at uncertainty. *Environmental Science & Policy* 9:3, 205-216. [[Crossref](#)]
600. I.J. Bateman, M.A. Cole, S. Georgiou, D.J. Hadley. 2006. Comparing contingent valuation and contingent ranking: A case study considering the benefits of urban river water quality improvements. *Journal of Environmental Management* 79:3, 221-231. [[Crossref](#)]
601. H. LORNE CARMICHAEL, W. BENTLEY MACLEOD. 2006. Welfare Economics with Intransitive Revealed Preferences: A Theory of the Endowment Effect. *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 8:2, 193-218. [[Crossref](#)]
602. Knut Veisten, Ståle Navrud. 2006. Contingent valuation and actual payment for voluntarily provided passive-use values: Assessing the effect of an induced truth-telling mechanism and elicitation formats. *Applied Economics* 38:7, 735-756. [[Crossref](#)]
603. Rafael Rob, Joel Waldfogel. 2006. Piracy on the High C's: Music Downloading, Sales Displacement, and Social Welfare in a Sample of College Students. *The Journal of Law and Economics* 49:1, 29-62. [[Crossref](#)]
604. Brooks A. Kaiser. 2006. Economic impacts of non-indigenous species: Miconia and the Hawaiian economy. *Euphytica* 148:1-2, 135-150. [[Crossref](#)]
605. Gabriel Matthew Leung, Raymond Yue Ting Yeung, Irene Oi Ling Wong, Susana Castan-Cameo, Janice Mary Johnston. 2006. Time costs of waiting, doctor-shopping and private-public sector imbalance: Microdata evidence from Hong Kong. *Health Policy* 76:1, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
606. Joan Mogas, Pere Riera, Jeff Bennett. 2006. A comparison of contingent valuation and choice modelling with second-order interactions. *Journal of Forest Economics* 12:1, 5-30. [[Crossref](#)]
607. Murat Isik. 2006. An experimental analysis of impacts of uncertainty and irreversibility on willingness-to-pay. *Applied Economics Letters* 13:2, 67-72. [[Crossref](#)]
608. Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch. 2006. Some Uses of Happiness Data in Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20:1, 25-46. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
609. John R. Stoll, Robert B. Ditton. 2006. Understanding Anglers' Willingness to Pay Under Alternative Management Regimes. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 11:1, 27-42. [[Crossref](#)]
610. Felix Schlapfer, Nick Hanley. 2006. Contingent Valuation and Collective Choice. *Kyklos* 59:1, 115-135. [[Crossref](#)]
611. David Aadland, Arthur J. Caplan. 2006. Curbside recycling: Waste resource or waste of resources?. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25:4, 855-874. [[Crossref](#)]
612. Joachim Weimann. Kollektive Entscheidungen 155-228. [[Crossref](#)]
613. Joachim Weimann. Delegations-probleme in Repräsentativen Demokratien 409-436. [[Crossref](#)]
614. Trine Bille, Günther G. Schulze. Chapter 30 Culture in Urban and Regional Development 1051-1099. [[Crossref](#)]
615. Timo Kuosmanen, Mika Kortelainen. 2006. Valuing Environmental Factors in Cost-Benefit Analysis Using Data Envelopment Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
616. Erzo F. P. Luttmer, Richard J. Zeckhauser, Carolyn Kousky. 2006. Permits to Elicit Information. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

617. Ville Ovaskainen, Matleena Kniivila. 2005. Consumer versus citizen preferences in contingent valuation: evidence on the role of question framing\*. *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 49:4, 379-394. [[Crossref](#)]
618. John C. Whitehead. 2005. Environmental Risk and Averting Behavior: Predictive Validity of Jointly Estimated Revealed and Stated Behavior Data. *Environmental & Resource Economics* 32:3, 301-316. [[Crossref](#)]
619. Arild Vatn. 2005. Rationality, institutions and environmental policy. *Ecological Economics* 55:2, 203-217. [[Crossref](#)]
620. Roland W. Scholz, Arnim Wiek. 2005. Operational Eco-efficiency: Comparing Firms' Environmental Investments in Different Domains of Operation. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 9:4, 155-170. [[Crossref](#)]
621. Ian J. Bateman, Phillip Cooper, Stavros Georgiou, Ståle Navrud, Gregory L. Poe, Richard C. Ready, Pere Riera, Mandy Ryan, Christian A. Vossler. 2005. Economic valuation of policies for managing acidity in remote mountain lakes: Examining validity through scope sensitivity testing. *Aquatic Sciences* 67:3, 274-291. [[Crossref](#)]
622. Lori S. Benneer, Robert N. Stavins, Alexander F. Wagner. 2005. Using Revealed Preferences to Infer Environmental Benefits: Evidence from Recreational Fishing Licenses. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 28:2, 157-179. [[Crossref](#)]
623. Supriya Garikipati. 2005. Consulting the Development-Displaced Regarding their Resettlement: Is there a Way?. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 18:3, 340-361. [[Crossref](#)]
624. Amy K. Donahue, Joanne M. Miller. 2005. Citizen Preferences and Paying for Police. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27:4, 419-435. [[Crossref](#)]
625. Samiran Banerjee, James H. Murphy \*. 2005. The scope test revisited. *Applied Economics Letters* 12:10, 613-617. [[Crossref](#)]
626. W. David Bradford, Andrew Kleit, M.A. Krousel-Wood, Richard M. Re. 2005. Comparing Willingness to Pay for Telemedicine Across a Chronic Heart Failure and Hypertension Population. *Telemedicine and e-Health* 11:4, 430-438. [[Crossref](#)]
627. Thomas A. Heberlein, Matthew A. Wilson, Richard C. Bishop, 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. [[Crossref](#)]
628. Thomas W. Blaine, Frank R. Lichtkoppler, Keith R. Jones, Randall H. Zondag. 2005. An assessment of household willingness to pay for curbside recycling: A comparison of payment card and referendum approaches. *Journal of Environmental Management* 76:1, 15-22. [[Crossref](#)]
629. Ranjith Bandara, Clem Tisdell. 2005. Changing abundance of elephants and willingness to pay for their conservation. *Journal of Environmental Management* 76:1, 47-59. [[Crossref](#)]
630. Verónica Farreras, Pere Riera, Joan Mogas. 2005. Does gender matter in valuation studies? Evidence from three forestry applications. *Forestry: An International Journal of Forest Research* 78:3, 239-248. [[Crossref](#)]
631. Yongsung Cho, K. William. Easter, Laura M.J. McCann, Frances Homans. 2005. ARE RURAL RESIDENTS WILLING TO PAY ENOUGH TO IMPROVE DRINKING WATER QUALITY?. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 41:3, 729-740. [[Crossref](#)]
632. J. D. Snowball. 2005. Art for the Masses? Justification for the Public Support of the Arts in Developing Countries – Two Arts Festivals in South Africa. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 29:2, 107-125. [[Crossref](#)]
633. Yaoqi Zhang, Yiqing Li. 2005. Valuing or pricing natural and environmental resources?. *Environmental Science & Policy* 8:2, 179-186. [[Crossref](#)]



634. Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch. 2005. Partisan Social Happiness. *Review of Economic Studies* 72:2, 367-393. [[Crossref](#)]
635. Dominika Anna Parry Dziegielewska, Robert Mendelsohn. 2005. Valuing Air Quality in Poland. *Environmental & Resource Economics* 30:2, 131-163. [[Crossref](#)]
636. Obinna Onwujekwe, Kara Hanson, Julia Fox-Rushby. 2005. Do divergences between stated and actual willingness to pay signify the existence of bias in contingent valuation surveys?. *Social Science & Medicine* 60:3, 525-536. [[Crossref](#)]
637. Min Ding, Rajdeep Grewal, John Liechty. 2005. Incentive-Aligned Conjoint Analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research* 42:1, 67-82. [[Crossref](#)]
638. Joan Mogas, Pere Riera, Jeff Bennett. 2005. Accounting for afforestation externalities: a comparison of contingent valuation and choice modelling. *European Environment* 15:1, 44-58. [[Crossref](#)]
639. Nancy E. Bockstael, A. Myrick Freeman. Chapter 12 Welfare Theory and Valuation 517-570. [[Crossref](#)]
640. Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann. Chapter 17 Contingent Valuation 821-936. [[Crossref](#)]
641. Jason F. Shogren. Chapter 19 Experimental Methods and Valuation 969-1027. [[Crossref](#)]
642. Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch. 2005. Gross National Happiness as an Answer to the Easterlin Paradox?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
643. Benno Torgler, Maria Angeles Garcia-Valiñas. 2005. The Determinants of Individuals' Attitudes Towards Preventing Environmental Damage. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
644. Ravi Bapna, Wolfgang Jank, Galit Shmueli. 2005. Consumer Surplus in Online Auctions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
645. Knut Veisten, Hans Fredrik Hoen, Jon Strand. 2004. Sequencing and the Adding-up Property in Contingent Valuation of Endangered Species: Are Contingent Non-Use Values Economic Values?. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 29:4, 419-433. [[Crossref](#)]
646. Yung En Chee. 2004. An ecological perspective on the valuation of ecosystem services. *Biological Conservation* 120:4, 549-565. [[Crossref](#)]
647. Knut Veisten, Hans Fredrik Hoen, Ståle Navrud, Jon Strand. 2004. Scope insensitivity in contingent valuation of complex environmental amenities. *Journal of Environmental Management* 73:4, 317-331. [[Crossref](#)]
648. Tracy Boyer, Stephen Polasky. 2004. Valuing urban wetlands: A review of non-market valuation studies. *Wetlands* 24:4, 744-755. [[Crossref](#)]
649. Lisa A. Wainger, Dennis M. King, Joyce A. Cantrell, Sandra L. Bird. 2004. Development of Indicators to Assess Economic Vulnerabilities to Changes in Ecosystem Services: Case Study of Counties in Maryland, USA. *Environmental Management* 34:5, 730-747. [[Crossref](#)]
650. Michael Mandler. 2004. Status Quo Maintenance Reconsidered: Changing or Incomplete Preferences?. *The Economic Journal* 114:499, F518-F535. [[Crossref](#)]
651. Henry D Jacoby. 2004. Informing climate policy given incommensurable benefits estimates. *Global Environmental Change* 14:3, 287-297. [[Crossref](#)]
652. Rachel Connelly, Deborah S. Degraff, Rachel A. Willis. 2004. The Value of Employer-Sponsored Child Care to Employees. *Industrial Relations* 43:4, 759-792. [[Crossref](#)]
653. Douglas S. Noonan. 2004. Valuing Arts and Culture: A Research Agenda for Contingent Valuation. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 34:3, 205-221. [[Crossref](#)]
654. Michael Rushton. 2004. Contingent Valuation and the Public Interest in Privately Owned Cultural Property. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 34:3, 222-234. [[Crossref](#)]

655. Obinna Onwujekwe, Benjamin Uzochukwu, Elvis Shu, Christian Ibeh, Paul Okonkwo. 2004. Is combination therapy for malaria based on user-fees worthwhile and equitable to consumers?. *Acta Tropica* **91**:2, 101-115. [[Crossref](#)]
656. Marko Kryvobokov. 2004. Urban land zoning for taxation purposes in Ukraine. *Property Management* **22**:3, 214-229. [[Crossref](#)]
657. Svanhild Aabø, Jon Strand. 2004. Public library valuation, nonuse values, and altruistic motivations. *Library & Information Science Research* **26**:3, 351-372. [[Crossref](#)]
658. Rafiq Dossani, V Ranganathan. 2004. Farmers' willingness to pay for power in India: conceptual issues, survey results and implications for pricing. *Energy Economics* **26**:3, 359-369. [[Crossref](#)]
659. Jayson L. Lusk, Ted C. Schroeder. 2004. Are Choice Experiments Incentive Compatible? A Test with Quality Differentiated Beef Steaks. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **86**:2, 467-482. [[Crossref](#)]
660. Mandy Ryan, David A Scott, Cam Donaldson. 2004. Valuing health care using willingness to pay: a comparison of the payment card and dichotomous choice methods. *Journal of Health Economics* **23**:2, 237-258. [[Crossref](#)]
661. Obinna Onwujekwe. 2004. Criterion and content validity of a novel structured haggling contingent valuation question format versus the bidding game and binary with follow-up format. *Social Science & Medicine* **58**:3, 525-537. [[Crossref](#)]
662. Gregory M. Parkhurst, Jason F. Shogren, David L. Dickinson. 2004. Negative Values in Vickrey Auctions. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **86**:1, 222-235. [[Crossref](#)]
663. Paul Rappoport, Lester D. Taylor, James Alleman. WTP Analysis of Mobile Internet Demand 165-179. [[Crossref](#)]
664. L. Venkatachalam. 2004. The contingent valuation method: a review. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* **24**:1, 89-124. [[Crossref](#)]
665. CYNTHIA B. GREEN, THERESE GRIJALVA, STEPHAN KROLL. 2004. Social Capital and the Value of Hunting Club Memberships. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* **9**:1, 57-68. [[Crossref](#)]
666. Bruno S. Frey, Simon Luechinger. 2004. Measuring Terrorism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
667. Richard L. Revesz, Robert N. Stavins. 2004. Environmental Law and Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
668. Alois Stutzer, Simon Luechinger, Bruno S. Frey. 2004. Valuing Public Goods: The Life Satisfaction Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
669. Richard H. McAdams, Eric Bennett Rasmusen. 2004. Norms in Law and Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
670. Rafael Di Tella, John P. Haisken-DeNew, Robert MacCulloch. 2004. Happiness Adaptation to Income and to Status in an Individual Panel. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
671. George D.C Eckton. 2003. Road-user charging and the Lake District National Park. *Journal of Transport Geography* **11**:4, 307-317. [[Crossref](#)]
672. Blessing M Maumbe, Scott M Swinton. 2003. Hidden health costs of pesticide use in Zimbabwe's smallholder cotton growers. *Social Science & Medicine* **57**:9, 1559-1571. [[Crossref](#)]
673. Jayson L. Lusk. 2003. Effects of Cheap Talk on Consumer Willingness-to-Pay for Golden Rice. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **85**:4, 840-856. [[Crossref](#)]
674. Christopher D. Azevedo, Joseph A. Herriges, Catherine L. Kling. 2003. Combining Revealed and Stated Preferences: Consistency Tests and Their Interpretations. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **85**:3, 525-537. [[Crossref](#)]



675. Christian A. Vossler, Joe Kerkvliet, Stephen Polasky, Olesya Gainutdinova. 2003. Externally validating contingent valuation: an open-space survey and referendum in Corvallis, Oregon. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 51:2, 261-277. [[Crossref](#)]
676. N.A. Powe, I.J. Bateman. 2003. Ordering effects in nested 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' contingent valuation designs. *Ecological Economics* 45:2, 255-270. [[Crossref](#)]
677. James A. Brox, Ramesh C. Kumar, Kenneth R. Stollery. 2003. Estimating Willingness to Pay for Improved Water Quality in the Presence of Item Nonresponse Bias. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 85:2, 414-428. [[Crossref](#)]
678. David Aadland, Arthur J. Caplan. 2003. Willingness to Pay for Curbside Recycling with Detection and Mitigation of Hypothetical Bias. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 85:2, 492-502. [[Crossref](#)]
679. Ian J. Bateman, Andrew A. Lovett, Julii S. Brainard. *Applied Environmental Economics* **October**, . [[Crossref](#)]
680. Kenneth F. D. Hughey, Ross Cullen, Emma Moran. 2003. Integrating Economics into Priority Setting and Evaluation in Conservation Management. *Conservation Biology* 17:1, 93-103. [[Crossref](#)]
681. Richard C. Bishop. Where to from Here? 537-566. [[Crossref](#)]
682. Nicholas E. Flores. Conceptual Framework for Nonmarket Valuation 27-58. [[Crossref](#)]
683. James R Foreit, Karen G.Fleischman Foreit. 2003. The reliability and validity of willingness to pay surveys for reproductive health pricing decisions in developing countries. *Health Policy* 63:1, 37-47. [[Crossref](#)]
684. Heather L. MacLean, Lester B. Lave. 2003. Evaluating automobile fuel/propulsion system technologies. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* 29:1, 1-69. [[Crossref](#)]
685. Kjartan Sælensminde. 2003. Embedding effects in valuation of non-market goods. *Transport Policy* 10:1, 59-72. [[Crossref](#)]
686. Shashi Kant. 2003. Extending the boundaries of forest economics. *Forest Policy and Economics* 5:1, 39-56. [[Crossref](#)]
687. Gloria E. Helfand, Peter Berck, Tim Maull. The Theory of Pollution Policy 249-303. [[Crossref](#)]
688. Thamir M. Salih. 2003. Sustainable economic development and the environment. *International Journal of Social Economics* 30:1/2, 153-162. [[Crossref](#)]
689. Lori Snyder Benneer, Robert N. Stavins, Alexander F. Wagner. 2003. Private Options to Use Public Goods: Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
690. Gregory Mark Besharov, Bentley Coffey. 2003. Reconsidering the Experimental Evidence for Quasi-Hyperbolic Discounting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
691. Annegrete Bruvoll, Bente Halvorsen, Karine Nyborg. 2002. Households' recycling efforts. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 36:4, 337-354. [[Crossref](#)]
692. Richard Brunett, Daniel Krewski, David Stieb, Barry Jessiman. Population Health Issues in the Management of Air Quality\* . [[Crossref](#)]
693. Thomas C Brown, Dawn Nannini, Robert B Gorter, Paul A Bell, George L Peterson. 2002. Judged seriousness of environmental losses: reliability and cause of loss. *Ecological Economics* 42:3, 479-491. [[Crossref](#)]
694. Kathleen Segerson, Dan Walker. 2002. Nutrient pollution: An economic perspective. *Estuaries* 25:4, 797-808. [[Crossref](#)]
695. Richard Bennett, Ralph Blaney. 2002. Social consensus, moral intensity and willingness to pay to address a farm animal welfare issue. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 23:4, 501-520. [[Crossref](#)]

696. Terrill R. Hanson, Luther Upton Hatch, Howard C. Clonts. 2002. RESERVOIR WATER LEVEL IMPACTS ON RECREATION, PROPERTY, AND NONUSER VALUES. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **38**:4, 1007-1018. [[Crossref](#)]
697. Warwick J. McKibbin, Peter J. Wilcoxon. 2002. The Role of Economics in Climate Change Policy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **16**:2, 107-129. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
698. Alan Shiell, Lisa Gold. 2002. Contingent valuation in health care and the persistence of embedding effects without the warm glow. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **23**:2, 251-262. [[Crossref](#)]
699. John A. List, Jason F. Shogren. 2002. Calibration of Willingness-to-Accept. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **43**:2, 219-233. [[Crossref](#)]
700. John W Freebairn, John W Zillman. 2002. Economic benefits of meteorological services. *Meteorological Applications* **9**:1, 33-44. [[Crossref](#)]
701. A. Myrick Freeman III. 2002. Environmental Policy Since Earth Day I: What Have We Gained?. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **16**:1, 125-146. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
702. Obinna Onwujekwe, Reginald Chima, Elvis Shu, Douglas Nwagbo, Cyril Akpala, Paul Okonkwo. 2002. Altruistic willingness to pay in community-based sales of insecticide-treated nets exists in Nigeria. *Social Science & Medicine* **54**:4, 519-527. [[Crossref](#)]
703. Volkmar Hartje, Ina Meyer, Jürgen Meyerhoff. Kosten einer möglichen Klimaänderung auf Sylt 181-218. [[Crossref](#)]
704. Robert W. Turner. 2002. Market Failures and the Rationale for National Parks. *The Journal of Economic Education* **33**:4, 347-356. [[Crossref](#)]
705. . Introduction 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
706. . Issue 1 25-36. [[Crossref](#)]
707. . Issue 2 37-50. [[Crossref](#)]
708. . Issue 3 51-71. [[Crossref](#)]
709. . Issue 4 72-86. [[Crossref](#)]
710. . Introduction 89-90. [[Crossref](#)]
711. . The Subnational Role in Sustainable Development 91-114. [[Crossref](#)]
712. . Sustainable Development and Natural Hazards Mitigation 115-130. [[Crossref](#)]
713. . Sustainable Governance 131-144. [[Crossref](#)]
714. . Sustainability in the United States 145-160. [[Crossref](#)]
715. . Sustainable Development and the Use of Public Lands 161-175. [[Crossref](#)]
716. . The Impact of Political Institutions on Preservation of U.S. and Canadian National Parks 176-193. [[Crossref](#)]
717. . Global Environmental Accountability 194-206. [[Crossref](#)]
718. . Introduction 209-211. [[Crossref](#)]
719. . Issue 1 212-235. [[Crossref](#)]
720. . Issue 2 236-261. [[Crossref](#)]
721. . Issue 3 262-290. [[Crossref](#)]
722. . Issue 4 291-313. [[Crossref](#)]
723. . Conclusion 314-339. [[Crossref](#)]
724. . Note 341-349. [[Crossref](#)]
725. . References 351-374. [[Crossref](#)]

726. John A. List. 2001. Do Explicit Warnings Eliminate the Hypothetical Bias in Elicitation Procedures? Evidence from Field Auctions for Sportscards. *American Economic Review* **91**:5, 1498-1507. [[Citation](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
727. John M. Gowdy, Kozo Mayumi. 2001. Reformulating the foundations of consumer choice theory and environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* **39**:2, 223-237. [[Crossref](#)]
728. Marlene Gyldmark, Gwendolyn C Morrison. 2001. Demand for health care in Denmark: results of a national sample survey using contingent valuation. *Social Science & Medicine* **53**:8, 1023-1036. [[Crossref](#)]
729. Robert Drago, David Costanza, Robert Caplan, Tanya Brubaker, Darnell Cloud, Naomi Harris, Russell Kashian, T. Lynn Riggs. 2001. The Willingness-to-Pay for Work/Family Policies: A Study of Teachers. *ILR Review* **55**:1, 22-41. [[Crossref](#)]
730. Douglas D Ofiara. 2001. Assessment of Economic Losses from Marine Pollution: An Introduction to Economic Principles and Methods. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **42**:9, 709-725. [[Crossref](#)]
731. Adam Finn, Stuart McFadyen, Colin Hoskins, Maureen Hupfer. 2001. Quantifying the Sources of Value of a Public Service. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* **20**:2, 225-239. [[Crossref](#)]
732. Anna Norinder, Krister Hjalte, Ulf Persson. 2001. Scope and scale insensitivities in a contingent valuation study of risk reductions. *Health Policy* **57**:2, 141-153. [[Crossref](#)]
733. L. U. Hatch, T. R. Hanson. 2001. Change and Conflict in Land and Water Use: Resource Valuation in Conflict Resolution among Competing Users. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* **33**:2, 297-306. [[Crossref](#)]
734. M. Christie. 2001. A comparison of alternative contingent valuation elicitation treatments for the evaluation of complex environmental policy. *Journal of Environmental Management* **62**:3, 255-269. [[Crossref](#)]
735. Roberto Roson. 2001. Assessing the Option Value of a Publicly Provided Service: The Case of Local Transport. *Urban Studies* **38**:8, 1319-1327. [[Crossref](#)]
736. Karen Blumenschein, Magnus Johannesson, Krista K Yokoyama, Patricia R Freeman. 2001. Hypothetical versus real willingness to pay in the health care sector: results from a field experiment. *Journal of Health Economics* **20**:3, 441-457. [[Crossref](#)]
737. Youdi Schipper, Piet Rietveld, Peter Nijkamp. 2001. Environmental externalities in air transport markets. *Journal of Air Transport Management* **7**:3, 169-179. [[Crossref](#)]
738. H. Peter Witzke, Guido Urfei. 2001. Willingness To Pay for Environmental Protection in Germany: Coping With the Regional Dimension. *Regional Studies* **35**:3, 207-214. [[Crossref](#)]
739. Fredrik Carlsson, Peter Martinsson. 2001. Willingness to pay for reduction in air pollution: a multilevel analysis. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* **4**:1, 17-27. [[Crossref](#)]
740. A. Lovett, I. Bateman. 2001. Economic analysis of environmental preferences: progress and prospects. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **25**:2, 131-139. [[Crossref](#)]
741. J.B Braden, C.D Kolstad, R.A Woock, J.A Machado. 2001. Is coal desulphurisation worthwhile? Evidence from the market. *Energy Policy* **29**:3, 217-225. [[Crossref](#)]
742. Donald W. Katzner. The Misuse of Measurement in Economics 175-195. [[Crossref](#)]
743. V.K. Smith. Environmental Economics 4611-4617. [[Crossref](#)]
744. R.T. Carson. Resources and Environment: Contingent Valuation 13272-13275. [[Crossref](#)]
745. Ju-Chin Huang. 2001. Precision of dichotomous choice contingent valuation welfare measures: some simulation results. *Applied Economics* **33**:1, 91-101. [[Crossref](#)]
746. Simon Hudson, J. R. Brent Ritchie. 2001. Cross-cultural tourist behavior: An analysis of tourist attitudes towards the environment. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* **10**:2-3, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]

747. Gary R. Vieth, Herath Gunatilake, Linda J. Cox. 2001. Economics of Soil Conservation: The Upper Mahaweli Watershed of Sri Lanka. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **52**:1, 139-152. [[Crossref](#)]
748. Tobias Schulz. 2001. Framing Environmental Ballot, Propositions: The Influence of Simultaneous 'Pocketbook Measures' and Negative Framing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
749. Henrik Svedsäter. 2000. Contingent valuation of global environmental resources: Test of perfect and regular embedding. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **21**:6, 605-623. [[Crossref](#)]
750. Richard W. Dunford. 2000. Estimating Ground-Water Damages from Hazardous-Substance Releases. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* **126**:6, 366-373. [[Crossref](#)]
751. Leonard Shabman, Kurt Stephenson. 2000. Environmental Valuation and Its Economic Critics. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* **126**:6, 382-388. [[Crossref](#)]
752. John B. Braden. 2000. Value of Valuation: Introduction. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* **126**:6, 336-338. [[Crossref](#)]
753. Dong-Churl Suh. 2000. Consumers' Willingness to Pay for Pharmacy Services that Reduce Risk of Medication-Related Problems. *Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (1996)* **40**:6, 818-827. [[Crossref](#)]
754. Peter Hjertholm, Finn Tarp. References . [[Crossref](#)]
755. John C. Whitehead, Timothy C. Haab, Ju-Chin Huang. 2000. Measuring recreation benefits of quality improvements with revealed and stated behavior data. *Resource and Energy Economics* **22**:4, 339-354. [[Crossref](#)]
756. Jacquelin Burgess, Judy Clark, Carolyn Harrison. 2000. Culture, Communication, and the Information Problem in Contingent Valuation Surveys: A Case Study of a Wildlife Enhancement Scheme. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* **18**:5, 505-524. [[Crossref](#)]
757. Ronald G. Cummings, Mary Beth Walker. 2000. Measuring the effectiveness of voluntary emission reduction programmes. *Applied Economics* **32**:13, 1719-1726. [[Crossref](#)]
758. James K Hammitt, Jin-Tan Liu, Wen-Ching KLin. 2000. Sensitivity of willingness to pay to the magnitude of risk reduction: a Taiwan-United States comparison. *Journal of Risk Research* **3**:4, 305-320. [[Crossref](#)]
759. Kelly M. Brown, Laura O. Taylor. 2000. Do as you say, say as you do: evidence on gender differences in actual and stated contributions to public goods. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **43**:1, 127-139. [[Crossref](#)]
760. Donald Kent. Evaluating Wetland Functions and Values . [[Crossref](#)]
761. Richard A. Hirth, Michael E. Chernew, Edward Miller, A. Mark Fendrick, William G. Weissert. 2000. Willingness to Pay for a Quality-adjusted Life Year. *Medical Decision Making* **20**:3, 332-342. [[Crossref](#)]
762. Wendy A. Stock, Richard M. Alston, Martin Milkman. 2000. The academic labor market for economists: 1995-96. *Atlantic Economic Journal* **28**:2, 164-185. [[Crossref](#)]
763. Mandy Ryan, Fernando San Miguel. 2000. Testing for consistency in willingness to pay experiments. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **21**:3, 305-317. [[Crossref](#)]
764. V.Kerry Smith. 2000. JEEM and Non-market Valuation: 1974-1998. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **39**:3, 351-374. [[Crossref](#)]
765. David J Ball. 2000. Consumer affairs and the valuation of safety. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* **32**:3, 337-343. [[Crossref](#)]
766. Richard Cookson. 2000. Incorporating psycho-social considerations into health valuation: an experimental study. *Journal of Health Economics* **19**:3, 369-401. [[Crossref](#)]

767. Bengt Liljas, Karen Blumenschein. 2000. On hypothetical bias and calibration in cost–benefit studies. *Health Policy* 52:1, 53–70. [[Crossref](#)]
768. Fredrik Carlsson, Olof Johansson-Stenman. 2000. Willingness to pay for improved air quality in Sweden. *Applied Economics* 32:6, 661–669. [[Crossref](#)]
769. Judy Clark, Jacquelin Burgess, Carolyn M Harrison. 2000. “I struggled with this money business”: respondents’ perspectives on contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* 33:1, 45–62. [[Crossref](#)]
770. J.G.F. Caplen. 2000. Southampton international airport: an environmental approach. *Eco-Management and Auditing* 7:1, 43–49. [[Crossref](#)]
771. John Hall, Ian Preston. 2000. Tax price effects on attitudes to hypothecated tax increases. *Journal of Public Economics* 75:3, 417–438. [[Crossref](#)]
772. Gary A. Zarkin, Sheryl C. Cates, Mohan V. Bala. 2000. Estimating the willingness to pay for drug abuse treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 18:2, 149–159. [[Crossref](#)]
773. Richard T. Burnett, Barry Jessiman, David Stieb, Daniel Krewski. 2000. Population Health Issues in the Management of Air Quality. *Ecosystem Health* 6:1, 67–78. [[Crossref](#)]
774. R.P Berrens, A.K Bohara, C.L Silva, D Brookshire, M McKee. 2000. Contingent values for New Mexico instream flows: With tests of scope, group-size reminder and temporal reliability. *Journal of Environmental Management* 58:1, 73–90. [[Crossref](#)]
775. Matthew J Kotchen, Stephen D Reiling. 2000. Environmental attitudes, motivations, and contingent valuation of nonuse values: a case study involving endangered species. *Ecological Economics* 32:1, 93–107. [[Crossref](#)]
776. John G. Cullis, Philip R. Jones, Carol Propper. Chapter 23 Waiting lists and medical treatment: Analysis and policies 1201–1249. [[Crossref](#)]
777. Ruth Thomas, Cam Donaldson, David Torgerson. 2000. Who Answers ‘Willingness to Pay’ Questions?. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 5:1, 7–11. [[Crossref](#)]
778. . Bibliography . [[Crossref](#)]
779. Euston Quah, Khye Chong Tan. 1999. Pricing a scenic view: the case of Singapore's East Coast Park. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 17:4, 295–303. [[Crossref](#)]
780. David M. Aadland, Arthur J. Caplan. 1999. Household Valuation of Curbside Recycling. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 42:6, 781–799. [[Crossref](#)]
781. Bonwoo Koo, Brian D Wright. 1999. The role of biodiversity products as incentives for conserving biological diversity: some instructive examples. *Science of The Total Environment* 240:1–3, 21–30. [[Crossref](#)]
782. W. Kip Viscusi,, James T. Hamilton. 1999. Are Risk Regulators Rational? Evidence from Hazardous Waste Cleanup Decisions. *American Economic Review* 89:4, 1010–1027. [[Citation](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
783. Robert P. Berrens, Michael McKee, Michael C. Farmer. 1999. Incorporating distributional considerations in the safe minimum standard approach: endangered species and local impacts. *Ecological Economics* 30:3, 461–474. [[Crossref](#)]
784. David Zilberman, Scott R Templeton, Madhu Khanna. 1999. Agriculture and the environment: an economic perspective with implications for nutrition. *Food Policy* 24:2–3, 211–229. [[Crossref](#)]
785. Tsu-Tan Fu, Jin-Tan Liu, James K. Hammitt. 1999. Consumer Willingness to Pay for Low-Pesticide Fresh Produce in Taiwan. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 50:2, 220–233. [[Crossref](#)]
786. Terrance M. Hurley, Daniel Otto, Janice Holtkamp. 1999. Valuation of Water Quality in Livestock Regions: An Application to Rural Watersheds in Iowa. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 31:1, 177–184. [[Crossref](#)]

787. P. B. Anand, Roger Perman. 1999. Preferences, inequity and entitlements: some issues from a CVM study of water supply in Madras, India. *Journal of International Development* 11:1, 27-46. [[Crossref](#)]
788. James T. Hamilton, W. Kip Viscusi. 1999. How costly is "clean"? An analysis of the benefits and costs of Superfund site remediations. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18:1, 2-27. [[Crossref](#)]
789. Michael Ahlheim. Die monetäre Bewertung von Naturgütern aus ökonomischer Sicht 249-263. [[Crossref](#)]
790. Scott M. Swinton, Nicole N. Owens, Eileen O. van Ravenswaay. Health Risk Information to Reduce Water Pollution 263-271. [[Crossref](#)]
791. Daniel McFadden, Mark J. Machina, Jonathan Baron. Rationality for Economists? 73-110. [[Crossref](#)]
792. Daniel Kahneman, Ilana Ritov, David Schkade, Steven J. Sherman, Hal R. Varian. Economic Preferences or Attitude Expressions?: An Analysis of Dollar Responses to Public Issues 203-242. [[Crossref](#)]
793. Kjartan Sælensminde. 1999. Stated choice valuation of urban traffic air pollution and noise. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 4:1, 13-27. [[Crossref](#)]
794. M STRAHILEVITZ. 1999. The Effects of Product Type and Donation Magnitude on Willingness to Pay More for a Charity-Linked Brand. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 8:3, 215-241. [[Crossref](#)]
795. Douglas C. Macmillan, David Harley, Ruth Morrison. 1998. Cost-effectiveness analysis of woodland ecosystem restoration. *Ecological Economics* 27:3, 313-324. [[Crossref](#)]
796. John Duffield. 1998. TWO PERSPECTIVES ON ECONOMY AND NATURE: A REVIEW. *Review of Income and Wealth* 44:4, 571-583. [[Crossref](#)]
797. Kimberly Rollins, Audrey Lyke. 1998. The Case for Diminishing Marginal Existence Values. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 36:3, 324-344. [[Crossref](#)]
798. Robert P. Berrens, Alok K. Bohara, Hank Jenkins-Smith, Carol L. Silva, Philip Ganderton, David Brookshire. 1998. A joint investigation of public support and public values: case of instream flows in New Mexico. *Ecological Economics* 27:2, 189-203. [[Crossref](#)]
799. Michael Ahlheim. 1998. Contingent valuation and the budget constraint. *Ecological Economics* 27:2, 205-211. [[Crossref](#)]
800. John A. List, Jason F. Shogren. 1998. Calibration of the difference between actual and hypothetical valuations in a field experiment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 37:2, 193-205. [[Crossref](#)]
801. Magnus Johannesson, Per-Olov Johansson, Tore Söderqvist. 1998. Time spent on waiting lists for medical care: an insurance approach. *Journal of Health Economics* 17:5, 627-644. [[Crossref](#)]
802. John A. List, Michael Margolis, Jason F. Shogren. 1998. Hypothetical-actual bid calibration of a multigood auction. *Economics Letters* 60:3, 263-268. [[Crossref](#)]
803. Ronald C. Griffin. 1998. The fundamental principles of cost-benefit analysis. *Water Resources Research* 34:8, 2063-2071. [[Crossref](#)]
804. John Calfee, Clifford Winston. 1998. The value of automobile travel time: implications for congestion policy. *Journal of Public Economics* 69:1, 83-102. [[Crossref](#)]
805. Ian Hodge, Sandra McNally. 1998. Evaluating the environmentally sensitive areas: the value of rural environments and policy relevance. *Journal of Rural Studies* 14:3, 357-367. [[Crossref](#)]
806. John B. Loomis, Armando González-Cabán. 1998. A willingness-to-pay function for protecting acres of spotted owl habitat from fire. *Ecological Economics* 25:3, 315-322. [[Crossref](#)]
807. Donald Green, Karen E. Jacowitz, Daniel Kahneman, Daniel McFadden. 1998. Referendum contingent valuation, anchoring, and willingness to pay for public goods. *Resource and Energy Economics* 20:2, 85-116. [[Crossref](#)]



808. Robert P. Berrens, David Brookshire, Philip Ganderton, Mike McKee. 1998. Exploring nonmarket values for the social impacts of environmental policy change. *Resource and Energy Economics* 20:2, 117-137. [[Crossref](#)]
809. William D. Schulze, Gary H. McClelland, Jeffrey K. Lazo, Robert D. Rowe. 1998. Embedding and calibration in measuring non-use values. *Resource and Energy Economics* 20:2, 163-178. [[Crossref](#)]
810. Christopher N. Carter. 1998. Fiscal effects of voter initiatives to ban certain methods of bear and cougar hunting: Oregon's experience. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 3:2, 29-41. [[Crossref](#)]
811. Bryan L. Boulier, Robert S. Goldfarb. 1998. On the use and nonuse of surveys in economics. *Journal of Economic Methodology* 5:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
812. Michael Beenstock, Ephraim Goldin, Yoel Haitovsky. 1998. Response bias in a conjoint analysis of power outages. *Energy Economics* 20:2, 135-156. [[Crossref](#)]
813. William S. Breffle, Edward R. Morey, Tymon S. Lodder. 1998. Using Contingent Valuation to Estimate a Neighbourhood's Willingness to Pay to Preserve Undeveloped Urban Land. *Urban Studies* 35:4, 715-727. [[Crossref](#)]
814. Choong-Ki Lee, Ju-Hee Lee, Sang-Yoel Han. 1998. Measuring the Economic Value of Ecotourism Resources: The Case of South Korea. *Journal of Travel Research* 36:4, 40-46. [[Crossref](#)]
815. F. Reed Johnson, William H. Desvousges, Melissa C. Ruby, David Stieb, Paul De Civita. 1998. Eliciting Stated Health Preferences. *Medical Decision Making* 18:2\_suppl, S57-S67. [[Crossref](#)]
816. Cam Donaldson, Vanora Hundley, Tracy Mapp. 1998. Willingness To Pay: A Method For Measuring Preferences For Maternity Care?. *Birth* 25:1, 32-39. [[Crossref](#)]
817. 1998. Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences. *Psychological Science* 9:2, 79-90. [[Crossref](#)]
818. Jacquelin Burgess, Judy Clark, Carolyn M Harrison. 1998. Respondents' evaluations of a CV survey: a case study based on an economic valuation of the Wildlife Enhancement Scheme, Pevensey Levels in East Sussex. *Area* 30:1, 19-27. [[Crossref](#)]
819. Nick Hanley, Douglas MacMillan, Robert E. Wright, Craig Bullock, Ian Simpson, Dave Parsisson, Bob Crabtree. 1998. Contingent Valuation Versus Choice Experiments: Estimating the Benefits of Environmentally Sensitive Areas in Scotland. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 49:1, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
820. Stephen Polasky, Holly Doremus. 1998. When the Truth Hurts: Endangered Species Policy on Private Land with Imperfect Information. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 35:1, 22-47. [[Crossref](#)]
821. Agostina Aimola. Individual WTPs for Reductions in Cancer Death Risks 195-212. [[Crossref](#)]
822. Giorgio Casoni. Cognitive Representations of Total Value in a CVM Framework: A Critical Review of the Literature 73-94. [[Crossref](#)]
823. Bente Halvorsen, Jon Strand, Kjartan Sælensminde, Fred Wenstøp. Comparing Contingent Valuation, Conjoint Analysis and Decision Panels: An Application to the Valuation of Reduced Damages from Air Pollution in Norway 285-302. [[Crossref](#)]
824. Daniel McFadden. Measuring Willingness-to-Pay for Transportation Improvements 339-364. [[Crossref](#)]
825. Richard T Carson. 1998. Valuation of tropical rainforests: philosophical and practical issues in the use of contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* 24:1, 15-29. [[Crossref](#)]
826. Melissa Ruby Banzhaf, William H. Desvousges, F. Reed Johnson, Dave Stieb, Paul De Civita. 1998. Eliciting Stated Preferences: An Application to Willingness to Pay for Longevity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

827. Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann, Raymond J. Kopp, Jon A. Krosnick, Robert C. Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. Kerry Kerry Smith. 1998. Referendum Design and Contingent Valuation: The NOAA Panel's No-Vote Recommendation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
828. Kofi Kissi Dompere. 1997. Cost-benefit analysis, benefit accounting and fuzzy decisions. (I) Theory. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **92**:3, 275-287. [[Crossref](#)]
829. Karen Blumenschein, Magnus Johannesson, Glenn C Blomquist, Bengt Liljas, Richard M O'Conor. 1997. Hypothetical versus real payments in Vickrey auctions. *Economics Letters* **56**:2, 177-180. [[Crossref](#)]
830. JOHN DUFFIELD. 1997. NONMARKET VALUATION AND THE COURTS: THE CASE OF THE EXXON VALDEZ. *Contemporary Economic Policy* **15**:4, 98-110. [[Crossref](#)]
831. Paul M. Jakus, J. Mark Fly, Becky Stephens. 1997. Estimating tennessee residents' willingness to pay for Teaming with wildlife. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* **2**:3, 16-26. [[Crossref](#)]
832. Magnus Johannesson, Per-Olov Johansson. 1997. Quality of life and the WTP for an increased life expectancy at an advanced age. *Journal of Public Economics* **65**:2, 219-228. [[Crossref](#)]
833. Hege Westskog. 1997. The Use of Cost-Benefit Analysis to Decide Environmental Policy – a Dead End?. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* **8**:3, 185-208. [[Crossref](#)]
834. Catherine M. Chambers, Paul E. Chambers, John C. Whitehead. 1997. Historical resources, uncertainty and preservation values: An application of option and optimal stopping models. *Journal of Economics and Finance* **21**:2, 51-61. [[Crossref](#)]
835. Kathryn A. Phillips, Rick K. Homan, Harold S. Luft, Patricia H. Hiatt, Kent R. Olson, Thomas E. Kearney, Stuart E. Heard. 1997. Willingness to pay for poison control centers. *Journal of Health Economics* **16**:3, 343-357. [[Crossref](#)]
836. John B. Loomis, Armando González-Cabán. 1997. How certain are visitors of their economic values of river recreation: An evaluation using repeated questioning and revealed preference. *Water Resources Research* **33**:5, 1187-1193. [[Crossref](#)]
837. G.D. Carnegie, P.W. Wolnizer. 1997. The Financial Reporting of Publicly-owned Collections: Whither Financial (market) Values and Contingent Valuation Estimates?. *Australian Accounting Review* **7**:13, 44-50. [[Crossref](#)]
838. K.E. McConnell. 1997. Does Altruism Undermine Existence Value?. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **32**:1, 22-37. [[Crossref](#)]
839. Bruno S. Frey. The Evaluation of Cultural Heritage: Some Critical Issues 31-49. [[Crossref](#)]
840. Michael A. Toman. Ecosystem Valuation: An Overview of Issues and Uncertainties 25-44. [[Crossref](#)]
841. Anne van der Veen. Contingent Valuation, Sustainability and a Green National Income 163-179. [[Crossref](#)]
842. Raymond J. Kopp, Katherine A. Pease. Contingent Valuation: Economics, Law and Politics 7-58. [[Crossref](#)]
843. Raymond J. Kopp, V. Kerry Smith. Constructing Measures of Economic Value 101-125. [[Crossref](#)]
844. Richard T. Carson. Contingent Valuation Surveys and Tests of Insensitivity to Scope 127-163. [[Crossref](#)]
845. K. E. McConnell. Nonmarket Valuation and the Estimation of Damages from Global Warming 121-139. [[Crossref](#)]
846. Kathryn A. Phillips, David R. Holtgrave. 1997. Using Cost-Effectiveness/Cost- Benefit Analysis to Allocate Health Resources: A Level Playing Field for Prevention?. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **13**:1, 18-25. [[Crossref](#)]



847. Vivien Foster, Ian J. Bateman, David Harley. 1997. REAL AND HYPOTHETICAL WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION: A NON-EXPERIMENTAL COMPARISON. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **48**:1-3, 123-137. [[Crossref](#)]
848. V. Kerry Kerry Smith. 1997. Pricing What is Priceless: A Status Report on Non-Market Valuation of Environmental Resources. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
849. V. Kerry Kerry Smith, Xiaolong Zhang, Raymond B. Palmquist. 1997. Marine Debris, Beach Quality, and Non-Market Values. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
850. Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann, Raymond J. Kopp, Jon A. Krosnick, Robert C. Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. Kerry Kerry Smith. 1997. Temporal Reliability of Estimates from Contingent Valuation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
851. Rebecca P. Judge, Laura L. Osborne, V. Kerry Kerry Smith. 1997. Valuing Beach Renourishment: Is it Preservation?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
852. Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann, Raymond J. Kopp, Jon A. Krosnick, Robert C. Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. Kerry Kerry Smith. 1997. Was the NOAA Panel Correct about Contingent Valuation?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
853. V. Kerry Kerry Smith, Laura L. Osborne. 1997. Do Contingent Valuation Estimates Pass a "Scope" Test? A Meta Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
854. V. Kerry Kerry Smith, Kurt A. Schwabe, Carol Mansfield. 1997. Does Nature Limit Environmental Federalism?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
855. V. Kerry Kerry Smith, Carol Mansfield. 1997. Buying Time: Real and Hypothetical Offers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
856. Bente Halvorsen. 1996. Ordering effects in contingent valuation surveys. *Environmental & Resource Economics* **8**:4, 485-499. [[Crossref](#)]
857. John B. Loomis, Armando Gonzalez-Caban. 1996. The Importance of the Market Area Determination for Estimating Aggregate Benefits of Public Goods: Testing Differences in Resident and Nonresident Willingness to Pay. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* **25**:2, 161-170. [[Crossref](#)]
858. John B. Loomis, Douglas S. White. 1996. Economic benefits of rare and endangered species: summary and meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* **18**:3, 197-206. [[Crossref](#)]
859. John E. Keith, Christopher Fawson, Van Johnson. 1996. Preservation or use A contingent valuation study of wilderness designation in Utah. *Ecological Economics* **18**:3, 207-214. [[Crossref](#)]
860. MICHAEL T. FRENCH, JOSEPHINE A. MAUSKOPF, JACKQUELINE L. TEAGUE, E. JOYCE ROLAND. 1996. Estimating the Dollar Value of Health Outcomes from Drug-Abuse Interventions. *Medical Care* **34**:9, 890-910. [[Crossref](#)]
861. Peter C. Boxall, Wiktor L. Adamowicz, Joffre Swait, Michael Williams, Jordan Louviere. 1996. A comparison of stated preference methods for environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* **18**:3, 243-253. [[Crossref](#)]
862. W. Kip Viscusi. 1996. Economic Foundations of the Current Regulatory Reform Efforts. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **10**:3, 119-134. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
863. William F. Hyde, Gregory S. Amacher. 1996. Applications of environmental accounting and the new household economics: new technical economic issues with a common theme in forestry. *Forest Ecology and Management* **83**:3, 137-148. [[Crossref](#)]
864. STUART HARRIS. 1996. Economics of the Environment: A Survey. *Economic Record* **72**:217, 154-171. [[Crossref](#)]
865. Phil Shackley, John Cairns. 1996. Evaluating the benefits of antenatal screening: an alternative approach. *Health Policy* **36**:2, 103-115. [[Crossref](#)]

866. Magnus Johannesson. 1996. The Contingent Valuation Controversy in Environmental Economics and its Relevance to Health Services Research. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 1:2, 116-117. [[Crossref](#)]
867. James Stodder. 1996. The evolution of externality rights: Flexibility versus ambiguity. *European Journal of Law and Economics* 3:1, 61-81. [[Crossref](#)]
868. Anthony M. Yezer,, Robert S. Goldfarb,, Paul J. Poppen. 1996. Does Studying Economics Discourage Cooperation? Watch What We Do, Not What We Say or How We Play. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10:1, 177-186. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
869. J. Weimann. Monetarisierungsverfahren aus der Sicht der ökonomischen Theorie 415-440. [[Crossref](#)]
870. Joachim Weimann. Kollektive Entscheidungen 150-228. [[Crossref](#)]
871. James A. Brox, Ramesh C. Kumar, Kenneth R. Stollery. 1996. WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY ENHANCEMENTS IN THE GRAND RIVER WATERSHED. *Canadian Water Resources Journal* 21:3, 275-288. [[Crossref](#)]
872. Cam Donaldson, Phil Shackley, Mona Abdalla, Zosia Miedzybrodzka. 1995. Willingness to pay for antenatal carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. *Health Economics* 4:6, 439-452. [[Crossref](#)]
873. Milind Kandlikar. 1995. The relative role of trace gas emissions in greenhouse abatement policies. *Energy Policy* 23:10, 879-883. [[Crossref](#)]
874. Kevin J. Boyle, Michael P. Welsh, Richard C. Bishop, Robert M. Baumgartner. 1995. Validating Contingent Valuation with Surveys of Experts. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 24:2, 247-254. [[Crossref](#)]
875. GLENN C. BLOMQUIST, JOHN C. WHITEHEAD. 1995. Existence Value, Contingent Valuation, and Natural Resources Damages Assessment. *Growth and Change* 26:4, 573-589. [[Crossref](#)]
876. JAMES R. KAHN. 1995. Square Pegs and Round Holes: Can the Economic Paradigm be Used to Value the Wilderness?. *Growth and Change* 26:4, 591-610. [[Crossref](#)]
877. Thomas H. Stevens, Samuel Benin, Joseph S. Larson. 1995. Public attitudes and economic values for wetland preservation in New England. *Wetlands* 15:3, 226-231. [[Crossref](#)]
878. James K. Hammitt. 1995. Outcome and value uncertainties in global-change policy. *Climatic Change* 30:2, 125-145. [[Crossref](#)]
879. Peter B. Moyle, Petrea R. Moyle. 1995. Endangered fishes and economics: intergenerational obligations. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 43:1, 29-37. [[Crossref](#)]
880. Erik Doxtader. 1995. Learning Public Deliberation Through the Critique of Institutional Argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 31:4, 185-203. [[Crossref](#)]
881. Amartya Sen. 1995. ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION AND SOCIAL CHOICE: CONTINGENT VALUATION AND THE MARKET ANALOGY. *The Japanese Economic Review* 46:1, 23-37. [[Crossref](#)]
882. Asbjorn Aaheim, Karine Nyborg. 1995. ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICABILITY OF A "GREEN NATIONAL PRODUCT". *Review of Income and Wealth* 41:1, 57-71. [[Crossref](#)]
883. Kenneth E. McConnell. 1995. Issues in Estimating Benefits with Non-Market Methods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
884. Yacov Tsur, Amos Zemel. 1994. ENDANGERED SPECIES AND NATURAL RESOURCE EXPLOITATION: EXTINCTION VS. COEXISTENCE. *Natural Resource Modeling* 8:4, 389-413. [[Crossref](#)]
885. Paul Rappoport, Lester D. Taylor, James Alleman. Estimating the Demand for Voice over IP Services: A Contingent Valuation Approach 227-240. [[Crossref](#)]

886. David A. Evans, H. Spencer Banzhaf, Dallas Burtraw, Alan J. Krupnick, Juha Siikamäki. Valuing Benefits from Ecosystem Improvements using Stated Preference Methods: An Example from Reducing Acidification in the Adirondacks Park 101-117. [[Crossref](#)]
887. . The Contingent Valuation Method 77-130. [[Crossref](#)]
888. Sang Sup Cho, Sin-won Kang. An economic value analysis on the evolution path of portable internet service: is voice better than broadcast as integrated service? 327-335. [[Crossref](#)]
889. Sang-Woo Lee, Myeong-Cheol Park, Dan J. Kim. Mobile Number Portability in an Asymmetric Telecommunications Market 298-321. [[Crossref](#)]