

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

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	Aitknet 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.		<p>Journal: <i>Regional Science and Urban Economics</i></p> <p>Use mixed logit models. We follow this paper in their methodologoy</p>	<p>Use mixed logit models.</p>	<p>Journal: <i>Land use Policy</i></p> <p>Use mixed logit models.</p>
Separate regression results and Willingness to pay estimates into 2 tables:	<p>Report regression results in appendix. Do not show WTP in a table - but illustrate with a figure (also in the appendix).</p> <p>VERY sparse explanations of tables</p>	<p>Report three tables - a "Main effects model" and "Models including interaction terms" and separate WTP table</p>	<p>Report one table of regression results</p>	<p>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)</p>	<p>Reports regression results between renters and owners in initial tables.</p> <p>Secondary tables include interaction effects.</p>	<p>Report mixed logit results and a separate WTP table (in percentage terms).</p> <p>VERY sparse explanations of the mixed logit model or results (e.g. do not present Standard deviations of the normally distributed coefficients)</p>

Table 5. Estimation results				
Variable	OLS model	Corrected estimator	Standard model	Final model

Table 6
Homeowner results (parametric model).

	MNL	ML
	Mens	Std.
Coefvar	0.031 (0.017)	0.036 (0.017)
Comm1	-0.005* (0.014)	-0.123** (0.042)
Comm2	-0.002 (0.022)	-0.043 (0.043)
Comm3	0.565** (0.017)	-0.719** (0.017)
Dat1	-0.004* (0.027)	-0.073 (0.045)
Dat2	-0.002 (0.035)	-0.001 (0.045)
Dat3	-0.631** (0.017)	-0.766** (0.017)
Honor	0.186** (0.023)	0.377** (0.023)
Altruos	0.026 (0.032)	0.050 (0.045)
Altruoc	0.040 (0.034)	0.042 (0.045)
Funk1	-1.071** (0.024)	-1.323** (0.024)
Funk2	-1.279** (0.024)	-1.599** (0.024)

	94501 + μ	94501 + ν
Open space: 2 hrs for 12 hrs	1.29***	0.23

Given system: 300 m (or 15 km)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Shape: 2 km (or 15 km)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Shape: 1 km (or 15 km)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Shape: 0.5 km (or 15 km)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Voronoi shape: 300 m (or 300 m)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Voronoi shape: 300 m (or 300 m)	2,013	1,272	(0.62)
Parking covered garage (no noise)	2,009	1,268	(0.61)
Parking covered space (no noise)	2,009	1,268	(0.61)
Parking space (no noise)	2,009	1,268	(0.61)
Parking	-5,-5	-5,-5	(0.61)
None, etc.	T10		
Log Likelihood	-1139.21		

Table 4
Statistical estimation results of the mixed logit model

Attribute	Level	Value
Observe	1	0.0
Observe active	1	0.0
Observe save state	1	0.0
Handle drop zone	1	0.0
Handle drop zone	2	0.0
Handle credits	1	0.0
Read health	1	0.0
Observe in CBO	1	0.0
Observe in CBO	2	0.0
Observe in communication	1	0.0
Observe in communication	2	0.0
Observe in purchase	1	0.0
Observe in purchase	2	0.0
Observe in dropping	1	0.0
Observe in dropping	2	0.0
Handle credits in individual	1	0.0
Handle credits in individual	2	0.0
Observe save state	1	0.0
Observe save state	2	0.0
Handle complete	1	0.0
Handle complete	2	0.0
Handle communication	1	0.0
Handle communication	2	0.0
Handle in purchase	1	0.0
Handle in purchase	2	0.0
Handle in dropping	1	0.0
Handle in dropping	2	0.0

Attribute	Level 1			Level 2		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Actual						
Actual number of training examples	60.0	0.000	0.000	60.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of test examples	15.0	0.000	0.000	15.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of features	4.0	0.000	0.000	4.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of classes	2.0	0.000	0.000	2.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of hidden units	1.0	0.000	0.000	1.00	0.000	0.000
Actual learning rate	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.10	0.00	0.00
Total WPE for number of training examples	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of test examples	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of features	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of classes	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of hidden units	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for learning rate	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for all attributes	0.000			0.000		
Actual						
Actual number of training examples	60.0	0.000	0.000	60.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of test examples	15.0	0.000	0.000	15.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of features	4.0	0.000	0.000	4.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of classes	2.0	0.000	0.000	2.00	0.000	0.000
Actual number of hidden units	1.0	0.000	0.000	1.00	0.000	0.000
Actual learning rate	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.10	0.00	0.00
Total WPE for number of training examples	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of test examples	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of features	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of classes	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for number of hidden units	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for learning rate	0.000			0.000		
Total WPE for all attributes	0.000			0.000		

Statement	Percentage (%)
AI will increase efficiency and reduce costs	92
AI will help solve global challenges like climate change and poverty	88
AI will create new jobs and improve working conditions	85
AI will make our lives easier and more convenient	83
AI will lead to significant economic growth	80
AI will improve medical treatments and save lives	78
AI will increase the risk of job displacement	65
AI will pose a threat to personal privacy	62
AI will lead to a loss of control over technology	58
AI will exacerbate social inequality and discrimination	55
AI will pose a threat to national security	52
AI will lead to a decrease in human creativity and originality	48
AI will eventually become self-aware and pose a threat to humanity	45

Attribute	Level
Constant	10 % less
Dwelling price	About 10 %
Green open area	10 % less
Green along streets	No Some A lot 0
School complex	25 % 50 %

- Report only interaction effects in the secondary tables (hide the main effects)
 - Arne Hole suggestion - could focus solely on MWTP presentation and keep full specification tables in the appendix
 - ✓ Combine introduction with literature review.
 - ✓ Separate WTP to separate table.
 - Follow structure of Aiteken for result section
 - Discussion: sub headings nice.
 - limitations
 - methodological considerations
 - policy implications
 - conclusions.