

Appendix G

This Appendix first provides the list of the WTP studies included in the meta-analysis, along with the study year and the country where the study took place. Second, the Appendix provides the full references for all the included studies. Note that for the creation of the Table and the study references, we used ChatGPT as support.

List of WTP Studies

Table 11: List of included WTP studies

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Aadland et al. (2012)	2006	United States
Abate et al. (2020)	2018	Norway
Acharya et al. (2021)	2018	Nepal
Adams et al. (2008)	2004	Brazil
Adams et al. (2020)	2016	United States
Adhikari et al. (2017)	2013	United States
Ahlheim et al. (2006)	2004	Philippines
Ahlheim et al. (2013)	2009	China
Ahlheim et al. (2015)	2009	China
Ahtiainen et al. (2014)	2011	Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Germany, Estonia, Poland, Russia, Latvia, Lithuania
Akhtar et al. (2017)	2016	Pakistan
Akinyemi & Mushunje (2017)	2014	South Africa
Akinyemi & Mushunje (2020)	2016	South Africa
Al-Amin et al. (2020)	2015	Malaysia
Al-Assaf (2015)	2012	Jordan
Albaladejo-García et al. (2021)	2018	Spain
Alberini et al. (2005)	2002	Italy
Aldrich et al. (2007)	1997	United States
Amare et al. (2016)	2014	Ethiopia
Ami et al. (2011)	2006	France
Ami et al. (2014)	2011	France
Amiri et al. (2015)	2011	Iran
Amirnejad et al. (2006)	2004	Iran
Aoun (2015)	2011	Lebanon
Arabomen et al. (2019)	2015	Nigeria
Aravena et al. (2012)	2008	Chile
Ardiansyah et al. (2019)	2018	Indonesia

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Arega & Tadesse (2017)	2014	Ethiopia
Arowolo et al. (2014)	2011	Nigeria
Asciuto et al. (2015)	2012	Italy
Atkinson et al. (2012)	2006	United Kingdom
Azlina et al. (2018)	2016	Malaysia
Bandara & Tisdell (2004)	2001	Sri Lanka
Bandara & Tisdell (2005)	2001	Sri Lanka
Banna et al. (2016)	2012	Malaysia
Baral et al. (2007)	2004	Nepal
Barrena et al. (2014)	2012	Chile
Barton (2002)	1997	Costa Rica
Bederli Tümay & Brouwer (2007)	2001	Turkey
Belhaj (2003)	1995	Morocco
Bernath & Roschewitz (2008)	2004	Switzerland
Bernstein et al. (2013)	2010	United States
Berrens et al. (2004)	2000	United States
Bhat & Sofi (2021)	2018	India
Bigerna et al. (2019)	2016	Italy
Blaine & Smith (2006)	2003	United States
Bliem & Getzner (2012)	2007	Austria
Bonnichsen & Olsen (2016)	2008	Denmark
Börger (2013)	2012	Italy
Bostan et al. (2020)	2016	Iran
Bowman et al. (2009)	2004	United States
Bowman et al. (2012)	2009	United States
Brandli et al. (2015)	2011	Brazil
Braun et al. (2016)	2013	Germany
Broadbent et al. (2015)	2012	United States
Broberg & Brännlund (2008)	2004	Sweden
Brouwer (2006)	2002	Netherlands
Brouwer (2008)	2003	Netherlands
Brouwer (2012)	2006	Netherlands
Brouwer & Martín-Ortega (2012)	2007	Spain
Brouwer et al. (2008)	2003	Netherlands
Brouwer et al. (2016)	2006	Netherlands
Bueno et al. (2016)	2014	Philippines
Bundal et al. (2018)	2014	Philippines
Carandang et al. (2013)	2009	Philippines

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Carlsson & Johansson-Stenman (2000)	1996	Sweden
Carlsson & Martinsson (2001)	1996	Sweden
Carlsson et al. (2012)	2009	United States, Sweden, China
Carlsson et al. (2013)	2009	Sweden, China
Castro et al. (2011)	2008	Spain
Cerda et al. (2014)	2009	Chile
Chambers & Whitehead (2003)	2001	United States
Chaudhry et al. (2007)	2002	India
Chaudhry et al. (2008)	2002	India
Chen (2015)	2013	China
Chen & Han (2018)	2018	Taiwan
Chen & Jim (2010)	2007	China
Chen & Jim (2012)	2009	Hong Kong
Chen & Liaw (2012)	2006	Taiwan
Chen et al. (2021)	2017	Taiwan
Cheng et al. (2017)	2016	Hong Kong
Cheng et al. (2021)	2019	China
Chien et al. (2005)	1996	Taiwan
Chigamba et al. (2021)	2019	Malawi
Choi (2013)	2009	South Korea
Choi (2015)	2012	Australia
Choi et al. (2016)	2015	South Korea
Choi et al. (2020)	2019	South Korea
Choi et al. (2021)	2016	South Korea
Colby & Orr (2005)	2001	United States
Collins & Rosenberger (2007)	2004	United States
Cook et al. (2018a)	2010	Iceland
Cook et al. (2018b)	2016	Iceland
Corrigan et al. (2008)	2004	United States
Dare et al. (2015)	2011	Nigeria
De Melo Travassos et al. (2018)	2011	Brazil
De Salvo et al. (2021)	2020	Italy
Denstadli & Veisten (2020)	2017	Norway
Dogan & Muhammad (2019)	2015	Turkey
Donfouet et al. (2015)	2011	Cameroon
Dong & Zeng (2018)	2016	China
Dong et al. (2011)	2009	China
Dribek & Voltaire (2017)	2008	Tunisia
Du & Mendelsohn (2011)	2009	China

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Du Preez et al. (2010)	2005	South Africa
Duan et al. (2014)	2010	China
Dupont (2004)	1995	Canada
Eisen-Hecht & Kramer (2002)	1998	United States
Endalew & Assefa	2017	Ethiopia
Wondimagegnhu (2019)		
Endalew et al. (2020)	2018	Ethiopia
Eregae et al. (2021)	2020	Kenya
Ezebilo et al. (2015)	2007	Sweden
Fattahi Ardakani et al. (2017)	2015	Iran
Ferreira et al. (2017)	2014	Portugal
Ferrini et al. (2014)	2008	United Kingdom
Francisco (2015)	2011	Philippines
Fujino & Kuriyama (2019)	2016	Japan
Gauthier (2004)	1996	France
Getzner (2012)	2011	Austria
Giaccaria et al. (2016)	2007	Italy
Giannelli et al. (2018)	2014	Spain
Giraud et al. (2001)	1996	United States
Giraud et al. (2002)	2000	United States
Goh & Matthew (2021)	2018	Malaysia
Gómez-Valenzuela et al. (2020)	2019	Dominican Republic
Gordillo et al. (2019)	2017	Ecuador
Grala et al. (2012)	2004	United States
Grazhdani (2015)	2012	Albania
Gregg & Wheeler (2018)	2016	Australia
Guo et al. (2014)	2010	China
Guo et al. (2020)	2016	China
Haefele et al. (2018)	2016	United States, Mexico
Haefele et al. (2019)	2016	United States, Canada, Mexico
Haile & Slangen (2009)	2005	Netherlands
Halkos & Matsiori (2012)	2008	Greece
Halkos & Matsiori (2014)	2010	Greece
Halkos & Matsiori (2017)	2013	Greece
Halkos & Matsiori (2018)	2014	Greece
Halkos et al. (2019)	2015	Greece
Hammitt et al. (2001)	1993	Taiwan
Hamuna et al. (2018)	2018	Indonesia
Han & Lee (2008)	2005	South Korea
Han et al. (2011)	2009	China

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Harper (2015)	2014	United States
He et al. (2015)	2012	China
He et al. (2017)	2013	Canada
Herriges et al. (2010)	2003	United States
Hidano et al. (2005)	2000	Japan
Hörnsten & Fredman (2000)	1998	Sweden
Huang et al. (2013)	2008	China
Huenchuleo et al. (2012)	2004	Chile
Huhtala (2004)	1999	Finland
Hwang et al. (2020)	2018	South Korea
Hynes & O'Donoghue (2020)	2012	Ireland
Hynes et al. (2011)	2008	Ireland
Imandoust & Gadam (2007)	2004	India
Jain et al. (2017)	2013	India
Jalilov (2018)	2016	Philippines
Janku et al. (2014)	2014	Czech Republic
Jaunky et al. (2021)	2016	Mauritius
Jenkins et al. (2002)	1999	United States
Jin et al. (2008)	2005	Macao
Jin et al. (2010)	2005	Thailand, China, Vietnam, Philippines
Jin et al. (2018)	2012	China
Jin et al. (2019)	2017	China
Jin et al. (2020)	2019	South Korea
Jørgensen et al. (2013)	2009	Denmark
Jung & Lee (2021)	2018	South Korea
Kaffashi et al. (2011)	2009	Iran
Kaffashi et al. (2013)	2010	Iran
Kaffashi et al. (2015)	2009	Iran
Kalfas et al. (2020)	2017	Greece
Khai & Yabe (2014)	2013	Vietnam
Kim & Petrolia (2013)	2009	United States
Kim & Yoo (2020)	2019	South Korea
Kim et al. (2012)	2010	South Korea
Kim et al. (2015)	2012	South Korea
Kim et al. (2016)	2014	South Korea
Kim et al. (2017a)	2015	South Korea
Kim et al. (2017b)	2016	South Korea
Kim et al. (2018a)	2017	South Korea
Kim et al. (2018b)	2017	South Korea

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Kim et al. (2019a)	2017	South Korea
Kim et al. (2019b)	2018	South Korea
Kim et al. (2020)	2016	South Korea
Kim et al. (2020)	2018	South Korea
Kim et al. (2021a)	2019	South Korea
Kim et al. (2021b)	2017	South Korea
Kniivilä et al. (2002)	2000	Finland
Kobayashi et al. (2010)	2005	United States
Kontogianni et al. (2012)	2009	Greece
Kontogianni et al. (2013)	2010	Greece
Kontogianni et al. (2014)	2005	Greece
Kotchen & Reiling (2000)	1997	United States
Kourtis & Tsihrintzis (2017)	2014	Greece
Kwak et al. (2003)	2001	South Korea
Kwon et al. (2018)	2016	South Korea
Labao et al. (2008)	2005	Philippines
Latvala et al. (2021)	2019	Finland
Lee (2012)	2009	South Korea
Lee (2020)	2017	South Korea
Lee & Hwang (2016)	2012	South Korea
Lee & Mjelde (2007)	2005	South Korea
Lee et al. (2013)	2010	South Korea
Lee et al. (2017)	2014	South Korea
Lee et al. (2018a)	2016	South Korea
Lee et al. (2018b)	2017	South Korea
Lehtoranta et al. (2013)	2011	Finland
Lehtoranta et al. (2017)	2013	Finland
Lewis et al. (2017)	2014	United States
Li & Hu (2018)	2012	China
Li et al. (2014)	2011	China
Liebe et al. (2011)	2004	Germany
Lillo et al. (2014)	2014	Chile
Lim et al. (2017a)	2014	South Korea
Lim et al. (2017b)	2015	South Korea
Lin et al. (2017)	2016	Singapore
Lin et al. (2020)	2017	Taiwan
Lindhjem & Navrud (2009)	2007	Norway
Lindhjem & Navrud (2011)	2007	Norway
Liu et al. (2019)	2017	Taiwan
Liu et al. (2021a)	2020	China

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Liu et al. (2021b)	2018	Taiwan
Longo et al. (2012)	2008	Spain
Loomis et al. (2002)	1999	United States
Lopes & Kipperberg (2020)	2013	Norway
Loureiro et al. (2009)	2006	Spain
Loureiro et al. (2013)	2010	Spain
Lyssenko & Martínez-Espiñeira (2012a)	2005	Canada
Lyssenko & Martínez-Espiñeira (2012b)	2008	Canada
Ma et al. (2015)	2010	China
Ma et al. (2021)	2018	China
Madureira et al. (2011)	2003	Portugal
Magnan et al. (2012)	2004	United States
Maharana et al. (2000a)	1997	India
Maharana et al. (2000b)	1998	India
Mahieu et al. (2017)	2015	France
Makwinja et al. (2019)	2015	Malawi
Malinauskaite et al. (2020)	2018	Iceland
Martín-López et al. (2007a)	2004	Spain
Martín-López et al. (2007b)	2004	Spain
Martínez-Espiñeira (2007)	2003	Canada
Martínez-Espiñeira & Lyssenko (2011)	2005	Canada
Martínez-Paz et al. (2019)	2016	Spain
Martínez-Paz et al. (2021)	2018	Spain
Masud et al. (2015)	2012	Malaysia
Maynard et al. (2019)	2016	Taiwan
Mazzocchi & Sali (2016)	2015	Italy
McDougall et al. (2020)	2018	United Kingdom
Metcalfe & Baker (2015)	2008, 2009	United Kingdom
Meyerhoff & Liebe (2008)	2004	Germany
Meyerhoff et al. (2012a)	2009	Germany
Meyerhoff et al. (2012b)	2004	Germany
Milovantseva (2016)	2010	United States
Mjelde et al. (2017)	2015	South Korea
Mohamed et al. (2012)	2011	Malaysia
Mohammed (2009)	2005	Thailand
Monteiro et al. (2012)	2008	Brazil
Morais et al. (2014)	2010	Brazil

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Morawetz & Koemle (2017)	2013	Austria
Mostafa & Al-Hamdi (2016)	2012	Kuwait
Mourato et al. (2004)	2001	United Kingdom
Muchapondwa et al. (2008)	2000	Zimbabwe
Muhammad et al. (2021)	2017	Turkey
Muñoz-Pizza et al. (2020)	2019	Mexico
Musa et al. (2020)	2017	Malaysia
Mwebaze et al. (2018)	2014	United Kingdom
Nallathiga & Paravasthu (2010)	2006	India
Nastis & Mattas (2018)	2014	Greece
Ndambiri et al. (2017)	2013	Kenya
Ndebele & Forgie (2017)	2008	New Zealand
Nielsen-Pincus et al. (2017)	2012	United States
Nieminen et al. (2019)	2017	Finland
Ning & Lee (2019)	2018	South Korea, China
Ning et al. (2019)	2019	China
Nishizawa et al. (2006)	2003	Japan
Noring et al. (2016)	2012	Norway
Novikova et al. (2019)	2017	Lithuania
Nurin Fadhlin et al. (2021)	2019	Malaysia
O'Connor et al. (2020)	2019	Italy
O'Garra & Mourato (2007)	2003	United Kingdom
O'Garra et al. (2007)	2003	United Kingdom, Australia
Ofori & Rouleau (2020)	2018	Ghana
Oh et al. (2019)	2017	South Korea
Östberg et al. (2012)	2009	Sweden
Pakhtigian & Jeuland (2019)	2017	Nepal
Palanca-Tan (2020)	2019	Philippines
Park & Chang (2019)	2017	South Korea
Park et al. (2013)	2010	South Korea
Peixer et al. (2011)	2006	Brazil
Pemberton et al. (2010)	2001	Dominica
Pérez-Sánchez et al. (2021)	2018	Colombia
Perni et al. (2011)	2010	Spain
Petrolia & Kim (2009)	2008	United States
Petrolia & Kim (2011)	2009	United States
Petrolia et al. (2011)	2009	United States
Pham et al. (2018)	2016	Vietnam
Pinto et al. (2016)	2011	Portugal
Piriyapada & Wang (2014)	2013	Thailand

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Poder & He (2017)	2009	Canada, France
Polyzos & Minetos (2007)	1995	United Kingdom
Ponce et al. (2011)	2008	Chile
Pouta et al. (2002)	1997	Finland
Pu et al. (2019)	2017	China
Rakthai (2018)	2015	Thailand
Ramos et al. (2019)	2013	Portugal
Ready et al. (2002)	1996	Latvia
Rekola & Pouta (2005)	1996	Finland
Rekola et al. (2000)	1997	Finland
Resende et al. (2017)	2012	Brazil
Ressurreição et al. (2012)	2008	Portugal, Poland
Ressurreição et al. (2011)	2007	Portugal
Ressurreição et al. (2012)	2007	Italy, Portugal, Poland
Rhodes et al. (2018)	2005	United States
Rodella et al. (2019)	2015	Italy
Roomratanapun (2001)	1996	Thailand
Sabyrbekov et al. (2020)	2014	Kyrgyz Republic
Saengsupavanich et al. (2008)	2006	Thailand
Sale et al. (2009)	2003	South Africa
Schiappacasse et al. (2012)	2008	Chile
Schiappacasse et al. (2013)	2008	Chile
Schläpfer & Getzner (2020)	2015	Austria
Schläpfer et al. (2004)	2001	Switzerland
Šebo et al. (2019)	2018	Slovak Republic
Shaari et al. (2020)	2017	Malaysia
Shah et al. (2016)	2012	Pakistan
Shang et al. (2012)	2011	China
Shu (2018)	2015	China
Sinha & Mishra (2015)	2010	India
Soliño et al. (2009)	2006	Spain
Solomon & Johnson (2009)	2007	United States
Srisawasdi et al. (2021)	2019	Thailand
Stanley (2005)	2001	United States
Stevens et al. (2000)	1996	United States
Stoll et al. (2006)	1996	United States
Subade & Francisco (2014)	2010	Philippines
Sun et al. (2016a)	2013	China
Sun et al. (2016b)	2014	China
Tan & Zhao (2014)	2008	China

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Tello et al. (2018)	2012	Argentina
Thormann & Wicker (2021)	2019	Germany
Tilahun et al. (2015)	2009	Ethiopia
Toivonen et al. (2004)	1999	Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland
Tolunay & Başsüllü (2015)	2013	Turkey
Tonin (2019)	2016	Italy
Tran et al. (2017)	2013	United States
Treiman & Gartner (2006)	2004	United States
Trung et al. (2020)	2017	Vietnam
Tseng et al. (2015)	2011	Taiwan
Tuan et al. (2014)	2010	Vietnam
Turpie (2003)	2001	South Africa
Tziakis et al. (2009)	2006	Greece
Uehara et al. (2018)	1998	Japan
Ureta et al. (2014)	2006	Philippines
Van et al. (2007)	2006	China
Van Oijstaeijen et al. (2020)	2017	Ethiopia
Vargas & Díaz (2014)	2012	Colombia
Vásquez & de Rezende (2019)	2016	Brazil
Vásquez-Lavín et al. (2016)	2009	Bolivia
Vaughan et al. (2000)	1998	Brazil
Veisten et al. (2004)	1992	Norway
Verbič & Slabe-Erker (2009)	2005	Slovenia
Verbič et al. (2016)	2015	Slovenia
Vesely (2007)	2003	New Zealand
Vieira et al. (2016)	2015	Brazil
Voltaire et al. (2017)	2013	France
Wang & He (2018)	2007	China
Wang & Zhang (2009)	2006	China
Wang et al. (2006)	1999	China
Wang et al. (2013a)	2009	China
Wang et al. (2013b)	2007	China
Wang et al. (2016)	2014	China
Wang et al. (2016)	2015	China
Wang et al. (2018)	2016	China
Wang et al. (2020)	2014	China
Whitehead (2005)	1998	United States
Wilson et al. (2010)	2006	Canada
Wilson et al. (2012)	2006	Canada

Continued on next page

Short reference	Study year	Study country
Wilson et al. (2019)	2015	Australia
Winden et al. (2018)	2013	United States, China
Wu et al. (2020)	2013	China
Xiao et al. (2020)	2017	China
Xu & Shan (2018)	2014	China
Xu et al. (2020)	2018	China
Yaacovi et al. (2021)	2018	Israel
Yang et al. (2014)	2011	China
Yang et al. (2018a)	2014	China
Yang et al. (2018b)	2016	China
Yi (2019)	2018	South Korea
Yi & Kim (2020)	2018	South Korea
Yoo & Kwak (2009)	1999	South Korea
Yoo et al. (2001)	1997	South Korea
Yoskowitz & Montagna (2009)	2007	United States
Yu et al. (2018)	2017	China
Zambrano-Monserrate (2020)	2019	Ecuador
Zander et al. (2014)	2011	Australia
Zeybrandt & Barnes (2001)	1998	Namibia
Zhang et al. (2020)	2018	China
Zhao et al. (2013)	2008	China
Zhongmin et al. (2003)	2001	China

References

- Aadland, D., B. Anatchkova, B. Grandjean, J. Shogren, B. Simon, and P. Taylor (2012). Valuing access to u.s. public lands: A pricing experiment to inform federal policy. *Social Science Quarterly* 93(1), 248–269.
- Abate, T., T. Börger, M. Aanesen, J. Falk-Andersson, K. Wyles, and N. Beaumont (2020). Valuation of marine plastic pollution in the european arctic: Applying an integrated choice and latent variable model to contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* 169.
- Acharya, R., T. Maraseni, and G. Cockfield (2021). Estimating the willingness to pay for regulating and cultural ecosystem services from forested siwalik landscapes: perspectives of disaggregated users. *Annals of Forest Science* 78(2).
- Adams, C., R. Seroa da Motta, R. Ortiz, J. Reid, C. Ebersbach Aznar, and P. de Almeida Sinisgalli (2008). The use of contingent valuation for evaluating protected areas in the developing world: Economic valuation of morro do diabo state park, atlantic rainforest, são paulo state (brazil). *Ecological Economics* 66, 359–370.
- Adams, D., J. Soto, J. Lai, F. Escobedo, S. Alvarez, and A. Kibria (2020). Public preferences and willingness to pay for invasive forest pest prevention programs in urban areas. *Forests* 11(10), 1–16.
- Adhikari, D., J. Thacher, J. Chermak, and R. Berrens (2017). Linking forest to faucets in a distant municipal area: Public support for forest restoration and water security in albuquerque, new mexico. *Water Economics and Policy* 3(1).
- Ahlheim, M., T. Börger, and O. Frör (2013). The effects of extrinsic incentives on respondent behaviour in contingent valuation studies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 2(1), 45–70.
- Ahlheim, M., T. Börger, and O. Frör (2015). Replacing rubber plantations by rain forest in southwest china—who would gain and how much? *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 187(2).
- Ahlheim, M., O. Frör, and N. Sinphurmsukskul (2006). Economic valuation of environmental benefits in developing and emerging countries: Theoretical considerations and practical evidence from thailand and the philippines. *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture* 45(4 SPEC. ISS.), 397–419.
- Ahtiainen, H., J. Artell, M. Czajkowski, B. Hasler, L. Hasselström, A. Huhtala, J. Meyerhoff, J. C. R. Smart, T. Söderqvist, M. H. Alemu, et al. (2014). Benefits of meeting nutrient reduction targets for the baltic sea—a contingent valuation study in the nine coastal states. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 3(3), 278–305.
- Akhtar, S., W. Saleem, V. Nadeem, I. Shahid, and A. Ikram (2017). Assessment of willingness to pay for improved air quality using contingent valuation method. *Global Journal of Environmental Science and Management* 3(3), 279–286.

- Akinyemi, B. E. and A. Mushunje (2017). Willingness to pay for wild coast nature reserves conservation through community-based ecotourism projects. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research* 15(16), 57–73.
- Akinyemi, B. E. and A. Mushunje (2020). Community-based ecotourism project in communities adjacent to the addo elephant national park: Will households pay for it? *Koedoe* 62(1), 1–10.
- Al-Amin, A. Q., M. M. Masud, M. S. Kabir Sarkar, W. L. Filho, and B. Doberstein (2020). Analysing the socioeconomic and motivational factors affecting the willingness to pay for climate change adaptation in malaysia. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 50.
- Al-Assaf, A. A. (2015). Applying contingent valuation to measure the economic value of forest services: A case study in northern jordan. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 22(3), 242–250.
- Albaladejo-García, J. A., F. Alcon, and J. M. Martínez-Paz (2021). Economic valuation of allotment gardens in peri-urban degraded agroecosystems: The role of citizens' preferences in spatial planning. *Sustainable Cities and Society* 68.
- Alberini, A., P. Rosato, A. Longo, and V. Zanatta (2005). Information and willingness to pay in a contingent valuation study: The value of s. erasmo in the lagoon of venice. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 48(2), 155–175.
- Aldrich, G. A., K. M. Grimsrud, J. A. Thacher, and M. J. Kotchen (2007). Relating environmental attitudes and contingent values: How robust are methods for identifying preference heterogeneity? *Environmental and Resource Economics* 37(4), 757–775.
- Amare, D., W. Mekuria, T. T/wold, B. Belay, A. Teshome, B. Yitaferu, T. Tessema, and B. Tegegn (2016). Perception of local community and the willingness to pay to restore church forests: the case of dera district, northwestern ethiopia. *Forests Trees and Livelihoods* 25(3), 173–186.
- Ami, D., F. Aprahamian, O. Chanel, R.-V. Joulé, and S. Luchini (2014). Willingness to pay of committed citizens: A field experiment. *Ecological Economics* 105, 31–39.
- Ami, D., F. Aprahamian, O. Chanel, and S. Luchini (2011). A test of cheap talk in different hypothetical contexts: The case of air pollution. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 50(1), 111–130.
- Amiri, N., S. F. Emadian, A. Fallah, K. Adeli, and H. Amirnejad (2015). Estimation of conservation value of myrtle (*myrtus communis*) using a contingent valuation method: A case study in a dooreh forest area, lorestan province, iran. *Forest Ecosystems* 2(1).

- Amirnejad, H., S. Khalilian, M. H. Assareh, and M. Ahmadian (2006). Estimating the existence value of north forests of iran by using a contingent valuation method. *Ecological Economics* 58(4), 665–675.
- Aoun, D. (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.
- Arabomen, O. J., P. W. Chirwa, and F. D. Babalola (2019). Willingness-to-pay for environmental services provided by trees in core and fringe areas of benin city, nigeria. *International Forestry Review* 21(1), 23–36.
- Aravena, C., W. G. Hutchinson, and A. Longo (2012). Environmental pricing of externalities from different sources of electricity generation in chile. *Energy Economics* 34(4), 1214–1225.
- Ardiansyah, M., Suharno, and I. Susilowati (2019). Estimating the conservation value of mangrove forests in marine protected areas: Special reference to karimunjawa waters, indonesia. *AACL Bioflux* 12(2), 437–447.
- Arega, T. and T. Tadesse (2017). Household willingness to pay for green electricity in urban and peri-urban tigray, northern ethiopia: Determinants and welfare effects. *Energy Policy* 100, 292–300.
- Arowolo, A. O., M. U. Agbonlahor, P. A. Okuneye, and J. A. Soaga (2014). Adopting a participatory approach to community forests management in rural nigeria. *Global Nest Journal* 16(5), 975–987.
- Asciuto, A., V. Borsellino, M. D’Acquisto, C. P. Di Franco, M. Di Gesaro, and E. Schimmenti (2015). Monumental trees and their existence value: Case study of an italian natural park. *Journal of Forest Science* 61(2), 56–61.
- Atkinson, G., S. Morse-Jones, S. Mourato, and A. Provins (2012). When to take “no” for an answer? using entreaties to reduce protests in contingent valuation studies. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 51(4), 497–523.
- Azlina, A. A., K. Mahirah, and M. S. Sin (2018). Willingness to pay for renewable energy: Evidence from malaysian’s households [kesanggupan membayar terhadap tenaga boleh diperbaharui: Kajian kes isi rumah di malaysia]. *Jurnal Ekonomi Malaysia* 52(3), 143–151.
- Bandara, R. and C. Tisdell (2004). The net benefit of saving the asian elephant: A policy and contingent valuation study. *Ecological Economics* 48(1), 93–107.
- Bandara, R. and C. Tisdell (2005). Changing abundance of elephants and willingness to pay for their conservation. *Journal of Environmental Management* 76(1), 47–59.

- Banna, H., R. Afroz, M. M. Masud, M. S. Rana, E. H. Y. Koh, and R. Ahmad (2016). Financing an efficient adaptation programme to climate change: A contingent valuation method tested in malaysia. *Cahiers Agricultures* 25(2).
- Baral, N., R. Gautam, N. Timilsina, and M. G. Bhat (2007). Conservation implications of contingent valuation of critically endangered white-rumped vulture *gyps bengalensis* in south asia. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science and Management* 3(3), 145–156.
- Barrena, J., L. Nahuelhual, A. Báez, I. Schiappacasse, and C. Cerda (2014). Valuing cultural ecosystem services: Agricultural heritage in chiloé island, southern chile. *Ecosystem Services* 7, 66–75.
- Barton, D. N. (2002). The transferability of benefit transfer: Contingent valuation of water quality improvements in costa rica. *Ecological Economics* 42.
- Bederli Tümay, A. and R. Brouwer (2007). Nonmarket valuation of water quality in a rural transition economy in turkey applying an a posteriori bid design. *Water Resources Research* 43(5).
- Belhaj, M. (2003). Estimating the benefits of clean air contingent valuation and hedonic price methods. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues* 3(1), 30–46.
- Bernath, K. and A. Roschewitz (2008). Recreational benefits of urban forests: Explaining visitors' willingness to pay in the context of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Environmental Management* 89(3), 155–166.
- Bernstein, P., T. C. Kinnaman, and M. Wu (2013). Estimating willingness to pay for river amenities and safety measures associated with shale gas extraction. *Eastern Economic Journal* 39(1), 28–44.
- Berrens, R. P., A. K. Bohara, H. C. Jenkins-Smith, C. L. Silva, and D. L. Weimer (2004). Information and effort in contingent valuation surveys: Application to global climate change using national internet samples. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 47(2), 331–363.
- Bhat, M. Y. and A. A. Sofi (2021). Willingness to pay for biodiversity conservation in dachigam national park, india. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 62.
- Bigerna, S., S. Micheli, and P. Polinori (2019). Willingness to pay for electric boats in a protected area in italy: A sustainable tourism perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 224, 603–613.
- Blaine, T. W. and T. Smith (2006). From water quality to riparian corridors: Assessing willingness to pay for conservation easements using the contingent valuation method. *Journal of Extension* 44(2).
- Bliem, M. and M. Getzner (2012). Willingness-to-pay for river restoration: Differences across time and scenarios. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 14(3), 241–260.

- Bonnichsen, O. and S. B. Olsen (2016). Correcting for non-response bias in contingent valuation surveys concerning environmental non-market goods: an empirical investigation using an online panel. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 59(2), 245–262.
- Börger, T. (2013). Keeping up appearances: Motivations for socially desirable responding in contingent valuation interviews. *Ecological Economics* 87, 155–165.
- Bostan, Y., A. Fatahi Ardakani, M. Fehrest Sani, and M. Sadeghinia (2020). A comparison of stated preferences methods for the valuation of natural resources: the case of contingent valuation and choice experiment. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 17(9), 4031–4046.
- Bowman, T., J. Thompson, and J. Colletti (2009). Valuation of open space and conservation features in residential subdivisions. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90(1), 321–330.
- Bowman, T., J. C. Tyndall, J. Thompson, J. Kliebenstein, and J. P. Colletti (2012). Multiple approaches to valuation of conservation design and low-impact development features in residential subdivisions. *Journal of Environmental Management* 104, 101–113.
- Brandli, L. L., P. D. Marques Prietto, and A. 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).
- Braun, C., K. Rehdanz, and U. Schmidt (2016). Validity of willingness to pay measures under preference uncertainty. *PLoS ONE* 11(4).
- Broadbent, C. D., D. S. Brookshire, D. Goodrich, M. D. Dixon, L. A. Brand, J. Thacher, and S. Stewart (2015). Valuing preservation and restoration alternatives for ecosystem services in the southwestern usa. *Ecohydrology* 8(5), 851–862.
- Broberg, T. and R. Brännlund (2008). On the value of large predators in sweden: A regional stratified contingent valuation analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management* 88(4), 1066–1077.
- Brouwer, R. (2006). Do stated preference methods stand the test of time? a test of the stability of contingent values and models for health risks when facing an extreme event. *Ecological Economics* 60(2), 399–406.
- Brouwer, R. (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.
- Brouwer, R. (2012). Constructed preference stability: a test–retest. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 1(1), 70–84.

- Brouwer, R., S. Brouwer, M. A. Eleveld, M. Verbraak, A. J. Wagtendonk, and H. J. van der Woerd (2016). Public willingness to pay for alternative management regimes of remote marine protected areas in the north sea. *Marine Policy* 68, 195–204.
- Brouwer, R. and J. Martín-Ortega (2012). Modeling self-censoring of polluter pays protest votes in stated preference research to support resource damage estimations in environmental liability. *Resource and Energy Economics* 34(1), 151–166.
- Brouwer, R., P. van Beukering, and E. Sultanian (2008). The impact of the bird flu on public willingness to pay for the protection of migratory birds. *Ecological Economics* 64(3), 575–585.
- Bueno, E. A., R. Ancog, E. Obalan, A. D. Cero, A. N. Simon, M. R. Malvecino-Macalintal, M. J. Bactong, J. Lunar, G. R. Buena, and L. Sugui (2016). Measuring households' willingness to pay for water quality restoration of a natural urban lake in the philippines. *Environmental Processes* 3(4), 875–894.
- Bundal, K. S. M., R. Subade, and R. R. Taperla (2018). Willingness to pay of households for conservation of seagrasses in nueva valencia, guimaras, philippines. *Asian Fisheries Science* 31(4), 297–318.
- Carandang, A. P., L. D. Camacho, D. T. Gevaña, J. T. Dizon, S. C. Camacho, C. C. de Luna, F. B. Pulhin, E. A. Comblicer, F. D. Paras, R. J. Peras, and L. L. Rebugio (2013). Economic valuation for sustainable mangrove ecosystems management in bohol and palawan, philippines. *Forest Science and Technology* 9(3), 118–125.
- Carlsson, F. and O. Johansson-Stenman (2000). Willingness to pay for improved air quality in sweden. *Applied Economics* 32(6), 661–669.
- Carlsson, F., M. Kataria, A. Krupnick, E. Lampi, Å. Löfgren, P. Qin, S. Chung, and T. Sterner (2012). Paying for mitigation: A multiple country study. *Land Economics* 88(2), 326–340.
- Carlsson, F., M. Kataria, A. Krupnick, E. Lampi, T. Löfgren, P. Qin, and T. Sterner (2013). The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth-a multiple country test of an oath script. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 89, 105–121.
- Carlsson, F. and P. Martinsson (2001). Willingness to pay for reduction in air pollution: a multilevel analysis. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 4(1), 17–27.
- Castro, A. J., B. Martín-López, M. García-Llorente, P. A. Aguilera, E. López, and J. Cabello (2011). Social preferences regarding the delivery of ecosystem services in a semiarid mediterranean region. *Journal of Arid Environments* 75(11), 1201–1208.
- Cerda, A. A., L. Y. Garcia, R. A. Pastén, I. A. Damino, and M. T. Diaz (2014). The effects of visual information on willingness to pay for a recreational site improvement in chile [los efectos de la información visual sobre la disposición a pagar por la mejora de un lugar recreativo en chile]. *Innovar* 24(53), 141–148.

- Chambers, C. M. and J. C. Whitehead (2003). A contingent valuation estimate of the benefits of wolves in minnesota. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 26(2), 249–267.
- Chaudhry, P., B. Singh, and V. Tewari (2007). Non-market economic valuation in developing countries: Role of participant observation method in cvm analysis. *Journal of Forest Economics* 13(4), 259–275.
- Chaudhry, P., V. Tewari, and B. Singh (2008). Wtp vs wta for assessing the recreational benefits of urban forests: A case from a modern and planned city of a developing country. *Forests Trees and Livelihoods* 18(3), 215–231.
- Chen, K.-L., W.-H. Kong, C.-C. Chen, and J.-L. Liou (2021). Evaluating benefits of eco-agriculture: The cases of farms along taiwan’s east coast in yilan and hualien. *Sustainability* 13(19).
- Chen, O. and D. Han (2018). A participatory multiple criteria decision analysis to tackle a complex environmental problem involving cultural water heritage and nature. *Water* 10(12).
- Chen, W.-J. and S.-C. Liaw (2012). What is the value of eco-tourism? an evaluation of forested trails for community residents and visitors. *Tourism Economics* 18(4), 871–885.
- Chen, W. Y. (2015). Public willingness-to-pay for conserving urban heritage trees in guangzhou, south china. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 14(4), 796–805.
- Chen, W. Y. and C. Y. Jim (2010). Resident motivations and willingness-to-pay for urban biodiversity conservation in guangzhou (china). *Environmental Management* 45(5), 1052–1064.
- Chen, W. Y. and C. Y. Jim (2012). Contingent valuation of ecotourism development in country parks in the urban shadow. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 19(1), 44–53.
- Cheng, Y., C. Ao, B. Mao, and L. Xu (2021). Influential factors of environmental behavior to reduce air pollution: integrating theories of planned behavior and psychological distance. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*.
- Cheng, Y. S., K. H. Cao, C. K. Woo, and A. Yatchew (2017). Residential willingness to pay for deep decarbonization of electricity supply: Contingent valuation evidence from hong kong. *Energy Policy* 109, 218–227.
- Chien, Y.-L., C.-J. Huang, and D. Shaw (2005). A general model of starting point bias in double-bounded dichotomous contingent valuation surveys. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 50(2), 362–377.
- Chigamba, G., M. Limuwa, and E. Kaunda (2021). Does paying for aquatic resources matter? a case of an african riverine ecosystem. *Sustainability* 13(8).

- Choi, A. S. (2013). Nonmarket values of major resources in the korean dmz areas: A test of distance decay. *Ecological Economics* 88, 97–107.
- Choi, A. S. (2015). An experimental study to explore wtp for aviation carbon offsets: the impact of a carbon tax on the voluntary action. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58(9), 1617–1634.
- Choi, E. C., J. S. Lee, and J.-I. Chang (2021). Willingness to pay for the prevention of beach erosion in korea: The case of haeundae beach. *Marine Policy* 132.
- Choi, I.-C., H. N. Kim, H.-J. Shin, J. Tenhunen, and T. T. Nguyen (2016). Willingness to pay for a highland agricultural restriction policy to improve water quality in south korea: Correcting anomalous preference in contingent valuation method. *Water* 8(11).
- Choi, K.-R., J.-H. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2020). Public perspective on constructing sea forests as a public good: A contingent valuation experiment in south korea. *Marine Policy* 120.
- Colby, B. and P. Orr (2005). Economic tradeoffs in preserving riparian habitat. *Natural Resources Journal* 45(1), 15–31.
- Collins, A. R. and R. S. Rosenberger (2007). Protest adjustments in the valuation of watershed restoration using payment card data. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 36(2), 321–335.
- Cook, D., B. Davíðsdóttir, and D. M. Kristófersson (2018b). Willingness to pay for the preservation of geothermal areas in iceland – the contingent valuation studies of eldvörp and hverahlí. *Renewable Energy* 116, 97–108.
- Cook, D., K. Eiríksdóttir, B. Davíðsdóttir, and D. M. Kristófersson (2018a). The contingent valuation study of heimörk, iceland – willingness to pay for its preservation. *Journal of Environmental Management* 209, 126–138.
- Corrigan, J. R., C. L. Kling, and J. Zhao (2008). Willingness to pay and the cost of commitment: An empirical specification and test. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 40(2), 285–298.
- Dare, A. M., I. A. Ayinde, and A. M. Shittu (2015). Urban trees forest management in abeokuta metropolis, ogun state, nigeria: An application of contingent valuation method. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* 26(1), 72–83.
- De Melo Travassos, S. K., J. C. De Lacerda Leite, and J. De Freitas Costa (2018). Contingent valuation method and the beta model: An accounting economic vision for environmental damage in atlântico sul shipyard. *Revista Contabilidade e Finanças* 29(77), 266–282.

- De Salvo, M., S. Notaro, G. Cucuzza, L. Giuffrida, and G. Signorello (2021). Protecting the local landscape or reducing greenhouse gas emissions? a study on social acceptance and preferences towards the installation of a wind farm. *Sustainability* 13(22).
- Denstadli, J. M. and K. Veisten (2020). The flight is valuable regardless of the carbon tax scheme: A case study of norwegian leisure air travelers. *Tourism Management* 81.
- Dogan, E. and I. Muhammad (2019). Willingness to pay for renewable electricity: A contingent valuation study in turkey. *Electricity Journal* 32(10).
- Donfouet, H. P. P., J. Cook, and P. W. Jeanty (2015). The economic value of improved air quality in urban africa: A contingent valuation survey in douala, cameroon. *Environment and Development Economics* 20(5), 630–649.
- Dong, X., J. Zhang, R. Zhi, S. Zhong, and M. Li (2011). Measuring recreational value of world heritage sites based on contingent valuation method: A case study of jizhaigou. *Chinese Geographical Science* 21(1), 119–128.
- Dong, X., J. Zhang, R. Zhi, S. Zhong, and M. Li (2018). Public willingness to pay for urban smog mitigation and its determinants: A case study of beijing, china. *Atmospheric Environment* 173, 355–363.
- Dribek, A. and L. Voltaire (2017). Contingent valuation analysis of willingness to pay for beach erosion control through the stabiplage technique: A study in djerba (tunisia). *Marine Policy* 86, 17–23.
- Du, X. and R. O. Mendelsohn (2011). Estimating the value of the reduction in air pollution during the beijing olympics. *Environment and Development Economics* 16(6), 735–749.
- Du Preez, M., S. Tessororf, and S. G. Hosking (2010). Application of the contingent valuation method to estimate the willingness-to-pay for restoring indigenous vegetation in underberg, kwazulu-natal, south africa. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* 13(2), 135–157.
- Duan, H.-B., Y.-L. Lü, and Y. Li (2014). Chinese public's willingness to pay for co2 emissions reductions: A case study from four provinces/cities. *Advances in Climate Change Research* 5(2), 100–110.
- Dupont, D. P. (2004). Do children matter? an examination of gender differences in environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* 49(3), 273–286.
- Eisen-Hecht, J. I. and R. A. Kramer (2002). A cost-benefit analysis of water quality protection in the catawba basin. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 38(2), 453–465.

- Endalew, B. and W. B. Assefa (2019). Determinants of households' willingness to pay for the conservation of church forests in northwestern ethiopia: A contingent valuation study. *Cogent Environmental Science* 5(1).
- Endalew, B., B. A. Wondimagegnhu, and K. Tassie (2020). Willingness to pay for church forest conservation: A case study in northwestern ethiopia. *Journal of Forest Science* 66(3), 105–116.
- Eregae, J. E., P. Njogu, R. Karanja, and M. Gichua (2021). Economic valuation for cultural and passive ecosystem services using a stated preference (contingent valuation method (cvm)) case of the elgeyo watershed ecosystem, kenya. *International Journal of Forestry Research*.
- Ezebilo, E. E., M. Boman, L. Mattsson, A. Lindhagen, and W. Mbongo (2015). Preferences and willingness to pay for close to home nature for outdoor recreation in sweden. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58(2), 283–296.
- Fattahi Ardakani, A. and M. Arab (2017). The comparison of discrete payment vehicle methods (dichotomous choice) in improving the quality of the environment. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 14(7), 1409–1418.
- Ferreira, A. M., J. C. Marques, and S. Seixas (2017). Integrating marine ecosystem conservation and ecosystems services economic valuation: Implications for coastal zones governance. *Ecological Indicators* 77, 114–122.
- Ferrini, S., M. Schaafsma, and I. Bateman (2014). Revealed and stated preference valuation and transfer: A within-sample comparison of water quality improvement values. *Water Resources Research* 50(6), 4746–4759.
- Francisco, J. P. S. (2015). Willingness to pay for air quality improvements from using electric jeepneys in metro manila. *Singapore Economic Review* 60(4).
- Fujino, M. and K. Kuriyama (2019). The effect of payer units on the willingness to pay in a contingent valuation survey. *Journal of Forest Research* 24(4), 250–254.
- Gauthier, C. (2004). Pricing sustainable development. *International Journal of Environmental Technology and Management* 4(4), 291–299.
- Getzner, M. (2012). The regional context of infrastructure policy and environmental valuation: the importance of stakeholders' opinions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 1(3), 255–275.
- Giaccaria, S., V. Frontuto, and S. Dalmazzone (2016). Valuing externalities from energy infrastructures through stated preferences: a geographically stratified sampling approach. *Applied Economics* 48(56), 5497–5512.
- Giannelli, A., S. Giuffrida, and M. R. Trovato (2018). Madrid río park. symbolic values and contingent valuation. *Valori e Valutazioni* 2018(21), 75–85.

- Giraud, K., B. Turcin, J. Loomis, and J. Cooper (2002). Economic benefit of the protection program for the steller sea lion. *Marine Policy* 26(6), 451–458.
- Giraud, K. L., J. B. Loomis, and J. C. Cooper (2001). A comparison of willingness to pay estimation techniques from referendum questions. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 20(4), 331–346.
- Goh, I. Z. and N. K. Matthew (2021). Residents' willingness to pay for a carbon tax. *Sustainability* 13(18).
- Gordillo, F., P. Elsasser, and S. Günter (2019). Willingness to pay for forest conservation in ecuador: Results from a nationwide contingent valuation survey in a combined "referendum" – "consequential open-ended" design. *Forest Policy and Economics* 105, 28–39.
- Grala, R. K., J. C. Tyndall, and C. W. Mize (2012). Willingness to pay for aesthetics associated with field windbreaks in iowa, united states. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 108, 13–21.
- Grazhdani, D. (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.
- Gregg, D. and S. A. Wheeler (2018). How can we value an environmental asset that very few have visited or heard of? lessons learned from applying contingent and inferred valuation in an australian wetlands case study. *Journal of Environmental Management* 220, 207–216.
- Guo, D., A. Wang, and A. T. Zhang (2020). Pollution exposure and willingness to pay for clean air in urban china. *Journal of Environmental Management* 261.
- Guo, X., H. Liu, X. Mao, J. Jin, D. Chen, and S. Cheng (2014). Willingness to pay for renewable electricity: A contingent valuation study in beijing, china. *Energy Policy* 68, 340–347.
- Gómez-Valenzuela, V., F. Alpízar, S. Bonilla, and C. Franco-Billini (2020). Mining conflict in the dominican republic: The case of loma miranda. *Resources Policy* 66.
- Haefele, M., J. Loomis, A. Lien, J. Dubovsky, R. Merideth, K. Bagstad, T.-K. Huang, B. Mattsson, D. Semmens, W. Thogmartin, et al. (2019). Multi-country willingness to pay for transborder migratory species conservation: A case study of northern pintails. *Ecological Economics* 157, 321–331.
- Haefele, M., J. Loomis, R. Merideth, A. Lien, D. Semmens, J. Dubovsky, R. Wiederholt, W. Thogmartin, T.-K. Huang, G. McCracken, et al. (2018). Willingness to pay for conservation of transborder migratory species: A case study of the mexican free-tailed bat in the united states and mexico. *Environmental Management* 62(2), 229–240.

- Haile, D. and L. Slangen (2009). Estimating the willingness to pay for the benefit of aes using the contingent valuation method. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 1(2), 139–152.
- Halkos, G. and S. Matsiori (2012). Determinants of willingness to pay for coastal zone quality improvement. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 41(4), 391–399.
- Halkos, G. and S. Matsiori (2014). Exploring social attitude and willingness to pay for water resources conservation. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 49, 54–62.
- Halkos, G. and S. Matsiori (2017). Environmental attitude, motivations and values for marine biodiversity protection. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 69, 61–70.
- Halkos, G. and S. Matsiori (2018). Environmental attitudes and preferences for coastal zone improvements. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 58, 153–166.
- Halkos, G., S. Matsiori, and S. Dritsas (2019). Stakeholder engagement for sustainable development and their suggestions for environmental policy: The case of mediterranean monk seal. *Sustainable Development* 27(3), 461–473.
- Hammit, J., J.-T. Liu, and J.-L. Liu (2001). Contingent valuation of a taiwanese wetland. *Environment and Development Economics* 6(2), 259–268.
- Hamuna, B., B. Rumahorbo, H. Keiluhu, and Alianto (2018). Willingness to pay for existence value of mangrove ecosystem in youtefa bay, jayapura, indonesia. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism* 9(5), 907–915.
- Han, F., Z. Yang, H. Wang, and X. Xu (2011). Estimating willingness to pay for environment conservation: A contingent valuation study of kanas nature reserve, xinjiang, china. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 180.
- Han, S.-Y. and C.-K. Lee (2008). Estimating the value of preserving the manchurian black bear using the contingent valuation method. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 23(5), 458–465.
- Harper, J. (2015). The new man and the sea: Climate change perceptions and sustainable seafood preferences of florida reef anglers. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* 3(2), 299–328.
- He, J., J. Dupras, and T. G. Poder (2017). The value of wetlands in quebec: a comparison between contingent valuation and choice experiment. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 6(1), 51–78.
- He, J., A. Huang, and L. Xu (2015). Spatial heterogeneity and transboundary pollution: A contingent valuation (cv) study on the xijiang river drainage basin in south china. *China Economic Review* 36, 101–130.

- Herriges, J., C. Kling, C.-C. Liu, and J. Tobias (2010). What are the consequences of consequentiality? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 59(1), 67–81.
- Hidano, N., T. Kato, and M. Aritomi (2005). Benefits of participating in contingent valuation mail surveys and their effects on respondent behavior: A panel analysis. *Ecological Economics* 52(1), 63–80.
- Hörnsten, L. and P. Fredman (2000). On the distance to recreational forests in sweden. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 51(1), 1–10.
- Huang, L., J. Ban, B. Duan, J. Bi, and Z. Yuan (2013). Public demand for remediating a local ecosystem: Comparing wtp and wta at hongze lake, china. *Lake and Reservoir Management* 29(1), 23–32.
- Huenchuleo, C., J. Barkmann, and P. Villalobos (2012). Social psychology predictors for the adoption of soil conservation measures in central chile. *Land Degradation and Development* 23(5), 483–495.
- Huhtala, A. (2004). What price recreation in finland? - a contingent valuation study of non-market benefits of public outdoor recreation areas. *Journal of Leisure Research* 36(1), 23–44.
- Hwang, Y., J. Moon, W. Lee, S. Kim, and J. Kim (2020). Evaluation of firefly as a tourist attraction and resource using contingent valuation method based on a new environmental paradigm. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism* 21(3), 320–336.
- Hynes, S., D. Campbell, and P. Howley (2011). A holistic vs. an attribute-based approach to agri-environmental policy valuation: Do welfare estimates differ? *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 62(2), 305–329.
- Hynes, S. and C. O'Donoghue (2020). Value transfer using spatial microsimulation modelling: Estimating the value of achieving good ecological status under the eu water framework directive across catchments. *Environmental Science and Policy* 110, 60–70.
- Imandoust, S. and S. Gadam (2007). Are people willing to pay for river water quality, contingent valuation. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 4(3), 401–408.
- Jain, A., G. Chandra, and R. Nautiyal (2017). Valuating intangible benefits from afforested areas: A case study in india. *Economia Agraria y Recursos Naturales* 17(1), 89–100.
- Jalilov, S.-M. (2018). Value of clean water resources: Estimating the water quality improvement in metro manila, philippines. *Resources* 7(1).
- Janku, J., D. Kučerová, J. Houška, J. Kozák, and A. Rubešová (2014). The evaluation of degraded land by application of the contingent method. *Soil and Water Research* 9(4), 214–223.

- Jaunky, V. C., J. Jeetoo, and M. Thomas (2021). Willingness to pay for the conservation of the mauritian flying fox. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 26.
- Jenkins, D., J. Sullivan, G. Amacher, N. Nicholas, and D. Reaves (2002). Valuing high altitude spruce-fir forest improvements: Importance of forest condition and recreation activity. *Journal of Forest Economics* 8(1), 77–99.
- Jin, J., R. He, W. Wang, and H. Gong (2018). Valuing cultivated land protection: A contingent valuation and choice experiment study in china. *Land Use Policy* 74, 214–219.
- Jin, J., A. Indab, O. Nabangchang, T. Thuy, D. Harder, and R. Subade (2010). Valuing marine turtle conservation: A cross-country study in asian cities. *Ecological Economics* 69(10), 2020–2026.
- Jin, J., Z. Wang, and X. Liu (2008). Valuing black-faced spoonbill conservation in macao: A policy and contingent valuation study. *Ecological Economics* 68, unknown. Page number not provided.
- Jin, M., Y. Juan, Y. Choi, and C.-K. Lee (2019). Estimating the preservation value of world heritage site using contingent valuation method: The case of the li river, china. *Sustainability* 11(4).
- Jin, S.-J., Y.-J. Kwon, and S.-H. Yoo (2020). Economic valuation of reducing submerged marine debris in south korea. *Applied Sciences* 10(17).
- Jørgensen, S., S. Olsen, J. Ladenburg, L. Martinsen, S. Svenningsen, and B. Hasler (2013). Spatially induced disparities in users' and non-users' wtp for water quality improvements-testing the effect of multiple substitutes and distance decay. *Ecological Economics* 92, 58–66.
- Jung, J. and W. Lee (2021). Estimating the preservation value of the confucianism symbol tree: application of the contingent valuation method. *Anatolia* 32(3), 375–386.
- Kaffashi, S., M. Shamsudin, A. Radam, and K. Rahim (2015). Socio-economic reason to save an international wetland. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences* 12(1), 67–83.
- Kaffashi, S., M. Shamsudin, A. Radam, K. Rahim, M. Yacob, A. Muda, and M. Yazid (2011). Economic valuation of shadegan international wetland, iran: Notes for conservation. *Regional Environmental Change* 11(4), 925–934.
- Kaffashi, S., M. Shamsudin, A. Radam, K. Rahim, M. Yacob, A. Muda, and M. Yazid (2013). We are willing to pay to support wetland conservation: Local users perspective. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 20(4), 325–335.
- Kalfas, D., D. Zagkas, E. Dragozi, and T. Zagkas (2020). Estimating value of the ecosystem services in the urban and peri-urban green of a town florina-greece, using the cvm. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 27(4), 310–321.

- Khai, H. and M. Yabe (2014). The demand of urban residents for the biodiversity conservation in u minh thuong national park, vietnam. *Agricultural and Food Economics* 2(1).
- Kim, G.-E., J.-H. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2019a). How much value do people place on preserving the seocheon coastal wetland in south korea? *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 26(18), 18913–18920.
- Kim, H.-Y., S.-Y. Park, and S.-H. Yoo (2016). Public acceptability of introducing a biogas mandate in korea: A contingent valuation study. *Sustainability* 8(11).
- Kim, J., S.-N. Kim, and S. Doh (2015). The distance decay of willingness to pay and the spatial distribution of benefits and costs for the ecological restoration of an urban branch stream in ulsan, south korea. *Annals of Regional Science* 54(3), 835–853.
- Kim, J., T. Lee, and S. Hyun (2021b). Estimating the economic value of urban forest parks: Focusing on restorative experiences and environmental concerns. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management* 20, 100603.
- Kim, J., S.-Y. Lim, and S.-H. Yoo (2017a). Measuring the economic benefits of designating baegnyeong island in korea as a marine protected area. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 24(3), 205–213.
- Kim, J., S.-Y. Lim, and S.-H. Yoo (2017b). Public willingness to pay for restoring destroyed tidal flats and utilizing them as ecological resources in korea. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 142, 143–149.
- Kim, J.-H., K.-R. Choi, and S.-H. Yoo (2020). Public perspective on increasing the numbers of an endangered species, loggerhead turtles in south korea: A contingent valuation. *Sustainability* 12(9), 3835.
- Kim, J.-H., H.-J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2018a). Consumers' willingness to pay for net-zero energy apartment in south korea. *Sustainability* 10(5), 1564.
- Kim, J.-H., H.-J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2018b). Public value of enforcing the pm2.5 concentration reduction policy in south korean urban areas. *Sustainability* 10(4), 1144.
- Kim, J.-H., H.-J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2019b). Willingness to pay price premium for smartphones produced using renewable energy. *Sustainability* 11(6), 1566.
- Kim, J.-H., J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2020). What value does the public put on managing and protecting an endangered marine species? the case of the finless porpoise in south korea. *Sustainability* 12(11), 4505.
- Kim, J.-H., S.-Y. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2021a). South koreans' willingness to pay for restoration of gomsoman tidal flat. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 199, 105388.
- Kim, J.-H. and S.-H. Yoo (2020). What do we know about public acceptance of designating marine protected area? the case of jaran bay in south korea. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 27(25), 31715–31725.

- Kim, J.-Y., J. Mjelde, T.-K. Kim, C.-K. Lee, and K.-M. Ahn (2012). Comparing willingness-to-pay between residents and non-residents when correcting hypothetical bias: Case of endangered spotted seal in south korea. *Ecological Economics* 78, 123–131.
- Kim, T.-G. and D. Petrolia (2013). Public perceptions of wetland restoration benefits in louisiana. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 70(5), 1045–1054.
- Kniivilä, M., V. Ovaskainen, O. Saastamoinen, and M. Kniivilä (2002). Costs and benefits of forest conservation: Regional and local comparisons in eastern finland. *Journal of Forest Economics* 8(2), 131–150.
- Kobayashi, M., K. Rollins, and M. Evans (2010). Sensitivity of wtp estimates to definition of ‘yes’: Reinterpreting expressed response intensity. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 39(1), 37–55.
- Kontogianni, A., D. Damigos, C. Tourkolias, M. Vousdoulas, A. Velegrakis, B. Zanou, and M. Skourtos (2014). Eliciting beach users’ willingness to pay for protecting european beaches from beachrock processes. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 98, 167–175.
- Kontogianni, A., C. Tourkolias, A. Machleras, and M. Skourtos (2012). Service providing units, existence values and the valuation of endangered species: A methodological test. *Ecological Economics* 79, 97–104.
- Kontogianni, A., C. Tourkolias, and M. Skourtos (2013). Renewables portfolio, individual preferences and social values towards res technologies. *Energy Policy* 55, 467–476.
- Kotchen, M. and S. Reiling (2000). Environmental attitudes, motivations, and contingent valuation of nonuse values: A case study involving endangered species. *Ecological Economics* 32(1), 93–107.
- Kourtis, I. and V. 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.
- Kwak, S.-J., S.-H. Yoo, and S.-Y. Han (2003). Estimating the public’s value for urban forest in the seoul metropolitan area of korea: A contingent valuation study. *Urban Studies* 40(11), 2207–2221.
- Kwon, Y.-J., H.-J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2018). Assessment of the conservation value of munseom area in jeju island, south korea. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 25(8), 738–745.
- Labao, R., H. Francisco, D. Harder, and F. Santos (2008). Do colored photographs affect willingness to pay responses for endangered species conservation? *Environmental and Resource Economics* 40(2), 251–264.

- Latvala, T., K. Regina, and H. Lehtonen (2021). Evaluating non-market values of agroecological and socio-cultural benefits of diversified cropping systems. *Environmental Management* 67(5), 988–999.
- Lee, C. and J. Mjelde (2007). Valuation of ecotourism resources using a contingent valuation method: The case of the Korean DMZ. *Ecological Economics* 63, 511–520.
- Lee, C.-Y., M.-K. Lee, and S.-H. Yoo (2017). Willingness to pay for replacing traditional energies with renewable energy in South Korea. *Energy* 128, 284–290.
- Lee, H.-J., H.-J. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2018a). The public value of reducing the incidence of oil spill accidents in Korean rivers. *Sustainability* 10(4).
- Lee, J. and U. Hwang (2016). Hypothetical bias in risk preferences as a driver of hypothetical bias in willingness to pay: Experimental evidence. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 65(4), 789–811.
- Lee, J.-S. (2012). Measuring the economic benefits of the Youngsan River restoration project in Kwangju, Korea, using contingent valuation. *Water International* 37(7), 859–870.
- Lee, M.-K., J.-H. Kim, and S.-H. Yoo (2018b). Public willingness to pay for increasing photovoltaic power generation: The case of Korea. *Sustainability* 10(4).
- Lee, W. (2020). A study on the value of preserving a parasitic volcanic sieve as a tourism good for sustainable management: Using the contingent valuation method. *Sustainability* 12(7).
- Lee, W., J. Kim, A. Graefe, and S.-H. Chi (2013). Valuation of an eco-friendly hiking trail using the contingent valuation method: An application of psychological ownership theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 13(1), 55–69.
- Lehtoranta, V., A. Sarvilinna, S. Väisänen, J. Aroviita, and T. Muotka (2017). Public values and preference certainty for stream restoration in forested watersheds in Finland. *Water Resources and Economics* 17, 56–66.
- Lehtoranta, V., E. Seppälä, and A.-K. Kosenius (2013). Willingness to pay for water level regulation in Lake Pielinen, Finland. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 2(2), 148–163.
- Lewis, S., J. Popp, L. English, and T. Odetola (2017). Willingness to pay for riparian zones in an Ozark watershed. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 143(5).
- Li, S., Y. Zhang, L. Zhang, and L. Wang (2014). Willingness to pay for the urban river ecosystem restoration in Hangzhou and Nanjing, China. *World Review of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development* 11(1), 14–25.

- Li, Z. and B. Hu (2018). Perceived health risk, environmental knowledge, and contingent valuation for improving air quality: New evidence from the jinchuan mining area in china. *Economics and Human Biology* 31, 54–68.
- Liebe, U., P. Preisendörfer, and J. Meyerhoff (2011). To pay or not to pay: Competing theories to explain individuals' willingness to pay for public environmental goods. *Environment and Behavior* 43(1), 106–130.
- Lillo, F., E. Acuña, F. Vásquez, P. Mena, and R. Rodríguez (2014). Willingness to pay of smallholders for soil restoration: Results of a contingent valuation survey. *Custos e Agronegocio* 10(4), 118–138.
- Lim, S.-Y., S.-J. Jin, and S.-H. Yoo (2017a). The economic benefits of the dokdo seals restoration project in korea: A contingent valuation study. *Sustainability* 9(6).
- Lim, S.-Y., S.-Y. Park, and S.-H. Yoo (2017b). The environmental conservation value of the saemangeum open sea in korea. *Sustainability* 9(11).
- Lin, H.-W., Y.-C. Chuang, and W.-Y. Liu (2020). Assessing the economic value of an iconic urban heritage tree. *Forest Policy and Economics* 118.
- Lin, Y., L. Wijedasa, and R. Chisholm (2017). Singapore's willingness to pay for mitigation of transboundary forest-fire haze from indonesia. *Environmental Research Letters* 12(2).
- Lindhjem, H. and S. Navrud (2009). Asking for individual or household willingness to pay for environmental goods?: Implication for aggregate welfare measures. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 43(1), 11–29.
- Lindhjem, H. and S. Navrud (2011). Are internet surveys an alternative to face-to-face interviews in contingent valuation? *Ecological Economics* 70(9), 1628–1637.
- Liu, C., M. Lin, X. Qi, and W. Zheng (2021a). Estimating the preservation value of wuyishan national park from the perspective of bounded rational decision making. *Sustainability* 13(13).
- Liu, W.-Y., Y.-Y. Lin, H.-S. Chen, and C.-M. Hsieh (2019). Assessing the amenity value of forest ecosystem services: Perspectives from the use of sustainable green spaces. *Sustainability* 11(16).
- Liu, W.-Y., Y.-Z. Lin, and C.-M. Hsieh (2021b). Assessing the ecological value of an urban forest park: A case study of sinhua forest park in taiwan. *Forests* 12(6).
- Longo, A., D. Hoyos, and A. Markandya (2012). Willingness to pay for ancillary benefits of climate change mitigation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 51(1), 119–140.
- Loomis, J., L. Bair, and A. González-Cabán (2002). Language-related differences in a contingent valuation study: English versus spanish. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 84(4), 1091–1102.

- Lopes, A. and G. Kipperberg (2020). Diagnosing insensitivity to scope in contingent valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 77(1), 191–216.
- Loureiro, M., X. Labandeira, and M. Hanemann (2013). Transport and low-carbon fuel: A study of public preferences in Spain. *Energy Economics* 40, S126–S133.
- Loureiro, M., J. Loomis, and M. Vázquez (2009). Economic valuation of environmental damages due to the Prestige oil spill in Spain. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 44(4), 537–553.
- Lyssenko, N. and R. Martínez-España (2012a). Respondent uncertainty in contingent valuation: The case of whale conservation in Newfoundland and Labrador. *Applied Economics* 44(15), 1911–1930.
- Lyssenko, N. and R. Martínez-España (2012b). ‘Been there done that’: Disentangling option value effects from user heterogeneity when valuing natural resources with a use component. *Environmental Management* 50(5), 819–836.
- Ma, H., H. Liu, Y. Gong, J. Jin, and X. Mao (2015). A comparison of mode effects between face-to-face and drop-off contingent valuation surveys. *China Agricultural Economic Review* 7(3), 510–527.
- Ma, T., Q. Min, K. Xu, and W. Sang (2021). Resident willingness to pay for ecotourism resources and associated factors in Sanjiangyuan National Park, China. *Journal of Resources and Ecology* 12(5), 693–706.
- Madureira, L., L. Nunes, J. Borges, and A. Falcão (2011). Assessing forest management strategies using a contingent valuation approach and advanced visualisation techniques: A Portuguese case study. *Journal of Forest Economics* 17(4), 399–414.
- Magnan, N., A. Seidl, and J. Loomis (2012). Is resident valuation of ranch open space robust in a growing rural community? Evidence from the Rocky Mountains. *Society and Natural Resources* 25(9), 852–867.
- Maharana, I., S. Rai, and E. Sharma (2000a). Environmental economics of the Khangchendzonga National Park in the Sikkim Himalaya, India. *GeoJournal* 50(4), 329–337.
- Maharana, I., S. Rai, and E. Sharma (2000b). Valuing ecotourism in a sacred lake of the Sikkim Himalaya, India. *Environmental Conservation* 27(3), 269–277.
- Mahieu, P.-A., F.-C. Wolff, J. Shogren, and P. Gastineau (2017). Interval bidding in a distribution elicitation format. *Applied Economics* 49(51), 5200–5211.
- Makwinja, R., I. Kosamu, and C. Kaonga (2019). Determinants and values of willingness to pay for water quality improvement: Insights from Chia Lagoon, Malawi. *Sustainability* 11(17).

- Malinauskaite, L., D. Cook, B. Davísdóttir, H. Ögmundardóttir, and J. Roman (2020). Willingness to pay for expansion of the whale sanctuary in fxaflói bay, iceland: A contingent valuation study. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 183.
- Martín-López, B., C. Montes, and J. Benayas (2007a). The non-economic motives behind the willingness to pay for biodiversity conservation. *Biological Conservation* 139, 67–82.
- Martín-López, B., C. Montes, and J. Benayas (2007b). Influence of user characteristics on valuation of ecosystem services in doñana natural protected area (south-west spain). *Environmental Conservation* 34(3), 215–224.
- Martínez-Espiñeira, R. (2007). Adopt a hypothetical pup': A count data approach to the valuation of wildlife. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 37(2), 335–360.
- Martínez-Espiñeira, R. and N. Lyssenko (2011). Correcting for the endogeneity of pro-environment behavioral choices in contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* 70(8), 1435–1439.
- Martínez-Paz, J., J. Albaladejo-García, J. Barreiro-Hurlé, F.-C. Pleite, and A. Perni (2021). Spatial effects in the socioeconomic valuation of peri-urban ecosystems restoration. *Land Use Policy* 105.
- Martínez-Paz, J., I. Banos-González, J. Martínez-Fernández, and M. Esteve-Selma (2019). Assessment of management measures for the conservation of traditional irrigated lands: The case of the huerta of murcia (spain). *Land Use Policy* 81, 382–391.
- Masud, M., A. Al-Amin, R. Akhtar, F. Kari, R. Afroz, M. Rahman, and M. Rahman (2015). Valuing climate protection by offsetting carbon emissions: Rethinking environmental governance. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 89, 41–49.
- Maynard, N., P.-A. Château, L. Ribas-Deulofeu, and J.-L. Liou (2019). Using internet surveys to estimate visitors' willingness to pay for coral reef conservation in the kenting national park, taiwan. *Water* 11(7).
- Mazzocchi, C. and G. Sali (2016). Sustainability and competitiveness of agriculture in mountain areas: A willingness to pay (wtp) approach. *Sustainability* 8(4).
- McDougall, C., N. Hanley, R. Quilliam, K. Needham, and D. Oliver (2020). Valuing inland blue space: A contingent valuation study of two large freshwater lakes. *Science of the Total Environment* 715.
- Metcalfe, P. and W. Baker (2015). The sensitivity of willingness to pay to an economic downturn. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 4(1), 105–121.
- Meyerhoff, J., D. Angeli, and V. Hartje (2012a). Valuing the benefits of implementing a national strategy on biological diversity—the case of germany. *Environmental Science and Policy* 23, 109–119.

- Meyerhoff, J., A. Bartczak, and U. Liebe (2012b). Protester or non-protester: A binary state? on the use (and non-use) of latent class models to analyse protesting in economic valuation. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 56(3), 438–454.
- Meyerhoff, J. and U. Liebe (2008). Do protest responses to a contingent valuation question and a choice experiment differ? *Environmental and Resource Economics* 39(4), 433–446.
- Milovantseva, N. (2016). Are american households willing to pay a premium for greening consumption of information and communication technologies? *Journal of Cleaner Production* 127, 282–288.
- Mjelde, J., H. Kim, T. Kim, and C. Lee (2017). Estimating willingness to pay for the development of a peace park using cvm: The case of the korean demilitarized zone. *Geopolitics* 22(1), 151–175.
- Mohamed, N., M. Shamsudin, A. Ghani, A. Radam, S. Kaffashi, N. Rahim, and N. Bin Hassin (2012). Willingness to pay for watershed conservation at hulu langat, selangor. *Journal of Applied Sciences* 12(17), 1859–1864.
- Mohammed, E. (2009). Measuring the benefits of river quality improvement using the contingent valuation method: The case of the ping river, chiang mai, thailand. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management* 11(3), 349–367.
- Monteiro, J., E. Araújo, E. Amorim, and U. de Albuquerque (2012). Valuation of the aroeira (myracrodruon urundeuva allemão): Perspectives on conservation. *Acta Botanica Brasílica* 26(1), 125–132.
- Morais, M., A. De Araújo, and A. Da Paixão (2014). Environmental valuation of local and external economic benefits of urban tree cover: A case study in brazil. *International Journal of Ecological Economics and Statistics* 33(2), 58–74.
- Morawetz, U. and D. Koemle (2017). Contingent valuation of measures against urban heat: Limitations of a frequently used method. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 143(3).
- Mostafa, M. and M. Al-Hamdi (2016). Kuwaiti consumers' willingness to pay for environmental protection in failaka island: a contingent valuation analysis. *Tourism Review* 71(3), 219–233.
- Mourato, S., B. Saynor, and D. Hart (2004). Greening london's black cabs: A study of driver's preferences for fuel cell taxis. *Energy Policy* 32(5), 685–695.
- Muchapondwa, E., F. Carlsson, and G. Köhlin (2008). Wildlife management in zimbabwe: Evidence from a contingent valuation study. *South African Journal of Economics* 76(4), 685–704.

- Muhammad, I., M. Shabbir, S. Saleem, K. Bilal, and R. Ulucak (2021). Nexus between willingness to pay for renewable energy sources: evidence from turkey. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 28(3), 2972–2986.
- Muñoz-Pizza, D., M. Villada-Canela, P. Rivera-Castañeda, M. Reyna-Carranza, A. Osornio-Vargas, and A. Martínez-Cruz (2020). Stated benefits from air quality improvement through urban afforestation in an arid city – a contingent valuation in mexicali, baja california, mexico. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 55.
- Musa, F., N. Fozi, and D. Hamdan (2020). Coastal communities’ willingness to pay for mangrove ecotourism in marudu bay, sabah, malaysia. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management* 15(4), 130–140.
- Mwebaze, P., G. Marris, M. Brown, A. MacLeod, G. Jones, and G. Budge (2018). Measuring public perception and preferences for ecosystem services: A case study of bee pollination in the uk. *Land Use Policy* 71, 355–362.
- Nallathiga, R. and R. Paravasthu (2010). Economic value of conserving river water quality: Results from a contingent valuation survey in yamuna river basin, india. *Water Policy* 12(2), 260–271.
- Nastis, S. and K. Mattas (2018). Income elasticity of willingness-to-pay for a carbon tax in greece. *International Journal of Global Warming* 14(4), 510–524.
- Ndambiri, H., E. Mungatana, and R. Brouwer (2017). Scope effects of respondent uncertainty in contingent valuation: evidence from motorized emission reductions in the city of nairobi, kenya. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 60(1), 22–46.
- Ndebele, T. and V. 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.
- Nielsen-Pincus, M., P. Sussman, D. Bennett, H. Gosnell, and R. Parker (2017). The influence of place on the willingness to pay for ecosystem services. *Society and Natural Resources* 30(12), 1423–1441.
- Nieminen, E., H. Ahtiainen, C.-J. Lagerkvist, and S. Oinonen (2019). The economic benefits of achieving good environmental status in the finnish marine waters of the baltic sea. *Marine Policy* 99, 181–189.
- Ning, J., J. Jin, F. Kuang, X. Wan, C. Zhang, and T. Guan (2019). The valuation of grassland ecosystem services in inner mongolia of china and its spatial differences. *Sustainability* 11(24).
- Ning, P. and S.-H. Lee (2019). Estimating the young generation’s willingness to pay (wtp) for pm2.5 control in daegu, korea, and beijing, china. *Sustainability* 11(20).

- Nishizawa, E., T. Kurokawa, and M. Yabe (2006). Policies and resident's willingness to pay for restoring the ecosystem damaged by alien fish in lake biwa, japan. *Environmental Science and Policy* 9(5), 448–456.
- Noring, M., L. Hasselström, C. Håkansson, Å. Soutukorva, and Å. Gren (2016). Valuation of oil spill risk reductions in the arctic. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 5(3), 298–317.
- Novikova, A., L. Rocchi, and B. Vaznonis (2019). Valuing agricultural landscape: Lithuanian case study using a contingent valuation method. *Sustainability* 11(9).
- Nurin Fadhlin, M., N. Matthew, and A. Shuib (2021). Visitors' willingness to pay for entrance fee at puncak janing forest eco-park, kedah, malaysia. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science* 33(1), 49–57.
- O'Connor, E., S. Hynes, and W. Chen (2020). Estimating the non-market benefit value of deep-sea ecosystem restoration: Evidence from a contingent valuation study of the dohrn canyon in the bay of naples. *Journal of Environmental Management* 275.
- Ofori, R. and M. Rouleau (2020). Willingness to pay for invasive seaweed management: Understanding how high and low income households differ in ghana. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 192.
- O'Garra, T. and S. Mourato (2007). Public preferences for hydrogen buses: Comparing interval data, ols and quantile regression approaches. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 36(4), 389–411.
- O'Garra, T., S. Mourato, L. Garrity, P. Schmidt, A. Beerenwinkel, M. Altmann, D. Hart, C. Graesel, and S. Whitehouse (2007). Is the public willing to pay for hydrogen buses? a comparative study of preferences in four cities. *Energy Policy* 35(7), 3630–3642.
- Oh, C.-O., S. Lee, and H. Kim (2019). Economic valuation of conservation of inholdings in protected areas for the institution of payments for ecosystem services. *Forests* 10(12), 1–16.
- Östberg, K., L. Hasselström, and C. Håkansson (2012). Non-market valuation of the coastal environment - uniting political aims, ecological and economic knowledge. *Journal of Environmental Management* 110, 166–178.
- Pakhtigian, E. and M. Jeuland (2019). Valuing the environmental costs of local development: Evidence from households in western nepal. *Ecological Economics* 158, 158–167.
- Palanca-Tan, R. (2020). Willingness to pay of urban households for the conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage in a neighboring rural area: A cvm study. *Philippine Journal of Science* 149(2), 363–373.
- Park, S. and I. Chang (2019). Estimation of total benefits of battery-swapping electric bus systems using a contingent valuation method. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*.

- Park, S.-Y., S.-H. Yoo, and S.-J. Kwak (2013). The conservation value of the shinan tidal flat in korea: A contingent valuation study. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 20(1), 54–62.
- Peixer, J., H. Giacomini, and M. Petrere Jr. (2011). Economic valuation of the emas waterfall, mogi-guaçu river, sp, brazil. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias* 83(4), 1287–1301.
- Pemberton, C., E. Harris-Charles, and H. Patterson-Andrews (2010). Cultural bias in contingent valuation of copper mining in the commonwealth of dominica. *Ecological Economics* 70(1), 19–23.
- Perni, A., F. Martínez-Carrasco, and J. Martínez-Paz (2011). Economic valuation of coastal lagoon environmental restoration: Mar menor (se spain). *Ciencias Marinas* 37(2), 175–190.
- Petrolia, D. and T.-G. Kim (2009). What are barrier islands worth? estimates of willingness to pay for restoration. *Marine Resource Economics* 24(2), 131–146.
- Petrolia, D. and T.-G. Kim (2011). Preventing land loss in coastal louisiana: Estimates of wtp and wta. *Journal of Environmental Management* 92(3), 859–865.
- Petrolia, D., R. Moore, and T.-G. Kim (2011). Preferences for timing of wetland loss prevention in louisiana. *Wetlands* 31(2), 295–307.
- Pham, T., N. Kaida, K. Yoshino, X. Nguyen, H. Nguyen, and D. Bui (2018). Willingness to pay for mangrove restoration in the context of climate change in the cat ba biosphere reserve, vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 163, 269–277.
- Pinto, R., R. Brouwer, J. Patrício, P. Abreu, C. Marta-Pedroso, A. Baeta, J. Franco, T. Domingos, and J. Marques (2016). Valuing the non-market benefits of estuarine ecosystem services in a river basin context: Testing sensitivity to scope and scale. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 169, 95–105.
- Piriapada, S. and E. Wang (2014). Quantifying the costs and benefits of coastal water quality improvements in the ko chang marine national park, thailand. *Environmental Processes* 1(2), 149–169.
- Poder, T. and J. He (2017). Willingness to pay for a cleaner car: The case of car pollution in quebec and france. *Energy* 130, 48–54.
- Polyzos, S. and D. Minetos (2007). Valuing environmental resources in the context of flood and coastal defence project appraisal: A case-study of poole borough council seafront in the uk. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* 18(6), 684–710.

- Ponce, R., F. Vásquez, A. Stehr, P. Debels, and C. 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.
- Pouta, E., M. Rekola, J. Kuuluvainen, C.-Z. Li, and O. Tahvonen (2002). Willingness to pay in different policy-planning methods: Insights into respondents' decision-making processes. *Ecological Economics* 40(2), 295–311.
- Pu, S., Z. Shao, L. Yang, R. Liu, J. Bi, and Z. Ma (2019). How much will the chinese public pay for air pollution mitigation? a nationwide empirical study based on a willingness-to-pay scenario and air purifier costs. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 218, 51–60.
- Pérez-Sánchez, D., M. Montes, C. Cardona-Almeida, L. Vargas-Marín, T. Enríquez-Acevedo, and A. Suarez (2021). Keeping people in the loop: Socioeconomic valuation of dry forest ecosystem services in the colombian caribbean region. *Journal of Arid Environments* 188.
- Rakthai, S. (2018). Willingness to pay for biological diversity conservation of the lower mekong river basin in thailand: A contingent valuation study. *Songklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology* 40(3), 570–576.
- Ramos, P., L. Pinto, C. Chaves, and N. Formigo (2019). Surf as a driver for sustainable coastal preservation – an application of the contingent valuation method in portugal. *Human Ecology* 47(5), 705–715.
- Ready, R., J. Malzubris, and S. Senkane (2002). The relationship between environmental values and income in a transition economy: Surface water quality in latvia. *Environment and Development Economics* 7(1), 147–156.
- Rekola, M. and E. Pouta (2005). Public preferences for uncertain regeneration cuttings: A contingent valuation experiment involving finnish private forests. *Forest Policy and Economics* 7(4), 635–649.
- Rekola, M., E. Pouta, J. Kuuluvainen, O. Tahvonen, and C.-Z. Li (2000). Incommensurable preferences in contingent valuation: The case of natura 2000 network in finland. *Environmental Conservation* 27(3), 260–268.
- Resende, F., G. Fernandes, D. Andrade, and H. 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.
- Ressurreição, A., J. Gibbons, T. Dentinho, M. Kaiser, R. Santos, and G. Edwards-Jones (2011). Economic valuation of species loss in the open sea. *Ecological Economics* 70(4), 729–739.

- Ressurreição, A., J. Gibbons, M. Kaiser, T. Dentinho, T. Zarzycki, C. Bentley, M. Austen, D. Burdon, J. Atkins, R. Santos, and G. Edwards-Jones (2012). Different cultures, different values: The role of cultural variation in public's wtp for marine species conservation. *Biological Conservation* 145(1), 148–159.
- Ressurreição, A., T. Zarzycki, M. Kaiser, G. Edwards-Jones, T. Dentinho, R. Santos, and J. Gibbons (2012). Towards an ecosystem approach for understanding public values concerning marine biodiversity loss. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 467, 15–28.
- Rhodes, R., J. Whitehead, T. Smith, and M. Denson (2018). A benefit-cost analysis of a red drum stock enhancement program in south carolina. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* 9(2), 323–341.
- Rodella, I., F. Madau, M. Mazzanti, C. Corbau, D. Carboni, K. Utizi, and U. Simeoni (2019). Willingness to pay for management and preservation of natural, semi-urban and urban beaches in italy. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 172, 93–104.
- Roomratanapun, W. (2001). Introducing centralised wastewater treatment in bangkok: A study of factors determining its acceptability. *Habitat International* 25(3), 359–371.
- Sabyrbekov, R., M. Dallimer, and S. Navrud (2020). Nature affinity and willingness to pay for urban green spaces in a developing country. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 194.
- Saengsupavanich, C., U. Seenprachawong, W. Gallardo, and G. Shivakoti (2008). Port-induced erosion prediction and valuation of a local recreational beach. *Ecological Economics* 67(1), 93–103.
- Sale, M., S. Hosking, and M. Du Preez (2009). Application of the contingent valuation method to estimate a recreational value for the freshwater inflows into the kowie and the kromme estuaries. *Water SA* 35(3), 261–270.
- Schiappacasse, I., L. Nahuelhual, F. Vásquez, and C. Echeverría (2012). Assessing the benefits and costs of dryland forest restoration in central chile. *Journal of Environmental Management* 97(1), 38–45.
- Schiappacasse, I., F. Vásquez, L. Nahuelhual, and C. Echeverría (2013). Labor as a welfare measure in contingent valuation: The value of a forest restoration project. *Ciencia e Investigacion Agraria* 40(1), 69–84.
- Schläpfer, F. and M. Getzner (2020). Beyond current guidelines: A proposal for bringing behavioral economics to the design and analysis of stated preference surveys. *Ecological Economics* 176.
- Schläpfer, F., A. Roschewitz, and N. Hanley (2004). Validation of stated preferences for public goods: A comparison of contingent valuation survey response and voting behaviour. *Ecological Economics* 51, 1–16.

- Shaari, N. F., A. S. Abdul-Rahim, and S. H. M. Afandi (2020). Are malaysian airline passengers willing to pay to offset carbon emissions? *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 27(19), 24242–24252.
- Shah, S. A., D. L. K. Hoag, and S. Davies (2016). Household preferences and willingness to pay (wtp) for freshwater quality improvement in pakistan's swat river valley. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 18(4), 1081–1093.
- Shang, Z., Y. Che, K. Yang, and Y. Jiang (2012). Assessing local communities' willingness to pay for river network protection: A contingent valuation study of shanghai, china. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 9(11), 3866–3882.
- Shu, L. (2018). Games between stakeholders and the payment for ecological services: Evidence from the wuxijiang river reservoir area in china. *PeerJ* 2018(3).
- Sinha, B. and S. Mishra (2015). Ecosystem services valuation for enhancing conservation and livelihoods in a sacred landscape of the indian himalayas. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services and Management* 11(2), 156–167.
- Soliño, M., M. X. Vázquez, and A. Prada (2009). Social demand for electricity from forest biomass in spain: Does payment periodicity affect the willingness to pay? *Energy Policy* 37(2), 531–540.
- Solomon, B. D. and N. H. Johnson (2009). Valuing climate protection through willingness to pay for biomass ethanol. *Ecological Economics* 68(7), 2137–2144.
- Srisawasdi, W., T. W. Tsusaka, E. Winijkul, and N. Sasaki (2021). Valuation of local demand for improved air quality: The case of the mae moh coal mine site in thailand. *Atmosphere* 12(9).
- Stanley, D. L. (2005). Local perception of public goods: Recent assessments of willingness-to-pay for endangered species. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 23(2), 165–179.
- Stevens, T. H., R. Belkner, D. Dennis, D. Kittredge, and C. Willis (2000). Comparison of contingent valuation and conjoint analysis in ecosystem management. *Ecological Economics* 32(1), 63–74.
- Stoll, J. R., R. B. Ditton, and T. L. Eubanks (2006). Platte river birding and the spring migration: Humans, value, and unique ecological resources. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 11(4), 241–254.
- Subade, R. F. and H. A. Francisco (2014). Do non-users value coral reefs?: Economic valuation of conserving tubbataha reefs, philippines. *Ecological Economics* 102, 24–32.
- Sun, C., X. Yuan, and M. Xu (2016a). The public perceptions and willingness to pay: From the perspective of the smog crisis in china. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 112, 1635–1644.

- Sun, C., X. Yuan, and X. Yao (2016b). Social acceptance towards the air pollution in china: Evidence from public's willingness to pay for smog mitigation. *Energy Policy* 92, 313–324.
- Tan, J. and J. Zhao (2014). The value of clean air in china: Evidence from beijing and shanghai. *Frontiers of Economics in China* 9(1), 109–137.
- Tello, D. S., J. D. De Prada, and E. R. Cristeche (2018). Economic valuation of the calden (prosopis caldenia burkart) forest in the south of córdoba, argentina. *Revista Chapingo, Serie Ciencias Forestales y del Ambiente* 24(3), 297–312.
- Thormann, T. F. and P. Wicker (2021). Willingness-to-pay for environmental measures in non-profit sport clubs. *Sustainability* 13(5), 1–18.
- Tilahun, M., L. Vranken, B. Muys, J. Deckers, K. Gebregziabher, K. Gebrehiwot, H. Bauer, and E. Mathijs (2015). Rural households' demand for frankincense forest conservation in tigray, ethiopia: A contingent valuation analysis. *Land Degradation and Development* 26(7), 642–653.
- Toivonen, A.-L., E. Roth, S. Navrud, G. Gudbergsson, H. Appelblad, B. Bengtsson, and P. Tuunainen (2004). The economic value of recreational fisheries in nordic countries. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 11(1), 1–14.
- Tolunay, A. and C. Bas,ş  ull  u (2015). Willingness to pay for carbon sequestration and co-benefits of forests in turkey. *Sustainability* 7(3), 3311–3337.
- Tonin, S. (2019). Estimating the benefits of restoration and preservation scenarios of marine biodiversity: An application of the contingent valuation method. *Environmental Science and Policy* 100, 172–182.
- Tran, Y., J. Siry, J. Bowker, and N. Poudyal (2017). Atlanta households' willingness to increase urban forests to mitigate climate change. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 22, 84–92.
- Treiman, T. and J. Gartner (2006). Are residents willing to pay for their community forests? results of a contingent valuation survey in missouri, usa. *Urban Studies* 43(9), 1537–1548.
- Trung, H., T. Nguyen, and M. Simioni (2020). Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in xuan thuy national park, vietnam: do household knowledge and interest play a role? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 9(4), 402–420.
- Tseng, W., S.-H. Hsu, and C.-C. Chen (2015). Estimating the willingness to pay to protect coral reefs from potential damage caused by climate change—the evidence from taiwan. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 101(2), 556–565.

- Tuan, T., N. My, L. Anh, and N. Toan (2014). Using contingent valuation method to estimate the wtp for mangrove restoration under the context of climate change: A case study of thi nai lagoon, quy nhon city, vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 95, 198–212.
- Turpie, J. (2003). The existence value of biodiversity in south africa: How interest, experience, knowledge, income and perceived level of threat influence local willingness to pay. *Ecological Economics* 46(2), 199–216.
- Tziakis, I., I. Pachiadakis, M. Moraitakis, K. Xideas, G. Theologis, and K. Tsagarakis (2009). Valuing benefits from wastewater treatment and reuse using contingent valuation methodology. *Desalination* 237, –.
- Uehara, T., T. Tsuge, and T. Ota (2018). Long-term evolution of preferences for conservation projects in the seto inland sea, japan: A comprehensive analytic framework. *PeerJ* 2018(7), –.
- Ureta, J., R. Lasco, A. Sajise, and M. Calderon (2014). Oroquieta city households' willingness to pay for coastal biodiversity conservation. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 7(5), 82–92.
- Van Oijstaeijen, W., S. Van Passel, J. Cools, L. Janssens de Bisthoven, J. Hugé, D. Berihun, N. Ejigu, and J. Nyssen (2020). Farmers' preferences towards water hyacinth control: A contingent valuation study. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 46(5), 1459–1468.
- Van W., Yisheng Z., Q. W. and W. W. (2007). Residents' willingness to pay for improving air quality in jinan, china. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment* 5(2), 12–19.
- Vargas, A. and D. Díaz (2014). Community-based conservation programs and local people willingness to pay for wildlife protection: The case of the cotton-top tamarin in the colombian caribbean. *Lecturas de Economía*, 187–206.
- Vásquez, W. and C. de Rezende (2019). Willingness to pay for the restoration of the paraíba do sul river: A contingent valuation study from brazil. *Ecohydrology and Hydrobiology* 19(4), 610–619.
- Vásquez-Lavín, F., V. Ibarnegaray, R. Ponce Oliva, and J. Hernández Hernández (2016). Payment for ecosystem services in the bolivian sub-andean humid forest. *Journal of Environment and Development* 25(3), 306–331.
- Vaughan, W., C. Russell, D. Rodriguez, and A. Darling (2000). Uncertainty in cost-benefit analysis based on referendum contingent valuation. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 18(2), 125–137.
- Veisten, K., H. Fredrik Hoen, S. Navrud, and J. Strand (2004). Scope insensitivity in contingent valuation of complex environmental amenities. *Journal of Environmental Management* 73(4), 317–331.

- Verbič, M. and R. Slabe-Erker (2009). An econometric analysis of willingness-to-pay for sustainable development: A case study of the volčji potok landscape area. *Ecological Economics* 68(5), 1316–1328.
- Verbič, M., R. Slabe-Erker, and M. Klun (2016). Contingent valuation of urban public space: A case study of ljubljana riverbanks. *Land Use Policy* 56, 58–67.
- Vesely, E.-T. (2007). Green for green: The perceived value of a quantitative change in the urban tree estate of new zealand. *Ecological Economics* 63.
- Vieira, I., J. Oliveira, K. Santos, G. Silva, F. Vieira, and R. Barros (2016). A contingent valuation study of buriti (*mauritia flexuosa* l.f.) in the main region of production in brazil: Is environmental conservation a collective responsibility? *Acta Botanica Brasilica* 30(4), 532–539.
- Voltaire, L., H. Donfouet, C. Pirrone, and A. Larzilli'ere (2017). Respondent uncertainty and ordering effect on willingness to pay for salt marsh conservation in the brest roadstead (france). *Ecological Economics* 137, 47–55.
- Wang, G., Y. Song, J. Chen, and J. Yu (2016). Valuation of haze management and prevention using the contingent valuation method with the sure independence screening algorithm. *Sustainability* 8(4).
- Wang, H. and J. He (2018). Implicit individual discount rate in china: A contingent valuation study. *Journal of Environmental Management* 210, 51–70.
- Wang, H., J. He, and D. Huang (2020). Public distrust and valuation biases: Identification and calibration with contingent valuation studies of two air quality improvement programs in china. *China Economic Review* 61.
- Wang, H., Y. He, Y. Kim, and T. Kamata (2013a). Willingness-to-pay for water quality improvements in chinese rivers: An empirical test on the ordering effects of multiple-bounded discrete choices. *Journal of Environmental Management* 131, 256–269.
- Wang, H., Y. Shi, Y. Kim, and T. Kamata (2013b). Valuing water quality improvement in china: A case study of lake puzhehei in yunnan province. *Ecological Economics* 94, 56–65.
- Wang, P., J. Ya, L. Zhong, and R. Mei (2016). Respondent uncertainty and reliability in contingent valuation-a case of the dalai lake protected area. *Limnologica* 58, 59–68.
- Wang, X., W. Zhang, Y. Li, K. Yang, and M. Bai (2006). Air quality improvement estimation and assessment using contingent valuation method, a case study in beijing. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 120.
- Wang, Y. and Y.-S. Zhang (2009). Air quality assessment by contingent valuation in ji'nan, china. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90(2), 1022–1029.

- Wang, Z., Y. Gong, and X. Mao (2018). Exploring the value of overseas biodiversity to chinese netizens based on willingness to pay for the african elephants' protection. *Science of the Total Environment*, 600–608.
- Whitehead, J. (2005). Combining willingness to pay and behavior data with limited information. *Resource and Energy Economics* 27(2), 143–155.
- Wilson, J., V. Lantz, and D. MacLean (2010). A benefit-cost analysis of establishing protected natural areas in new brunswick, canada. *Forest Policy and Economics* 12(2), 94–103.
- Wilson, J., V. Lantz, and D. MacLean (2012). The social benefits of increasing protected natural areas: An eastern canadian case study using the contingent valuation method. *Forestry* 85(4), 531–538.
- Wilson, K., K. Davis, V. Matzek, and M. Kragt (2019). Concern about threatened species and ecosystem disservices underpin public willingness to pay for ecological restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 27(3), 513–519.
- Windén, M., E. Jamelske, and E. Tvinnereim (2018). A contingent valuation study comparing citizen's willingness-to-pay for climate change mitigation in china and the united states. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 20(2), 451–475.
- Wu, X., J. Guo, G. Wei, and Y. Zou (2020). Economic losses and willingness to pay for haze: the data analysis based on 1123 residential families in jiangsu province, china. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 27(15), 17864–17877.
- Xiao, J., M. Wang, and X. Gao (2020). Valuing tourists' willingness to pay for conserving the non-use values of marine tourism resources: a comparison of three archipelagic tourism destinations in china. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 29(4), 678–710.
- Xu, F., Y. Wang, N. Xiang, J. Tian, and L. Chen (2020). Uncovering the willingness-to-pay for urban green space conservation: A survey of the capital area in china. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 162.
- Xu, Z. and J. Shan (2018). The effect of risk perception on willingness to pay for reductions in the health risks posed by particulate matter 2.5: A case study of beijing, china. *Energy and Environment* 29(8), 1319–1337.
- Yaacovi, Y., A. Gasith, and N. Becker (2021). How much is an urban stream worth? using land senses and economic assessment of an urban stream restoration. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 28(7), 602–611.
- Yang, F., L. Ding, C. Liu, L. Xu, S. Nicholas, and J. Wang (2018a). Haze attitudes and the willingness to pay for haze improvement: Evidence from four cities in shandong province, china. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 15(10).

- Yang, J., L. Zou, T. Lin, Y. Wu, and H. Wang (2014). Public willingness to pay for co2 mitigation and the determinants under climate change: A case study of suzhou, china. *Journal of Environmental Management* 146, 1–8.
- Yang, X., L. Cheng, C. Yin, P. Lebailly, and H. Azadi (2018b). Urban residents' willingness to pay for corn straw burning ban in henan, china: Application of payment card. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 193, 471–478.
- Yi, S. (2019). Willingness-to-pay for sustainable aquaculture products: Evidence from korean red seabream aquaculture. *Sustainability* 11(6).
- Yi, S. and S. Kim (2020). Economic value of coastal environment improvement programs in aquaculture zones in south korea. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 195.
- Yoo, S.-H. and S.-J. Kwak (2009). Measuring the economic benefits of protecting the tong river in korea: A contingent valuation study. *International Journal of Environment and Pollution* 39.
- Yoo, S.-H., S.-J. Kwak, and T.-Y. Kim (2001). Modelling willingness to pay responses from dichotomous choice contingent valuation surveys with zero observations. *Applied Economics* 33(4), 523–529.
- Yoskowitz, D. and P. Montagna (2009). Socio-economic factors that impact the desire to protect freshwater flow in the rio grande, usa. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment* 122, 547–558.
- Yu, B., Y. Cai, L. Jin, and B. Du (2018). Effects on willingness to pay for marine conservation: Evidence from zhejiang province, china. *Sustainability* 10(7).
- Zambrano-Monserrate, M. (2020). The economic value of the andean condor: The national symbol of south america. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 54.
- Zander, K., G. Ainsworth, J. Meyerhoff, and S. Garnett (2014). Threatened bird valuation in australia. *PLoS ONE* 9(6).
- Zeybrandt, F. and J. Barnes (2001). Economic characteristics of demand in namibia's marine recreational shore fishery. *South African Journal of Marine Science*, 145–156.
- Zhang, X., Z. Ni, Y. Wang, S. Chen, and B. Xia (2020). Public perception and preferences of small urban green infrastructures: A case study in guangzhou, china. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 53.
- Zhao, J., Q. Liu, L. Lin, H. Lv, and Y. Wang (2013). Assessing the comprehensive restoration of an urban river: An integrated application of contingent valuation in shanghai, china. *Science of the Total Environment*, 517–526.
- Zhongmin, X., C. Guodong, Z. Zhiqiang, S. Zhiyong, and J. Loomis (2003). Applying contingent valuation in china to measure the total economic value of restoring ecosystem services in ejina region. *Ecological Economics* 44.

Šebo, J., M. Gróf, and M. Šebová (2019). A contingent valuation study of a polluted urban lake in košice, slovakia: The case of the positive distance effect. *Journal of Environmental Management* 243, 331–339.