

Appendix

Title: Incentive compatibility and respondent beliefs: Consequentiality and game form

Authors: Daniel Rondeau and Christian A. Vossler

Date: May 2024

Table A1. Characterization of Stated Preference Studies Published during 2018 to 2022

Study	Elicitation format	Survey incentive properties mentioned?	Cited Carson and Groves (2007)?	Policy conseq. question?	Payment conseq. question?	Removed “protest” respondents?	Controlled for beliefs?
Truong, Adamowicz & Boxall 2018	Attribute-other						
Petrolia, Interis & Hwang 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes				
Lloyd-Smith et al. 2018	Attribute-other						
Navrud & Strand 2018	OE			Yes			
Hassan, Olsen & Thorsen 2018	PC	Yes	Yes				
Mwebaze et al. 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Filippini, Greene & Martinez-Cruz 2018	SBC; OE						
Brown & Kramer 2018	DCE, 3 options						
Mozumder & Vásquez 2018	DCE, 3 options						
Blackman et al. 2018	DCE, 2 options						
Rheinberger, Schlöpfer & Lobsiger 2018	SBC						
Kjær, Nielsen & Hole 2018	DCE, 2 options						
Carlsson, Kataria & Lampi 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes					
Brent & Ward 2018	DCE, 3 options						
Hammit & Herrera-Araujo 2018	DCE, 3 options						
Campbell, Mørkbak & Olsen 2018	DCE, 2 options						
Pondorfer and Rehdanz 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes				
Aravena et al. 2018	Non-Attribute	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Logar & Brouwer 2018	Non-Attribute	Yes	Yes				
Lew 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes				Yes	
Zemo & Termansen 2018	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Alló & Loureiro 2018	DCE, 4+ options	Yes					
Needham et al. 2018	PC	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Cooper, Burton & Crase 2019	Non-Attribute						
Faccioli, Kuhfuss & Czajkowski 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Glatt, Brouwer & Logar 2019	DCE, 3 options					Yes	

Sheldon, DeShazo & Carson 2019	DCE, 3 options DCE, 4+ options	Yes					
Sandorf 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Ukpong et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Kassahun et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Schaafsma & Brouwer 2019	DCE, 4+ options					Yes	
Rousseau, Franck & De Jaeger 2019	DCE, 3 options	Yes					
Czajkowski et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes				
Shannon et al. 2019	DCE, 2 options						
Lloyd-Smith et al. 2019	Non-Attribute						
Zawojnska, Bartczak & Czajkowski 2019	DCE, 4+ options	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Boyce, Czajkowski & Hanley	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes				
Heutel 2019	DCE, 2 options						
Day et al. 2019	DCE, 2 options	Yes					
Mattea 2019	Attribute-other						
Jensen, Johnston & Olsen 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Morello et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options		Yes			Yes	
Lloyd-Smith, Adamowicz & Dupont 2019	SBC	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Davis, Burton & Kragt 2019	DCE, 3 options DCE, 2 options					Yes	
Bouma & Koetse 2019	PC	Yes	Yes				
Dorner, Brent & Leroux 2019	DCE, 4+ options	Yes					
Balmford et al. 2019	DCE, 4+ options	Yes	Yes				
Cherry, McEvoy & Westskog 2019	Non-Attribute						
Vasquez-Lavín et al. 2019	SBC						
DCE, 2 options							
Boyle et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options						
Glenk et al. 2019	DCE, 3 options	Yes				Yes	
Czajkowski, Zagórska & Hanley 2019	DCE, 4+ options	Yes	Yes				

Slunge, Sterner & Adamowicz 2019	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			
Howard et al. 2020	Attribute-other	Yes				
Bertram et al. 2020	Attribute-other					
Grammatikopoulou et al. 2020	DCE, 3 options					
Meya 2020	DCE, 4+ options					
Swait, Franceschinis & Thiene 2020	DCE, 3 options					
	DCE, 4+ options					
Lopes & Kipperberg 2020	SBC	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Olsen, Jensen & Panduro	DCE, 3 options				Yes	
Chen, Swallow & Yue 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			
Xuan & Sandorf 2020	DCE, 3 options					
Svenningsen & Thorsen 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			
Carson, Hanemann & Whittington 2020	SBC	Yes	Yes			
Badura et al. 2020	DCE, 4+ options	Yes	Yes		Yes	
Hulshof & Mulder 2020	DCE, 2 options	Yes	Yes			
Goeb et al. 2020	DCE, 4+options	Yes				
Jeuland et al. 2020	DCE, 3 options					
Jin, Andersson & Zhang 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes				
Landry, Shonkwiler & Whitehead 2020	SBC	Yes		Yes		
Blackman, Qin & Yang 2020	SBC	Yes	Yes			
Liu, Hanley & Campbell 2020	DCE, 3 options		Yes			
Manning et al. 2020	SBC					
Nobel et al. 2020	OE				Yes	
Ando et al. 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			
Parthum & Ando 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes	Yes			
Giguere, Moore & Whitehead 2020	DCE, 2 options	Yes	Yes			
Logar, Brouwer & Campbell 2020	DCE, 3 options	Yes			Yes	
Daziano 2020	DCE, 4+ options					
Voltaire & Koutchade 2020	DCE, 4+ options					

Hindsley & Morgan 2022	SBC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Iversen et al. 2022	PC						
Wu, Mentzakis & Schaafsma 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Sandorf, Grimsrud & Lindhjem 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Ishihara & Ida 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Lewis et al. 2022	DCE, 3 options	Yes					
Andor, Lange & Sommer 2022	SBC	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Parkins et al. 2022	Attribute-other						
Ando & Reeser 2022	PC	Yes				Yes	
Tienhaara et al. 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Faccioli & Glenk 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Luther, Swinton & Van Deynze 2022	SBC	Yes					
Pellegrini, Rose & Scarpa 2022	Attribute-other						
Chen et al. 2022	DCE, 3 options						
Luo, Swallow & Adamowicz 2022	DCE, 2 options	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Fanghella et al. 2022	DCE, 2 options	Yes					
Groh 2022	DCE, 3 options						
	Attribute-other						

Notes: Elicitation format: form of the valuation question(s) used, which includes discrete choice experiment (DCE), single binary choice (SBC), open ended (OE), payment card (PC), other attribute-based formats (Attribute-other) such as contingent ranking and best-worst scaling, and other non-attribute-based (Non-Attribute) formats such as multiple-bounded discrete choice and double-bounded binary choice. *Survey incentive properties mentioned:* “Yes” denotes study provided some discussion of the incentive properties of the survey value elicitation mechanism, as determined through key word searches. *Controlled for beliefs:* “Yes” denotes studies that control for consequentiality beliefs in the data analysis. Some studies analyze multiple survey versions that vary in terms of the elicitation format. Some studies incompletely describe research methods, and in these cases, we did our best to characterize them accurately. Any errors are unintentional.

Complete references

2018

1. Truong, T., Adamowicz, W. & Boxall, P.C. Modelling the Effect of Chronic Wasting Disease on Recreational Hunting Site Choice Preferences and Choice Set Formation over Time. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 70, 271–295 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0120-0>
2. Petrolia, D.R., Interis, M.G. & Hwang, J. Single-Choice, Repeated-Choice, and Best-Worst Scaling Elicitation Formats: Do Results Differ and by How Much?. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 69, 365–393 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-016-0083-6>
3. Lloyd-Smith, P., Schram, C., Adamowicz, W. et al. Endogeneity of Risk Perceptions in Averting Behavior Models. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 69, 217–246 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-016-0075-6>
4. Navrud, S., Strand, J. Valuing Global Ecosystem Services: What Do European Experts Say? Applying the Delphi Method to Contingent Valuation of the Amazon Rainforest. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 70, 249–269 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0119-6>
5. Hassan, S., Olsen, S.B. & Thorsen, B.J. Appropriate Payment Vehicles in Stated Preference Studies in Developing Economies. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71, 1053–1075 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0196-6>
6. Mwebaze, P., Bennett, J., Beebe, N.W. et al. Economic Valuation of the Threat Posed by the Establishment of the Asian Tiger Mosquito in Australia. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71, 357–379 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0158-z>
7. Filippini, M., Greene, W. & Martinez-Cruz, A.L. Non-market Value of Winter Outdoor Recreation in the Swiss Alps: The Case of Val Bedretto. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71, 729–754 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0181-0>
8. Brown, Z.S., Kramer, R.A. Preference Heterogeneity in the Structural Estimation of Efficient Pigovian Incentives for Insecticide Spraying to Reduce Malaria. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 70, 169–190 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0115-x>
9. Mozumder, P., Vásquez, W.F. Understanding Hurricane Evacuation Decisions Under Contingent Scenarios: A Stated Preference Approach. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 71, 407–425 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0163-2>
10. Blackman, Allen, Francisco Alpizar, Fredrik Carlsson, and Marisol Rivera Planter. A Contingent Valuation Approach to Estimating Regulatory Costs: Mexico’s Day without Driving Program *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 5(3), 607-641 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1086/697416>
11. Rheinberger, Christoph M., Felix Schläpfer, and Michael Lobsiger. A novel approach to estimating the demand value of public safety. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 89: 285-305 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.04.002>.
12. Kjær, Trine, Jytte Seested Nielsen, and Arne Risa Hole. An investigation into procedural (in)variance in the valuation of mortality risk reductions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 89: 278-284 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.04.004>.

13. Carlsson, Fredrik, Mitesh Kataria, and Elina Lampi. Demand effects in stated preference surveys, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 90, 294-302 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.06.003>
14. Brent, Daniel A., and Michael B. Ward. Energy efficiency and financial literacy. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 90, 181-216 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.05.004>
15. Hammitt, James K., and Daniel Herrera-Araujo. 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 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2017.06.006>
16. Campbell, Danny, Morten Raun Mørkbak, and Søren Bøye Olsen. The link between response time and preference, variance and processing heterogeneity in stated choice experiments. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 88, 18-34 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2017.10.003>
17. Pondorfer, Andreas, and Katrin Rehdanz. Eliciting preferences for public goods in nonmonetized communities: Accounting for preference uncertainty. *Land Economics* 94(1), 73-86 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.94.1.73>
18. Aravena, Claudia, et al. Testing preference formation in learning design contingent valuation using advance information and repetitive treatments. *Land Economics* 94(2), 284-301 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.94.2.284>
19. Logar, Ivana, and Roy Brouwer. Substitution effects and spatial preference heterogeneity in single-and multiple-site choice experiments. *Land Economics* 94(2), 302-322 (2018): <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.94.2.302>
20. Lew, Daniel K. Discounting future payments in stated preference choice experiments. *Resource and Energy Economics* 54, 150-164 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2018.09.003>
21. Zemo, Kahsay Haile, and Mette Termansen. Farmers' willingness to participate in collective biogas investment: A discrete choice experiment study. *Resource and Energy Economics* 52, 87-101 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2017.12.001>
22. Alló, Maria, and Maria L. Loureiro. The impact of illegal harvesting on time preferences and willingness to participate in shellfish resource management. *Resource and Energy Economics* 54, 226-236 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2017.10.006>
23. Needham, Katherine, Mikołaj Czajkowski, Nick Hanley, and Jacob LaRiviere. What is the causal impact of information and knowledge in stated preference studies? *Resource and Energy Economics* 54, 69-89 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2018.09.001>

2019

24. Cooper, B., Burton, M. & Crase, L. Willingness to Pay to Avoid Water Restrictions in Australia Under a Changing Climate. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 72, 823–847 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0228-x>
25. Faccioli, M., Kuhfuss, L. & Czajkowski, M. Stated Preferences for Conservation Policies Under Uncertainty: Insights on the Effect of Individuals' Risk Attitudes in the Environmental Domain. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 73, 627–659 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0276-2>

26. Glatt, M., Brouwer, R. & Logar, I. Combining Risk Attitudes in a Lottery Game and Flood Risk Protection Decisions in a Discrete Choice Experiment. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 74, 1533–1562 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00379-y>
27. Sheldon, T.L., DeShazo, J.R. & Carson, R.T. Demand for Green Refueling Infrastructure. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 74, 131–157 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-00312-9>
28. Sandorf, E.D. Did You Miss Something? Inattentive Respondents in Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 73, 1197–1235 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0296-y>
29. Ukpong, I.G., Balcombe, K.G., Fraser, I.M. et al. Preferences for Mitigation of the Negative Impacts of the Oil and Gas Industry in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 74, 811–843 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00349-4>
30. Kassahun, H.T., Thorsen, B.J., Swait, J. et al. Social Cooperation in the Context of Integrated Private and Common Land Management. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 105–136 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00390-3>
31. Schaafsma, M., Brouwer, R. Substitution Effects in Spatial Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 323–349 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00368-1>
32. Rousseau, S., Franck, M. & De Jaeger, S. The Impact of Spatial Patterns in Road Traffic Externalities on Willingness-to-Pay Estimates. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 271–295 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00348-5>
33. Czajkowski, M., Giergiczny, M., Kronenberg, J. et al. The Individual Travel Cost Method with Consumer-Specific Values of Travel Time Savings. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 74, 961–984 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00355-6>
34. Shannon, A.K., Usmani, F., Pattanayak, S.K. et al. The Price of Purity: Willingness to Pay for Air and Water Purification Technologies in Rajasthan, India. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 73, 1073–1100 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0290-4>
35. Lloyd-Smith, Patrick, Joshua K. Abbott, Wiktor Adamowicz, and Daniel Willard. Decoupling the Value of Leisure Time from Labor Market Returns in Travel Cost Models. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 6(2), 215-242 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1086/701760>.
36. Zawojska, Ewa, Anna Bartczak, and Mikołaj Czajkowski. Disentangling the effects of policy and payment consequentiality and risk attitudes on stated preferences. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 93, 63-84 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.11.007>
37. Boyce, Christopher, Mikołaj Czajkowski, Nick Hanley. Personality and economic choices. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 94, 82-100 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.12.004>
38. Heutel, Garth. Prospect theory and energy efficiency. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 96, 236-254 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.06.005>.
39. Day, Brett, Ian Bateman, Amy Binner, Silvia Ferrini, and Carlo Fezzi. Structurally-consistent estimation of use and nonuse values for landscape-wide environmental change. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 98, 102256 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.102256>

40. Mattea, Stefania. Exploring spatial sources of preference heterogeneity for landslide protection. *Land Economics* 95(3), 333-352 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.3.333>
41. Jensen, Anne Kejser, Robert J. Johnston, and Søren B. Olsen. Does one size really fit all? Ecological endpoint heterogeneity in stated preference welfare analysis. *Land Economics* 95(3), 307-332 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.3.307>
42. Morello, Thiago, et al. Fire, tractors, and health in the Amazon: a cost-benefit analysis of fire policy. *Land Economics* 95(3), 409-434 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.3.409>
43. Lloyd-Smith, Patrick, Wiktor Adamowicz, and Diane Dupont. Incorporating stated consequentiality questions in stated preference research. *Land Economics* 95(3), 293-306 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.3.293>
44. Davis, Katrina J., Michael Burton, and Marit E. Kragt. Scale heterogeneity and its implications for discrete choice analysis. *Land Economics* 95(3), 353-368 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.3.353>
45. Bouma, J. A., and M. J. Koetse. Mind the gap: stated versus revealed donations and the differential role of behavioral factors. *Land Economics* 95(2), 225-245 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.2.225>
46. Dorner, Zack, Daniel A. Brent, and Anke Leroux. Preferences for intrinsically risky attributes. *Land Economics* 95(4), 494-514 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.95.4.494>
47. Balmford, Ben, Ian J. Bateman, Katherine Bolt, Brett Day, and Silvia Ferrini. The value of statistical life for adults and children: Comparisons of the contingent valuation and chained approaches. *Resource and Energy Economics* 57, 68-84 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.04.005>
48. Cherry, Todd L., David M. McEvoy, and Hege Westskog. Cultural worldviews, institutional rules and the willingness to participate in green energy programs. *Resource and Energy Economics* 56, 28-38 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2017.10.001>
49. Vasquez-Lavín, Felipe, Roberto D. Ponce Oliva, José Ignacio Hernández, Stefan Gelcich, Moisés Carrasco, and Miguel Quiroga. Exploring dual discount rates for ecosystem services: Evidence from a marine protected area network. *Resource and Energy Economics* 55, 63-80 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2018.11.004>
50. Boyle, Kevin J., Jessica Boatwright, Sreeya Brahma, and Weibin Xu. NIMBY, not, in siting community wind farms. *Resource and Energy Economics* 57, 85-100 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.04.004>
51. Glenk, Klaus, Jürgen Meyerhoff, Faical Akaichi, and Julia Martin-Ortega. Revisiting cost vector effects in discrete choice experiments. *Resource and Energy Economics* 57, 135-155 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.05.001>
52. Czajkowski, Mikołaj, Katarzyna Zagórska, and Nick Hanley. Social norm nudging and preferences for household recycling. *Resource and Energy Economics* 58, 101110 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.07.004>
53. Slunge, Daniel, Thomas Sterner, and Wiktor Adamowicz. Valuation when baselines are changing: Tick-borne disease risk and recreational choice. *Resource and Energy Economics* 58, 101119 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.101119>

54. Howard, G., Roe, B.E., Interis, M.G. et al. Addressing Attribute Value Substitution in Discrete Choice Experiments to Avoid Unintended Consequences. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77, 813–838 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00519-9>
55. Bertram, C., Ahtainen, H., Meyerhoff, J. et al. Contingent Behavior and Asymmetric Preferences for Baltic Sea Coastal Recreation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 49–78 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00388-x>
56. Grammatikopoulou, I., Artell, J., Hjerpe, T. et al. A Mire of Discount Rates: Delaying Conservation Payment Schedules in a Choice Experiment. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77, 615–639 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00511-3>
57. Meya, J.N. Environmental Inequality and Economic Valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 76, 235–270 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00423-2>
58. Swait, J., Franceschinis, C. & Thiene, M. Antecedent Volition and Spatial Effects: Can Multiple Goal Pursuit Mitigate Distance Decay?. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 243–270 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00344-9>
59. Lopes, A.F., Kipperberg, G. Diagnosing Insensitivity to Scope in Contingent Valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77, 191–216 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00470-9>
60. Olsen, S.B., Jensen, C.U. & Panduro, T.E. Modelling Strategies for Discontinuous Distance Decay in Willingness to Pay for Ecosystem Services. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 351–386 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00370-7>
61. Chen, Z., Swallow, S.K. & Yue, I.T. Non-participation and Heterogeneity in Stated: A Double Hurdle Latent Class Approach for Climate Change Adaptation Plans and Ecosystem Services. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77, 35–67 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00434-z>
62. Xuan, B.B., Sandorf, E.D. Potential for Sustainable Aquaculture: Insights from Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77, 401–421 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00500-6>
63. Svenningsen, L.S., Thorsen, B.J. Preferences for Distributional Impacts of Climate Policy. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 1–24 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00386-z>
64. Carson, R.T., Hanemann, W.M. & Whittington, D. The Existence Value of a Distinctive Native American Culture: Survival of the Hopi Reservation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 931–951 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00412-5>
65. Badura, T., Ferrini, S., Burton, M. et al. Using Individualised Choice Maps to Capture the Spatial Dimensions of Value Within Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 297–322 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00358-3>
66. Hulshof, D., Mulder, M. Willingness to Pay for CO2 Emission Reductions in Passenger Car Transport. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75, 899–929 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00411-6>
67. Goeb, Joseph, Andrew Dillon, Frank Lupi, and David Tschirley. Pesticides: What You Don't Know Can Hurt You. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 7(5), 801-836 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1086/709782>.
68. Jeuland, Marc, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak, Jie-Sheng Tan Soo, and Faraz Usmani. Preferences and the Effectiveness of Behavior-Change Interventions: Evidence from Adoption of Improved Cookstoves in India. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 7(2), 305-343 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1086/706937>

69. Jin, Yana, Henrik Andersson, and Shiqiu Zhang. Do preferences to reduce health risks related to air pollution depend on illness type? Evidence from a choice experiment in Beijing, China. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 103, 102355 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102355>
70. Landry, Craig E., J. Scott Shonkwiler, and John C. Whitehead. Economic Values of Coastal Erosion Management: Joint Estimation of Use and Existence Values with recreation demand and contingent valuation data. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 103, 102364 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102364>
71. Blackman, Allen, Ping Qin, and Jun Yang. How costly are driving restrictions? Contingent valuation evidence from Beijing. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 104, 102366 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102366>
72. Liu, Zhaoyang, Nick Hanley, and Danny Campbell. Linking urban air pollution with residents' willingness to pay for greenspace: A choice experiment study in Beijing. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 104, 102383 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102383>
73. Manning, Dale T., Mani Rouhi Rad, Jordan F. Suter, Christopher Goemans, Zaichen Xiang, and Ryan Bailey. Non-market valuation in integrated assessment modeling: The benefits of water right retirement. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 103, 102341 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102341>
74. Nobel, Anne, Sebastien Lizin, Nele Witters, Francois Rineau, and Robert Malina. The impact of wildfires on the recreational value of heathland: A discrete factor approach with adjustment for on-site sampling. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 101, 102317 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102317>
75. Ando, Amy W., Catalina Londoño Cadavid, Noelwah R. Netusil, and Bryan Parthum. Willingness-to-volunteer and stability of preferences between cities: Estimating the benefits of stormwater management. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 99, 102274 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.102274>
76. Parthum, Bryan, and Amy W. Ando. Overlooked benefits of nutrient reductions in the Mississippi River Basin. *Land Economics* 96(4), 589-607 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.96.4.589>
77. Giguere, Christopher, Chris Moore, and John C. Whitehead. Valuing hemlock woolly adelgid control in public forests: Scope effects with attribute nonattendance. *Land Economics* 96(1), 25-42 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.96.1.25>
78. Logar, Ivana, Roy Brouwer, and Danny Campbell. Does attribute order influence attribute-information processing in discrete choice experiments? *Resource and Energy Economics* 60, 101164 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2020.101164>
79. Daziano, Ricardo A. Flexible customer willingness to pay for bundled smart home energy products and services. *Resource and Energy Economics* 61, 101175 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2020.101175>
80. Voltaire, Louinord, and Obafemi Philippe Koutchade. Public acceptance of and heterogeneity in behavioral beach trip responses to offshore wind farm development in Catalonia (Spain). *Resource and Energy Economics* 60, 101152 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2020.101152>
81. Sandorf, Erlend Dancke, Lars Persson, and Thomas Broberg. Using an integrated choice and latent variable model to understand the impact of "professional" respondents in a

stated preference survey. *Resource and Energy Economics* 61, 101178 (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2020.101178>

2021

82. He, J., Zhang, B. Current Air Pollution and Willingness to Pay for Better Air Quality: Revisiting the Temporal Reliability of the Contingent Valuation Method. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 79, 135–168 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-021-00556-y>
83. Baranzini, A., Carattini, S. & Tesauro, L. Designing Effective and Acceptable Road Pricing Schemes: Evidence from the Geneva Congestion Charge. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 79, 417–482 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-021-00564-y>
84. Banerjee, P., Pal, R., Wossink, A. et al. Heterogeneity in Farmers' Social Preferences and the Design of Green Payment Schemes. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 78, 201–226 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00529-7>
85. Dugstad, A., Grimsrud, K.M., Kipperberg, G. et al. Scope Elasticity of Willingness to pay in Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 80, 21–57 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-021-00577-7>
86. West, Grant H., Heather Snell, Kent F. Kovacs, and Rodolfo M. Nayga Jr. Flexible Estimation of Groundwater Service Values and Time Preferences. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 8(4), 825-861 (2021).
<https://doi.org/10.1086/713389>.
87. Mokas, Ilias, Sebastien Lizin, Tom Brijs, Nele Witters, Robert Malina. Can immersive virtual reality increase respondents' certainty in discrete choice experiments? A comparison with traditional presentation formats. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 109, 102509 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102509>
88. Vásquez-Lavín, Felipe, Moisés Carrasco, Manuel Barrientos, Stefan Gelcich, and Roberto D. Ponce Oliva. Estimating discount rates for environmental goods: Are People's responses inadequate to frequency of payments?. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 107, 102446 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102446>
89. Howard, Gregory, John C. Whitehead, and Jacob Hochard. Estimating discount rates using referendum-style choice experiments: An analysis of multiple methodologies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 105, 102399 (2021).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2020.102399>
90. Danley, Brian, Erlend Dancke Sandorf, and Danny Campbell. Putting your best fish forward: Investigating distance decay and relative preferences for fish conservation. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 108, 102475 (2021).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102475>
91. Carlsson, Fredrik, Mitesh Kataria, Alan Krupnick, Elina Lampi, Åsa Löfgren, Ping Qin, Thomas Sterner, and Xiaojun Yang. The climate decade: Changing attitudes on three continents. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 107, 102426 (2021).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102426>
92. Kovacs, Kent, and Heather Snell. Heterogeneity in time preferences for an investment in irrigation. *Land Economics* 97(4), 819-835 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.4.060120-0075R1>

93. Andor, Mark A., Manuel Frondel, and Marco Horvath. Consequentiality, elicitation formats, and the willingness to pay for green electricity: evidence from Germany. *Land Economics* 97(3), 626-640 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.3.092618-0130R1>
94. Börger, Tobias, et al. Payment and policy consequentiality in dichotomous choice contingent valuation: Experimental design effects on self-reported perceptions. *Land Economics* 97(2), 407-424 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.2.407>
95. Brown, Joshua, et al. Heterogeneity in preferences for nonfinancial incentives to engage landholders in native vegetation management. *Land Economics* 97(2), 388-406 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.2.388>
96. dit Sourd, Romain Crastes, et al. A Contingent Valuation Test for Measuring the Construct Validity of Willingness-to-Pay Estimates Derived from Choice Experiments. *Land Economics* 97(3), 608-625 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.3.102219-0150R1>
97. Aanesen, Margrethe, Claire W. Armstrong, and Thomas Van Rensburg. Do we choose differently after a discussion? Results from a deliberative valuation study in Ireland. *Land Economics* 97(1), 207-223 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.1.100719-0144R>
98. Liu, Pengfei, and Stephen K. Swallow. Incentive compatibility and the consequences when it is missing: Experiments with water quality credits purchase. *Land Economics* 97(4), 893-910 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.4.050920-0064R1>
99. Landry, Craig E., et al. Willingness to pay for multi-peril hazard insurance. *Land Economics* 97(4), 797-818 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.4.072820-0115R1>
100. Bronnmann, Julia, et al. Measuring motivations for choosing ecolabeled seafood: Environmental concerns and warm glow. *Land Economics* 97(3), 641-654 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.3.101119-0147R>
101. Netusil, Noelwah R., et al. The willingness to pay for flood insurance. *Land Economics* 97(1), 17-38 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.1.110819-0160R1>
102. Ocean, Neel, and Peter Howley. Using choice framing to improve the design of agricultural subsidy schemes. *Land Economics* 97(4), 933-950 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.97.4.041620-0055R1>
103. Frondel, Manuel, Stephan Sommer, and Lukas Tomberg. WTA-WTP disparity: the role of perceived realism of the valuation setting. *Land Economics* 97(1), 196-206 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3368/wple.97.1.030419-0033R1>
104. Suter, Jordan F., Mani Rouhi Rad, Dale T. Manning, Chris Goemans, and Matthew R. Sanderson. Depletion, climate, and the incremental value of groundwater. *Resource and Energy Economics* 63, 101143 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.101143>
105. Lang, Ghislaine, Mehdi Farsi, Bruno Lanz, and Sylvain Weber. Energy efficiency and heating technology investments: Manipulating financial information in a discrete choice experiment. *Resource and Energy Economics* 64, 101231 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2021.101231>
106. Schueftan, Alejandra, Claudia Aravena, and René Reyes. Financing energy efficiency retrofits in Chilean households: The role of financial instruments, savings and uncertainty in energy transition. *Resource and Energy Economics* 66, 101265 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2021.101265>
107. Choi, Dong Soon, and Richard Ready. Measuring benefits from spatially-explicit surface water quality improvements: The roles of distance, scope, scale, and size. *Resource and Energy Economics* 63, 101108 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2019.07.002>

108. Carlsson, Fredrik, Mitesh Kataria, Elina Lampi, and Peter Martinsson. Past and present outage costs – A follow-up study of households' willingness to pay to avoid power outages. *Resource and Energy Economics* 64, 101216 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2021.101216>
109. Oehlmann, Malte, Klaus Glenk, Patrick Lloyd-Smith, and Jürgen Meyerhoff. Quantifying landscape externalities of renewable energy development: Implications of attribute cut-offs in choice experiments. *Resource and Energy Economics* 65, 101240 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2021.101240>
110. Meya, Jasper N., Moritz A. Drupp, and Nick Hanley. Testing structural benefit transfer: The role of income inequality. *Resource and Energy Economics* 64, 101217 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2021.101217>

2022

111. Welling, M., Zawojcka, E. & Sagebiel, J. Information, Consequentiality and Credibility in Stated Preference Surveys: A Choice Experiment on Climate Adaptation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 82, 257–283 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-022-00675-0>
112. Hindsley, P.R., Ashton Morgan, O. The Role of Cultural Worldviews in Willingness to Pay for Environmental Policy. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 81, 243–269 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-021-00622-5>
113. Iversen, E.K., Grimsrud, K., Mitani, Y. et al. Altruist Talk May (also) Be Cheap: Revealed Versus Stated Altruism as a Predictor in Stated Preference Studies. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 83, 681–708 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-022-00704-y>
114. Wu, H., Mentzakis, E. & Schaafsma, M. Exploring Different Assumptions about Outcome-Related Risk Perceptions in Discrete Choice Experiments. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 81, 531–572 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-021-00638-x>
115. Sandorf, E.D., Grimsrud, K. & Lindhjem, H. Ponderous, Proficient or Professional? Survey Experience and Smartphone Effects in Stated Preference Research. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 81, 807–832 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-022-00654-5>
116. Ishihara, T., Ida, T. The Effect of Information Provision on Stated and Revealed Preferences: A Field Experiment on the Choice of Power Tariffs Before and After Japanese Retail Electricity Liberalization. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 82, 573–599 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-022-00667-0>
117. Lewis, David J., David M. Kling, Steven J. Dundas, and Daniel K. Lew. Estimating the value of threatened species abundance dynamics. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 113, 102639 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2022.102639>
118. Andor, Mark A., Andreas Lange, and Stephan Sommer. Fairness and the support of redistributive environmental policies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 114, 102682 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2022.102682>
119. Parkins, John R., et al. Landowner acceptance of wind turbines on their land: Insights from a factorial survey experiment. *Land Economics* 98(4), 674–689 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.4.012521-0008R1>

120. Ando, Amy W., and Collin Reeser. Homeowner Willingness to Pay for a Pre-flood Agreement for a Post-flood Buyout. *Land Economics* 98(4), 560-578 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.4.052721-0056>
121. Tienhaara, Annika, et al. Information use and its effects on the valuation of agricultural genetic resources. *Land Economics* 98(2), 337-354 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.2.090319-0127R1>
122. Faccioli, Michela, and Klaus Glenk. More in good condition or less in bad condition? Valence-based framing effects in environmental valuation. *Land Economics* 98(2), 314-336 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.2.051920-0067R1>
123. Luther, Zachary R., Scott M. Swinton, and Braeden Van Deynze. Potential supply of midwest cropland for conversion to in-field prairie strips. *Land Economics* 98(2): 274-291 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.2.082020-0129R1>
124. Pellegrini, Andrea, John Rose, and Riccardo Scarpa. Multiple Herbicide Use in Cropland: A Discrete-Continuous Model for Stated Choice Data. *Land Economics* 98(2), 355-375 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.2.092520-0150R1>
125. Chen, Zhenshan, et al. The influence of projected outcomes on preferences over alternative regulations: Evidence from a recreational fishery. *Land Economics* 98(4), 599-617 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.4.102820-0164R1>
126. Luo, Yicong, Brent M. Swallow, and Wiktor L. Adamowicz. Using Willingness to Pay and Willingness to Accept to Value Farmland Preservation under Ambiguous Property Rights and Preference Uncertainty. *Land Economics* 98(4), 639-657 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3368/le.98.4.060120-0074R2>
127. Fanghella, Valeria, Corinne Faure, Marie-Charlotte Guetlein, and Joachim Schleich. Discriminatory subsidies for energy-efficient technologies and the role of envy. *Resource and Energy Economics* 68, 101298 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2022.101298>
128. Groh, Elke D. Exposure to wind turbines, regional identity and the willingness to pay for regionally produced electricity. *Resource and Energy Economics* 70, 101332 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2022.101332>