

Contents

<i>Contributing authors</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgment</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	x
Daniel McFadden and Kenneth Train	
1 Response to cost prompts in stated preference valuation of environmental goods	1
<i>James Burrows, Powell Dixon, and Hiu Man Chan</i>	
2 Fat tails and truncated bids in contingent valuation: an application to an endangered shorebird species	17
<i>George Parsons and Kelley Myers</i>	
3 Inadequate response to frequency of payments in contingent valuation of environmental goods	43
<i>Kelley Myers, George Parsons, and Kenneth Train</i>	
4 An adding-up test on contingent valuations of river and lake quality	58
<i>William Desvousges, Kristy Mathews, and Kenneth Train</i>	
5 Do contingent valuation estimates of willingness to pay for non-use environmental goods pass the scope test with adequacy? A review of the evidence from empirical studies in the literature	82
<i>James Burrows, Rebecca Newman, Jerry Genser, and Jeffrey Plewes</i>	
6 Stated preference methods and their applicability to environmental use and non-use valuations	153
<i>Daniel McFadden</i>	
7 Some findings from further exploration of the “composite good” approach to contingent valuation	188
<i>Michael Kemp, Edward Leamer, James Burrows, and Powell Dixon</i>	

8	Inferences from stated preference surveys when some respondents do not compare costs and benefits <i>Edward Leamer and Josh Lustig</i>	224
9	Assessing the validity of stated preference data using follow-up questions <i>Kelley Myers, Doug MacNair, Ted Tomasi, and Jude Schneider</i>	252
10	Hypothetical bias: a new meta-analysis <i>Harry Foster and James Burrows</i>	270
11	Legal obstacles for contingent valuation methods in environmental litigation <i>Brian D. Israel, Jean Martin, Kelly Smith Fayne, and Lauren Daniel</i>	292
	<i>Index</i>	307