

DCE revisions

Housing study guidelines

Original papers and policy reviews should be compiled in the following order: **title page; abstract; keywords; main text introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion; acknowledgments; declaration of interest statement; references; appendices** (as appropriate); table(s) with caption(s) (on individual pages); figures; figure captions (as a list). Please include endnotes (not footnotes) sparingly. Until the paper is accepted for publication, the title page of the drafts should include next to the paper title, author information, a biographical note for each author, as well as the Acknowledgements. Acknowledgements would include reference to previous versions of the paper (such as to conference and working papers) that the paper submitted to Housing Studies benefitted from.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=chos20#structure>

Structure of DCE papers found in Housing Studies

Lee et al. 2025	Aitkenet al. 2024	Ossokina et al 2022	Ardeshiri et al. 2024	Guidelines
"Heterogeneities in willingness to pay for circular affordable housing: insight from young users"	"Do older homebuyers prefer dwellings with accessibility and adaptability features? Findings from an exploratory study"	"Reference-dependent housing choice behaviour: why are older people reluctant to move?"	"Housing preferences for owner-occupied versus investment properties in Sydney, Australia"	
<b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> <b>Literature review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Theory of affordable housing</li><li>- Circular business model in buildings</li><li>- CBM attributes for affordable housing</li><li>- Young adults WTP</li><li>- Influential factors for WTP<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>→ Socio-economic characteristics</li><li>→ Sustainability attitudes</li></ul></li></ul> <b>Research contexts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Similarities and differences between The Netherlands and Taiwan</li><li>- Affordable housing in Taiwan and the Netherlands</li></ul> <b>Methodology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Experimental design</li><li>- Sampling and questionnaire</li><li>- Empirical models for taste heterogeneity</li></ul> <b>Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sample description</li><li>- Examination of taste heterogeneity<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Young adults' preferences for attributes in different contexts</li><li>- WTP of young adults for a preferred CBM</li></ul></li></ul> <b>Discussion and recommendations</b> <b>Conclusions</b>	<b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> <b>Ageing, housing and relocation</b> <b>Materials and Methods</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Recruitment</li><li>- Analysis</li><li>- Ethics</li></ul> <b>Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sample</li><li>- Importance of housing attributes</li><li>- Modelling</li><li>- Marginal willingness to pay</li></ul> <b>Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Limitations</li></ul> <b>Conclusion</b> <b>Notes</b> <b>Acknowledgements</b> <b>Disclosure statement</b> <b>Funding</b> <b>Notes of contributors</b>	<b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> <b>A framework for analysing reference-dependent choice</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Concepts and definitions</li><li>- Models</li></ul> <b>Application - analysis of older-people housing preferences</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Discrete choice experiment data</li><li>- Set-up of the analysis</li><li>- Results of attribute tests</li><li>- Results of final model estimation</li><li>- Illustration</li></ul> <b>Policy implications</b> <b>Conclusions and discussion</b> <b>Notes</b> <b>Disclosure statement</b> <b>Funding</b>	<b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> <b>Literature review</b> <b>Materials and methods</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Measurement of preference</li><li>- Experimental design</li><li>- Model formulation</li></ul> <b>Estimation results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Household segment 1 - the urban denizens of the CBD</li><li>- Household segment 2 - the inhabitants of the suburban enclaves</li><li>- Household segment 3 - the exurban settlers</li><li>- Willingness to pay for purchasing owner occupied versus investment properties</li></ul> <b>Discussion</b> <b>Conclusion</b> <b>Notes</b> <b>Disclosure statement</b> <b>Notes on contributors</b>	<b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> <b>Materials and methods</b> <b>Results</b> <b>Discussion</b> <b>Acknowledgments</b> <b>Declaration of interest statemnet</b> <b>References</b> <b>Appendix</b>

Tables from DCE papers found in Housing studies (first four columns). Related papers, including the Caplan et al 2021 inspiration paper, in other columns.

Lee et al. 2025	Ardeshiri et al. 2024	Aitkenet al. 2024	Ossokina et al. 2022	Caplan et al 2021	Christie et al	Li et al. 2024
Use latent class logit. Separate tests on each country of interest	Use a type of latent class model on two different sets of attributes	Uses latent class model and has an interaction-term model.		Journal: <b>Regional Science and Urban Economics</b>  Use mixed logit models. We follow this paper in their methodology	Use mixed logit models.	Journal: <b>Land use Policy</b>  Use mixed logit models.
Separate regression results and Willingness to pay estimates into 2 tables:	Report regression results in appendix. Do not show WTP in a table - but illustrate with a figure (also in the appendix).  VERY sparse explanations of tables	Report three tables - a "Main effects model" and "Models including interaction terms" and separate WTP table	Report one table of regression results	Reports "parsimonious model" regressions first between owners and renters. Then presents results from interaction models in tables (only showing the interaction effects, hiding the main effects in the model)	Reports regression results between renters and owners in initial tables.  Secondary tables include interaction effects.	Report mixed logit results and a separate WTP table (in percentage terms).  VERY sparse explanations of the mixed logit model or results (e.g. do not present Standard deviations of the normally distributed coefficients)

[illegible]

Attribute	Level	Agreement		Detailed
		WTP	WTP	
Constant		1.00	4.20	2.10
		0.50	0.00	0.00
Dwelling price	10% above the same	0.00	0.00	0.00
Green open area	15% higher	0.50	0.00	0.00
	No	0.00	0.00	0.00
Green streets along	Some	15.00	32.00	19.00
	A lot	15.00	32.00	19.00
School complex	50%	-10.00	-29.00	-21.00
	25%	-10.00	-29.00	-21.00
Road traffic	Some	-16.00	-29.00	-21.00
	10 min, walking	0	0	0
	15 min, walking	0	0	0
Distance to CBD	20 min, walking	-22.00	-30.00	-3.00
	30 min, walking	-22.00	-30.00	-3.00
Distance to entertainment	15 min, walking	0.00	7.00	1.00
	30 min, walking	-3.00	3.00	3.00
Distance to green park	15 min, walking	-2.00	4.00	5.00
	30 min, walking	0	0	0
Distance to shopping	15 min, walking	-3.00	-18.00	-18.00
	30 min, walking	0	0	0
Distance to train station	15 min, walking	-3.00	-3.00	-3.00
	30 min, walking	0	0	0

- limitations
- methodological considerations
- policy implications
- conclusions.