

Index

- acceptability of stated preference
 methods 3, 35, 36, 91–4, 95–6, 171, 173
- affordability 80–81, 82–3, 106
- air quality 140, 141
- Ajzen (1991) 59
- Aldred and Jacobs (2000) 156, 157, 158, 166
- Álvarez-Farizo and Hanley (2006) 164–5
- analysis of results 45–6, 112–14
- Arrow (1986) 29, 79
- Arrow and Fisher (1974) 22
- articulated values philosophy 123
- attitudes 46–7, 137
- Baron and Greene (1996) 85
- basic values philosophy 123
- Bateman *et al.* (2001) 63, 67, 81
- behavioural psychology
 constructed preferences 121, 124, 125
 and group-based approach 130
 interpretation of responses 55–7, 69
 and scope sensitivity 98, 101–3
 and stated preference methods 136–7
- benchmarks 137, 144
- benefit transfer 136
- Berg (1995) 45
- best practice 129
- bias 112–13
- biodiversity 140–43
- Blamey (1998)
 communal scenarios 150, 155
 details of study 62, 67, 80
 interpretation of responses 55, 59, 68, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 84, 86, 87, 89
 reaction to survey 93
 scope sensitivity 103, 105
- Blamey *et al.* (1995, 1999) 62, 67, 80, 154
- brochures 68
- Brouwer *et al.* (1999) 37, 63, 67, 81, 131
- Brown *et al.* (1995) 156, 157
- Burgess *et al.* (1998, 2000) 62, 66, 68, 71, 76, 78, 80, 105, 128
- Cameron (1997) 62, 66, 68, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 86, 87, 91, 93, 155
- Carson and Mitchell (1995) 98, 100, 113
- Carson *et al.* (1992) 32
- charity like comments 80–81, 85–6, 95, 103, 109, 111, 142
- Chess and Purcell (1999) 14, 15
- Chilton and Hutchinson (1999, 2003) 72, 103, 105, 106, 111, 122
- choice cards 25, 27, 114, 163
- choice experiments (CE)
 and context 114
 environmental projects 172
 methodology 24–5, 27
 use of 1, 19
 and valuation workshops 164–5
 see also stated preference methods
- citizen preferences 153–5, 164–5, 170
- citizens' commission 126, 127–8, 130, 159–61
- citizens' juries
 case studies 161–5
 communal scenarios 175
 consensus in public consultation 36, 152, 155–8
 vs. contingent valuation (CV) 163–4
 methodology 16
 problems of 165
 and social willingness to pay (SWTP) 159–61
 and trust 158, 166
- Clark *et al.* (2000)
 details of study 62, 66, 80
 interpretation of responses 68, 69, 74, 75, 79, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89
 reaction to survey 91

- scope sensitivity 109–10
- cognitive ability
 - group-based approach 119, 173–4
 - and insensitivity 101–2
 - of respondents 2, 54, 55–7, 122–4, 162, 169–70, 171
 - and valuations 113
- collective goods 20, 59, 149–51
- communal scenarios
 - economic approach 149–51
 - group-based approach 119, 174, 175
 - interpretation of responses 54, 55, 58–61
 - respondents' problems with 2–3, 169, 170, 171
 - scope sensitivity 102–3
- community participation 152
- community preferences 153–5, 164–5, 170
- complementary schemes 83–5
- complexity, and extrapolation 143–6
- composition problem 12
- conditional co-operators 59
- consensus in public consultation 36, 152, 155–8, 159
- consent-based approach 152, 175
- constructed preferences
 - group-based approach 128
 - insensitivity of 101
 - interpretation of responses 69, 94
 - questionnaire design 72
 - respondent abilities 123–4, 169–70
 - and unfamiliarity 121
 - variance 55–6, 115, 124–6
- consumer preferences 153–5, 164–5, 170
- context
 - and benchmarks 137
 - and choice experiments (CE) 114
 - and preferences 125
 - sensitivity 55, 57, 60, 107–10
 - social 70
 - of valuations 113
- contingent valuation (CV)
 - vs. citizens' juries 163–4
 - and fair share 88
 - and guesswork 88
 - invariance 56–7
 - methodology 23–4
 - planned behaviour, theory of 59
 - public reaction 91–3, 95–6
 - respondent abilities 123
 - revealed preferences 126
 - scope sensitivity 98–9
 - second bound 76–7
 - transaction rules 29
 - use of 1, 19
 - see also* stated preference methods
- contribution (moral satisfaction) 85, 111
- Coombs (1964) 115
- cooperation 129, 150
- cooperative norms 59
- cost-benefit analysis (CBA)
 - communal scenarios 175
 - vs. consent-based approach 152
- cost information 69, 76
- criticisms 151
 - and total economic value (TEV) 21–3
 - use of 17, 176
 - and valuations 98, 153, 155, 169, 173
 - and willingness to pay (WTP) 160
- costs 69, 76–9
- Cummings and Taylor (1999) 82
- Cummings *et al.* (1986) 126
- Davies (1999) 15
- De Jong and Schellens (1998) 34
- Delphi method 36
- denial of responsibility 66–7
- design of surveys 112–14
- dominant participants 133, 157, 162
- Dryzek (1990, 2000) 151, 156
- economic approach
 - and collective goods 149–51
 - experimental economics 58–9, 129, 149–50
 - and group-based approach 130
 - and hypothetical transactions 57–9, 169–70
 - scope sensitivity 98, 99–101, 102
- environmental goods 12–13, 172
- equity 151–2
- estuary improvement plan 162–3
- ethics 12–13, 61
- existence value 22
- experimental economics 58–9, 129, 149–50
- expertise 13–14, 93, 140, 141, 146
- extrapolation from other valuations 136–46, 147

- fair share 80–81, 88–90, 95, 155
 financial commitment 159–60
 financial position of respondents 151–2, 159
 Fischhoff (1991) 123
 Fischhoff (1997) 122, 126, 127, 129, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139
 Fischhoff and Furby (1988) 26, 64
 Fischhoff *et al.* (1978) 113–14
 Fischhoff *et al.* (1993) 28, 34, 62, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 80, 82, 101, 104, 105, 115
 Fischhoff *et al.* (1999) 34, 62, 63, 65, 66, 70, 71, 80, 81, 103
 focus groups
 design 36–9, 172
 implementation 43–4
 overview 15, 32–3
 purpose 35–6, 57
 questions 41–2
 results 45–6
 structure 40–41
 see also group interviews; group-based approach
 follow-up interviews 130
 forest floodplain restoration 163–4
 free riders 12
 Frey (1997) 153
 functional transparency 11

 Garrod and Willis (1997) 144–6
 Germany, citizens' juries 16
 goods *see* collective goods; scope sensitivity
 Green and Tunstall (1999) 113
 Gregory and Slovic (1997) 138
 Gregory and Wellman (2001) 139, 162–3
 Gregory *et al.* (1993) 56, 124–5, 126, 136, 137, 138–9, 143, 145, 162
 group interviews 32–3, 34–5, 43, 68, 82, 95, 107–10
 see also focus groups
 group-based approach
 advantages of 121, 146–7
 citizens' commission 126, 127–8, 130
 and cognitive ability 119, 173–4
 communal scenarios 119, 174, 175
 composition of group 129
 extrapolation from other valuations 136–46, 147
 hypothetical transactions 174
 and information 128
 market stall approach 133–6
 post-questionnaire surveys 41, 131–3
 preference construction 126, 128
 problems of 175
 proposed method 127–30
 recording discussions 43
 representative groups 165, 175
 respondents attitudes to 131
 uses 4
 see also focus groups
 guessed values 80–81, 88

 Habermas (1984) 151
 Hanley *et al.* (2002) 143, 146
 hedonic pricing 19
 Hoehn (1991) 108
 holistic scenario 138–9
 Howarth and Wilson (2006) 151, 152, 155, 156, 159
 hypothetical elicitation mechanism 29–30
 hypothetical transactions
 economic approach 57–9, 169–70
 group-based approach 174
 interpretation of responses 54, 55, 57–8
 respondents' problems with 2, 169–70, 171
 scope sensitivity 102

 imperfect information 11
 independence of respondents 128–9, 133, 157
 in-depth meetings 15, 32, 33
 individual interviews 33–5, 68, 121, 146, 171
 individual preferences 21, 25, 153–5, 159, 164–5, 170
 individuality of respondents 128–9, 133, 157
 indivisible goods 12, 20
 information
 effect of additional 134–5
 group-based approach 128
 misconstrual 66–7, 70–72, 101–2, 103–5, 116
 respondent requirements 65–72, 135
 informed consent 126

- insensitivity to scope 98, 101–3
see also scope sensitivity
- interpretation of responses
 framework 53–61
 hypothetical transactions 54, 55, 57–8
 information provided 65–72
 methodology 61–4
 motivation 79–90, 95
 payment responsibility 66–7, 72–5, 95
 payment vehicle 58–61, 171, 173
 presentation 65–72, 94–5
 strategies 79–90, 95
 trust 66–7, 75–9
- interviews
 follow-up 130
 group 32–3, 34–5, 43, 68, 82, 95,
 107–10
 individual 33–5, 68, 121, 146, 171
 respondents attitudes to 131
- invariance 55, 56–7, 124–6
- Jacobs (1997) 153, 154, 155
 James and Blamey (2005) 160–62, 165
 Johnston *et al.* (1995) 35
 ‘judgement by prototype’ behaviour 60,
 102–3
- Kahneman (1986) 29, 79, 123
 Kahneman and Knetsch (1992) 98, 108
 Kahneman *et al.* (1999) 98, 114, 115,
 125, 136–8, 139, 143, 145
 Kaplowitz and Hoehn (2001) 34
 Kealy *et al.* (1990) 130
 Kenyon and Hanley (2005) 163–4
 Kenyon *et al.* (2001) 152
 Kreuger and Casey (2000) 36, 37, 45
 Krueger (1994) 15, 32, 33, 113
 Krutilla (1967) 22
 Kwak *et al.* (2001) 139
- Larson (1993) 22
 Lazo *et al.* (1992) 72, 122
 lexicographic approach 56, 60–61, 125
 Lienhoop and Macmillan (2007) 135–6
 Likert scale 47
 Lockwood (1998) 61
 Loomis *et al.* (1993) 113
- Macmillan *et al.* (2002, 2006) 129, 130,
 134, 135
- made up values 80–81, 88
 manipulation checks 70
 market failure 1
 market stall approach 130, 133–6
 market transactions 26
 McDaniels *et al.* (2003) 135
 Merton *et al.* (1990) 40, 41
 misconstrual of information 66–7, 70–72,
 101–2, 103–5, 116
 moderators 39, 43–4
 moral satisfaction 85, 111
 Morgan (1997) 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40,
 45–6, 128
 Morgan and Krueger (1993) 35
 Morgan and Spanish (1985) 41
 motivation, of respondents 57–8, 79–90,
 95, 105–11, 171, 173
 multi-attribute utility approach 138–9,
 162–3
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric
 Administration (NOAA) 17, 23, 99,
 176
 national park management 161–2
 Neill (1995) 113
 New South Wales (Australia) 161–2
 Niemeyer and Spash (2001) 176
 non-excludable goods 12, 20
 non-market goods 1
 non-rival goods 12, 20
 non-use benefits 21–2, 23
 norm-activation model 59, 75, 150
 norms 55, 59–60, 102, 150–51
- O’Neill (1997) 12
 opportunity cost 21, 80–81, 83–5,
 107–10, 142
 Oregon, USA 162–3
 ‘original position’ (Rawls) 152
 Ostrom (2000) 20, 29, 58–9, 129, 149–50
- partial values perspective 123
 payment card 134
 payment vehicle
 interpretation of responses 58–61, 171,
 173
 misconstrual of information 71
 and responsibility 66–7, 72–5
 role of 28–9
 scope sensitivity 102–3

- and transactions 95
- and trust 76–9
- Payne *et al.* (1992) 55, 56, 101, 124, 125
- personal norms 55
- Petty *et al.* (1995) 163
- Philip and Macmillan (2005) 134, 135
- planned behaviour, theory of 59
- planning cells 16
 - see also* citizens' juries
- political judgements 154–5
- post-questionnaire approach 41, 131–3
- Powe (2000)
 - details of study 63, 67, 81
 - interpretation of responses 65, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89
 - principled responses 155
 - reaction to survey 91, 92, 93
 - scope sensitivity 104, 106, 107, 111
- Powe and Bateman (2003, 2004) 28, 63, 67, 71, 78, 81, 104, 105, 115
- Powe *et al.* (2004a)
 - details of study 63, 67, 81
 - extrapolation potential 140–43
 - interpretation of responses 65, 75, 78, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88
 - post-questionnaire approach 131–3
 - principled responses 155
 - reaction to survey 91, 92, 93
- Powe *et al.* (2004b) 63, 67, 81
- Powe *et al.* (2005)
 - details of study 37, 38, 63, 67, 81
 - interpretation of responses 68, 75, 78, 79, 84, 86, 87, 90
 - post-questionnaire approach 131–3
 - reaction to survey 91, 92, 93
 - scope sensitivity 110, 114
- Powe *et al.* (2006)
 - details of study 63, 67, 81
 - dominant participants 157
 - interpretation of responses 68, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 84, 86, 87
 - post-questionnaire approach 131–3
 - scope sensitivity 105
- preference construction
 - and attitudes 137
 - group-based approach 126, 128
 - insensitivity of 101
 - interpretation of responses 69, 94
 - public preferences 150–51
- questionnaire design 72
 - respondent abilities 123–4, 169–70
 - and unfamiliarity 121
 - variance 55–6, 115, 124–6
- preference reversal 125
- presentation 26–8, 65–72, 94–5, 171, 173
- price 102, 106
- principled responses 80–81, 86–7, 95, 102–3, 110–11, 155
- production function 19
- profiles, of goods or services 25, 27
- public consultation 11–18, 155–8
- public goods 20
- public preferences 150–51
- public reaction 91–3, 95–6
- Purcell, K. 14
- qualitative methods 3–4, 31–5, 46–7, 61–4, 170–73
- quantitative methods 31–2, 46–7
- quasi-option value 22
- questionnaires 16, 41, 46, 72, 76, 122–3
- questions for focus groups 41–2
- Randall (1991) 21
- Rangitoto Island (New Zealand) 73
- rational egoists 59
- Rawls's 'original position' 152
- realism of bids 80–81, 88–90, 95, 155
- recollection by respondents 70, 103, 105
- record keeping 43
- recreational demand models 19
- reference operation conditions (ROC) 126
- referendum style dichotomous choice 29, 176
- referendum transactions
 - citizen preferences 153, 154
 - citizens' juries 155–6, 157
 - individual influence 159
 - use of 1, 23, 26, 31, 174
- representative groups 165, 175
- researchers 123–4
- respondents
 - cognitive ability 2, 54, 55–7, 122–4, 162, 169–70, 171
 - communal scenarios 2–3, 169, 170, 171
 - consideration of specifics 112–15

- financial commitment 159–60
- financial position 151–2, 159
- and group-based approach 131
- hypothetical transactions 2, 169–70, 171
- independence of 128–9, 133, 157
- information requirements 65–72, 135
- motivation 57–8, 79–90, 95, 105–11, 171, 175
- political judgements 154–5
- social judgements 154–5
- social skills 162
- social status 151–2, 159
- response bias 112–13
- response interpretation *see* interpretation of responses
- response mode 125
- responsibility for payment 66–7, 72–5
- revealed preferences 58, 126
- Rowe *et al.* (1980) 60

- Sagoff (1988) 150
- same-sample scope sensitivity 98–9
- sample size 129, 165
- Samuelson (1954) 20
- scenario specifics 112–15, 125
- scheme size 104–5
- Schkade and Payne (1993) 62, 66, 80, 112
- Schkade and Payne (1994)
 - details of study 62, 66, 80
 - interpretation of responses 56, 65, 69, 74, 75, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89
 - preference construction 125
 - principled responses 155
 - scope sensitivity 103
- Schwartz (1977) 59
- scope sensitivity
 - causes of 103–11
 - communal scenarios 102–3
 - contingent valuation (CV) 98–9
 - definition 98
 - and economic theory 98, 99–101, 102
 - hypothetical transactions 102
 - and insensitivity 98, 101–3
 - likelihood of success 70–71
 - market stall approach 135
 - payment vehicle 102–3
 - same-sample scope sensitivity 98–9
 - scenario specifics 112–15
 - split-sample scope sensitivity 98–9
 - symbolic meaning of responses 86–7
 - see also* sensitivity
 - second bound 76–7
 - sensitivity 55, 57, 60, 107–10
 - see also* scope sensitivity
 - Simon (1956) 124
 - Slovic (1995) 124, 125, 126
 - social context 70
 - social judgements, respondents 154–5
 - social norms 20, 22, 29, 55
 - social preferences 153–5
 - social status 151–2, 159
 - social welfare 160–161
 - social willingness to pay (SWTP) 159–65
 - Spash (2000) 61
 - Spash and Hanley (1995) 61, 154
 - specific domain of content 28
 - split-sample scope sensitivity 98–9, 103
 - stakeholder negotiation 156
 - stated preference methods
 - acceptability of 3, 35, 36, 91–4, 95–6, 171, 173
 - applicability 172–3
 - challenges of 2–4
 - criticisms 19, 136–7, 169–70
 - and environmental goods 172
 - focus groups 33, 35–6
 - future of 175–6
 - interpretation framework 53–61
 - interviews 33
 - overview 17
 - public reaction 91–3, 95–6
 - and qualitative methods 170–73
 - transactions 26–30
 - uses 1–2
 - see also* choice experiments (CE); contingent valuation (CV)
 - Stevens *et al.* (1991, 1994) 61, 88, 154
 - Strack and Schwarz (1992) 128
 - strategies of respondents 79–90, 95, 105–11, 171, 173
 - substitute schemes 83–5, 107–10, 135
 - surrogate market techniques 1
 - surveys 91–3, 95–6, 112–15
 - Sussman *et al.* (1994) 41
 - Svedsäter (2003)
 - details of study 63, 67, 81

- focus groups 35
- interpretation of responses 65, 69, 74, 79, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89
- principled responses 154–5
- reaction to survey 91, 93
- scope sensitivity 110
- symbolic meaning of responses 80–81, 86–7, 95, 102–3, 110–111, 155

- task sensitivity 55, 57
- taxation 75
- telephone surveys 68
- textual analysis tools 45
- time available 134–5
- tokens 144–5
- top-down valuation 113–14, 135
- total economic value (TEV) 21–3
- trade-offs
 - communal scenarios 54
 - difficulty of 73, 84–5, 110, 112
 - economic approach 102
 - focus groups 15, 172
 - and information provided 68
 - and lexicographic approach 56, 60–61
 - multi-attribute utility approach 138–9, 162–3
 - objections to 151, 154
 - as stated preference methods tool 173
- transactions
 - delivery 66–7, 75–9
 - payment 66–7
 - and payment vehicle 95
 - presentation 65–72, 94–5
 - stated preference methods 26–30
 - strategies 79–90
- transparency 11
- trust
 - citizens' juries 158, 166
 - and cooperation 150
 - in group meetings 129
 - information presentation 71
 - and payment 76–9
 - in provider 59, 66–7, 75–9
 - and questionnaire design 76
 - and willingness to pay (WTP) 78–9
- Turner *et al.* (1991) 13–14
- Turner *et al.* (2000) 22
- Tversky *et al.* (1988) 55, 125

- uncertainty 22

- understanding, importance of 166
- United Kingdom 17
- United States 16, 17, 23
- use benefits 21–2, 23

- Vadnjaj and O'Connor (1994) 62, 66, 68, 73, 80, 89, 111, 154, 172
- valuation workshops 163–5
- valuations 113–14, 136–46, 147, 164–5, 173
- Varian (1999) 57
- Vatn (2004) 60, 102–3, 150
- Vatn and Bromley (1994) 11, 12, 56

- warm glow value 85, 111
- water
 - contingent valuation (CV) 93
 - responsibility 74, 75–6
 - stated preference methods 1, 13, 17
 - studies concerned with 62–3, 70, 92, 104
 - symbolic responses 87
 - trade-offs 110, 155
 - trust in provider 78, 86, 92, 142–3
- Welch and Fischhoff (2001) 63, 70, 81, 91, 92
- wetlands
 - choice cards 27
 - group-based approach 156
 - stated preference methods 1, 12, 13–14, 169
 - studies concerned with 23, 69, 74–5, 76, 80, 87, 89
- Whittington *et al.* (1992) 130
- willingness to pay (WTP)
 - and attitudes 46–7, 137
 - and contingent valuation (CV) 24
 - definition 21
 - and ethics 61
 - extrapolation 140–43
 - inappropriate use 114–15
 - market stall approach 133–6
 - multi-attribute utility approach 139
 - payment vehicle 28–9
 - public preferences 150–51
 - scheme size 104–5
 - and second bound 77
 - social (SWTP) 159–65
 - social measure 139
 - and social norms 22

tokens, use of 144–5
and trust 78–9

Willis *et al.* (2005) 63, 67, 81
Wilson and Howarth (2002) 151