

Valuation of species and nature conservation in Asia and Oceania:

A meta-analysis

Henrik Lindhjem^{a*} and Tran Huu Tuan^b

^a Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), Gaustadalleen 21, N-0349 Oslo, Norway.

^b College of Economics, Hue University, 100 Phung Hung Street, Hue City, Vietnam.

Forthcoming in *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*. Draft, August 2011

Abstract

We conduct a meta-analysis (MA) of around 100 studies valuing species and nature conservation in Asia and Oceania, using both revealed and stated preferences methods. Dividing our dataset into two levels of heterogeneity in terms of good characteristics (species vs. nature conservation more generally) and valuation methods, we show that the degree of regularity and conformity with theory and empirical expectations is higher for the more homogenous dataset of contingent valuation of species. For example, we find that willingness to pay (WTP) for preservation of mammals tends to be higher than other species and that WTP for species preservation increases with income (elasticity below one). For the full dataset we find that marine habitats are valued significantly higher than other habitat types in the region. Despite some encouraging results, more research is required to answer the question of how homogenous is homogenous enough in MA, especially when moving towards using MA for benefit transfer and policy use.

Keywords: Asia; biodiversity; meta-analysis; Oceania; valuation

JEL Classification: Q26; Q51; Q57; H41

* Corresponding author. E-mail: henrik.lindhjem@nina.no

1. Introduction

According to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, more than 60 per cent of the world's ecosystems are being degraded or used unsustainably (MEA 2005). The pressure on nature is among the highest in the many rapidly growing economies of Asia and Oceania. The (neoclassical) economist's prescription to stemming this trend is to value changes in the provision of environmental goods in monetary terms, and create mechanisms to internalise their values in the billions of everyday decisions of consumers, producers and government officials. In response to this challenge, an enormous amount of primary valuation research has been produced using stated and revealed preference methods in Asia and elsewhere. However, paraphrasing Glass *et al.* (1981: p11)¹, results of much of this work "are strewn among the scree of a hundred journals and lies in the unsightly rubble of a million dissertations." This valuation research could be much better utilised to demonstrate the social return to nature conservation, a key area where environmental economists need to do more in the future, as pointed out by the late David Pearce (2005) and more recently by the international study "The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity".²

For a range of environmental goods meta-analysis (MA) techniques have been used to synthesize valuation research, test hypotheses, and facilitate the transfer of existing welfare estimates to new, unstudied policy sites ("benefit transfer" – BT) for use e.g. in cost-benefit analysis (Smith and Pattanayak 2002; Navrud and Ready 2007). Responding to Pearce's challenge, this is to our knowledge the first MA that reviews and takes stock of the literature on environmental valuation of a complex and somewhat heterogeneous good: (changes in) conservation of habitat,

¹ Originally quoted in Stanley and Jarrel (2005).

² <http://www.teebweb.org/>

biodiversity and species, in a geographical region where such research is rapidly growing: Asia and Oceania.

We attempt to answer the following two research questions: (1) To what extent do welfare estimates for this complex good conform with theoretically and empirically derived expectations regarding the good characteristics, valuation methods, study quality, socio-economic and other variables?; and (2) How sensitive are the meta-regression results to; (a) the “scope of the MA”, i.e. the level of heterogeneity of the good valued and the valuation methods used; and (b) the choice of meta-regression models? The first question investigates whether the welfare estimates display the degree of validity and regularity more typically found for less complex environmental goods with higher share of use values, and offers a first check of the potential for using such data for BT applications (Johnston *et al.* 2005; Lindhjem 2007).

The second question contributes to our understanding and refinement of MA methodology in environmental economics, where the meta-analyst typically is left to make a number of choices potentially introducing various subjective biases (Hoehn 2006). An important choice both for the robustness of MA models and their suitability for use in BT applications, relates to the scope of the MA, i.e. the trade-off between the number of observations and the acceptable level of heterogeneity of the data, as pointed out by e.g. Engel (2002) and Nelson and Kennedy (2009) (question 2a above). Another important consideration is the choice among meta-regression models, for example which covariates to include (question 2b).³

Previous MA studies have primarily analysed the values of more homogenous types of environmental goods (e.g. water and air quality, recreation days) often within the same country

³ An alternative approach to dealing with classical MA challenges, not pursued here, is to use Bayesian techniques (e.g. Moeltner *et al.* (2007).

(Desvousges *et al.* 1998; Rosenberger and Loomis 2000a; Van Houtven *et al.* 2007). However, there is a trend towards using MA to study more complex goods in international settings, though this work has generally not considered heterogeneity in the data or related methodological choices (for goods such as wetlands, coral reefs, forests, biodiversity, agricultural land preservation) (Brander *et al.* 2006; Brander *et al.* 2007; Lindhjem 2007; Jacobsen and Hanley 2009; Richardson and Loomis 2009; Barrio and Loureiro 2010). Before moving towards widespread use of MA results not just as a quantitative literature review but also for BT, we think it is worth more carefully considering the questions we pose here than the literature has done to date (Lindhjem and Navrud 2008).

We begin by explaining the conceptual framework underlying MA, give a descriptive overview of the valuation literature in the region and describe the data collection and coding process (next section). In section three we explain the econometric approach to the data and in section four the main results. To investigate the effect of MA scope, we divide our dataset into two levels of heterogeneity; species (more similar good and methods used) and nature conservation more generally (more heterogeneity in good and methods used). We then estimate a number of random effects meta-regression models for these two main datasets using different cleaning procedures and subsets of the data investigating conformity with expectations, explanatory power and the robustness of results. Section five concludes and discusses potential implications for future research and the further use of MA for literature review and BT in non-market valuation.

2. Conceptual framework and data

2.1 Conceptual framework

We define “nature conservation” broadly as the protection or active management of any natural terrestrial or aquatic ecosystem, resource or amenity, Q . The economic value measure for an

increase in the level of nature conservation (Q) is the change in the quantity and/or quality (QUAL) of Q, or some set of services provided by Q, and is referred to as consumers' surplus (CS) or Willingness to pay (WTP). It should be noted that the available valuation methods used in economics differ in terms of the welfare measures that they estimate (see e.g. Freeman (2003)) – a potential source of heterogeneity in the data we will try to control for in our regressions. From the standard indirect utility function, the bid function for a representative individual j for this change can be given by (Bergstrom and Taylor 2006):⁴

$$(1) \text{ WTP} = f(P_j, M_j, Q_j^T - Q_j^R, \text{QUAL}_j^T - \text{QUAL}_j^R, \text{SUB}_j^T - \text{SUB}_j^R, H_j)$$

Where P = a price index of market goods (assumed constant), M = (individual or household) income (assumed constant), $Q^T - Q^R$ and $\text{QUAL}^T - \text{QUAL}^R$ are the changes in quantity and quality from a reference situation (R) to a target state-of-the-world (T), SUB = substitutes for Q available to individual j, H = non-income household or individual characteristics.

Further to make (1) elastic enough for use in MA, we assume, following Bergstrom and Taylor (2006) a “weak structural utility theoretic approach” in which the underlying variables in the bid function are assumed to be derivable from some unknown utility function, but that flexibility is maintained to introduce explanatory variables into the model, such as study design and different valuation methods, that do not necessarily follow from (1). This is the most common approach in MA, where the meta-analyst records welfare estimates from different studies and corresponding explanatory variables both informed by theory and empirical expectations.

In this process the empirical specification chosen for (1) needs to trade off the availability of information reported in valuation studies with the range of potentially relevant explanatory

⁴ For simplicity and brevity we do not elaborate the details of how nature conservation may increase utility e.g. related to market goods and household production, e.g. as done by Van Houtven *et al.* (2007) for water quality.

variables. For example, information about substitute sites to a national park will mostly not be reported even if important for WTP. In addition, if information *is* reported, for example about the exact change in nature conservation valued (e.g. in hectares protected), this change may not be easily comparable across sites and studies. No MA studies are free of this problem. Some try to map changes to a common unit of measurement in terms of hectares or to a water quality ladder or similar, though such simplified common units may mask differences in other dimensions of the good important to individuals (see e.g. Lindhjem 2007). There are no easy solutions, and in our rather general case we interpret mean WTP from different studies as welfare estimates for a (small, though not marginal) change in Q and/or in one or more elements in an attribute vector of QUAL describing the quality of the nature site.⁵ We then use dummy variables to detect differences in WTP depending on the type of habitat or change valued. For example, when considering studies that value preservation of biodiversity we use variables for types of species and other characteristics of the good to capture variation in this overall value category. Before discussing the empirical specification of (1), we first describe the data used for the MA.

2.2 Description of meta-data

Given this conceptual framework, we conducted a broad search for studies (published papers, reports, book chapters etc.⁶) internationally available in English valuing nature conservation in the region drawn from various databases, including EVRI (Environmental Valuation Reference

⁵ The ecosystem services and functions and total economic value from nature and biodiversity conservation are discussed in depth elsewhere, and not elaborated in detail here (see e.g. Fromm (2000)).

⁶ We did not include Master theses for practical reasons (hard to find and/or to get hold of) and because many are written in the native language.

Inventory), ECONLIT, ISI Web of Science, EEPSEA's (Environment and Economy Programme for Southeast Asia), etc.⁷

The first studies were conducted in Australia in the 1980s. In the rest of Asia, valuation started much later, but has grown in number substantially during the 1990's and 2000's. Based on the literature search we compiled a gross meta-dataset of 577 mean WTP estimates (i.e. observations) from 99 studies. A first crude screening of the studies was conducted by excluding the ones reporting negative mean WTP or very high or low estimates (2 standard deviations of the mean), leaving 550 estimates from 95 studies for detailed analysis. This reduces the influence of outlier estimates in regressions. The resulting distribution of studies by region, by type of habitat or service valued, and valuation method used is given in Tables 1-3 below.⁸ Most of the studies are from Southeast Asia, East Asia or Oceania (mostly Australia), with a smaller number of studies from South and Southwest Asia (Table 1). Australia has the largest number of studies (22), followed by the Philippines with 10 studies. Raw mean annual WTP is highest for Oceania at US\$ 254, as expected, though also high for South Asia (US\$ 206). The lowest WTP, all at around the same level, is found in Southeast Asia (US\$ 83), East Asia (US\$ 76) and Southwest Asia (US\$ 66).

⁷ Since the Australian database ENVALUE is no longer updated, has been (partly) integrated with EVRI and includes limited study information, our main search used the EVRI database.

⁸ We do not claim to have collected an exhaustive database of all studies in Asia and Oceania, but we are confident that we cover the majority of such studies in the region until 2009. Further, it is unlikely that our search has been biased in any way.

Table 1 Regional distribution of valuation studies (WTP in US\$ 2006)

Region	Mean WTP (St.dev.)	No. of obs.	No. of studies
Southeast Asia (SEA)	83 (212)	244	32
Oceania (O)	254 (914)	116	23
East Asia (EA)	76 (108)	99	23
South Asia (SA)	206 (286)	70	11
Southwest Asia (SWA)	66 (78)	21	6
Total		550	95

Note: O= Australia, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu; SEA= Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam; EA= China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan; SA= India, Sri Lanka; SWA= Iran, Israel, Pakistan.

The most frequently valued habitat is terrestrial (including forests, nature reserves and national parks) grouped together here for ease of exposition (Table 2). Marine and freshwater habitats (i.e. coral reefs, beaches, sea, rivers, water courses) for simplicity termed “marine habitats”, follow second.

Table 2 Distribution of valuation studies by habitat types (WTP in US\$ 2006)

Types of habitats/services	Mean WTP (St.dev.)	No. of obs.	No. of studies
Terrestrial habitats (reserves, national parks, forests)	116 (252)	176	33
Marine habitats (reefs, beaches, sea, watercourses)	80 (97)	162	27
Species (single or multiple)	105 (220)	129	16
Wetlands (wetlands, mangroves)	514 (1503)	41	8
Other habitats/services (landscapes, eco.-services)	121 (182)	37	13
Total		550	97*

Note: * Some studies have more split samples asking different types of good, and thus the number of studies is higher than reported in Table 1.

Wetlands have the highest value at US\$ 514 mostly due to the market price methods often used to value such habitats (see Table 3). Studies that value named species or groups of species are categorised as “species”. Marine habitats provide the lowest value (US\$ 80) compared to other types of habitats, while terrestrial habitats (US\$ 116), species (US\$ 105), and other habitats (US\$ 121) have values that are around 40-50 percent higher. By far, the most frequently used method of valuation is contingent valuation (CV), with 77 studies, while the travel cost method (TCM) comes second with only 14 studies (Table 3). A small number of studies (5) use other methods, such as the hedonic pricing method (HPM) or calculate the value of wetlands and forests using the market price approach. As noted above, these methods frequently calculate a different welfare measure than CV, choice modelling (CM) and TCM studies, and also yield higher estimates than the other methods.

Table 3 Valuation studies by methods (WTP in US\$ 2006)

Method	Mean WTP (St.dev.)	No. of obs	No. of studies
Contingent valuation method (CV)	124 (505)	417	77
Choice modelling/experiments (CM)	67 (41)	50	8
Travel cost method (TCM)	161 (162)	37	14
Others (market price, hedonic pricing)	269 (435)	46	5
Total		550	104*

Note: * In some studies, there are more than one method used, and thus the number of studies is higher than reported in Table 1.

Details of the individual studies (including references) are given in the supplementary Appendix.

2.3 Coding of data for meta-regression analysis

Information from the studies was coded in a spreadsheet originally containing 30 of the likely most important variables chosen from the universe of potentially interesting and relevant covariates, with between 1 and 36 observations drawn from each study (average 5.8). The same study typically has several sub-samples varying the methods used, scope and other aspects of the good being valued. Table 4 below gives the variable names and definitions we include in the

final regressions. We coded a number of additional variables that were tested in preliminary analysis. However, a choice was made to include those variables that were more commonly significant or are relevant for comparing regions and for BT.

Since there is no standardised way of reporting welfare estimates in the literature, a wide variety of units are typically used, e.g. WTP per individual or household, per unit of area⁹, per visitor, for different time periods (e.g. per month, per visit, per year, one-time amount etc.), and in different currencies and reporting years. To deal with this problem, we standardized the values to a common metric following standard MA practice, i.e. WTP (US\$ in 2006 prices) per household per year as a default, and coded WTP per individual, WTP per month etc., using dummies. For WTP per visit from CV or TCM studies, we calculated WTP per visit per year (if the study had information about how many trips a person would make per year, we converted to WTP per year).

Values from different years were converted to 2006 prices using GDP deflators from the World Bank World Development Indicators. Purchase Power Parity (PPP) corrected exchange rates were used to correct for differences in price levels between countries. This is the recommended procedure in international BT and MA (Ready and Navrud 2006). Some theoretical models predict that WTP given per household is higher than individual WTP, though empirical evidence is mixed (Lindhjem and Navrud 2009). It can also be expected that WTP given per month multiplied by 12 to convert to an annual amount is higher than WTP originally stated on an annual basis (a well-known bias).

⁹ Studies that reported results with per unit of an area were excluded, as the total size typically was not given.

We also included other methodological variables that are often used in MA studies: whether the study was a stated preference study (i.e. CV or CM) or other methods, whether it used personal interviews, if the CV method applied a dichotomous choice (DC) question format (i.e. the respondent says yes or no to a given bid, rather than stating max WTP), whether the CV data were analysed using non-parametric statistical methods and whether the payment vehicle was formulated as voluntary (e.g. donation) or mandatory (e.g. tax).¹⁰

Some studies find that CV yields lower WTP than revealed preference studies (e.g. Carson *et al.* (1996)), which is also in line with results in Table 3 above. DC formats are often found to give higher mean WTP than open ended formats (a main reason is so-called yea-saying), while non-parametric methods in stated preference such as the Turnbull estimator, typically give a conservative lower bound on WTP (see e.g. Bateman *et al.* (2002)). There is no clear prior for use of interviews vs. other modes, though type of survey mode is known to influence results (Lindhjem and Navrud 2011a,b). There is also mixed a priori expectations regarding the voluntary vs. mandatory payment vehicle (e.g. Jianjun *et al.* 2008) (see discussion in results section).

Further, we include a set of geographic and good characteristics variables to control for differences in welfare estimates between types of species (mammals, turtles) and habitat types, between regions and countries, and between primarily non-use vs. use value. Larger and more charismatic or iconized species (for example elephants or pandas) are likely to yield higher welfare estimates than non-charismatic species or biodiversity/nature conservation in general (e.g. as found in Jacobsen *et al.* (2008) and Richardson and Loomis 2009)¹¹, though it is

¹⁰ See the tables in the supplementary Appendix for classifications of the studies along some of these main dimensions.

¹¹ Which also tend to be reflected in actual conservation policies (see e.g. Metrick and Weitzman (1996)).

uncertain a priori if our MA will be able to detect such a pattern across several studies. Studies that primarily estimate non-use values may give rise to both higher and lower value estimates than studies that cover only use value (or both use and non-use). This leaves the expected relationship of the “nonuse” variable with WTP ambiguous. There are also no strong priors regarding other habitat types or regional/country dummies, though it is expected that these dimensions may influence WTP.¹² We considered including a dummy for the season of the study (e.g. rainy vs. dry season) similar to Lindhjem (2007), however in most cases such information was not reported.

The only socio-economic variable generally reported is income of the sample, which we include in our analysis. Around 78 percent of the studies report this. For those which do not, we follow common practice from other MA studies to use a proxy for income from other sources instead, i.e. we use GDP/capita for the country. It is expected that income will positively influence WTP, an often-found result in the literature for primary studies. However, in MA studies WTP is often relatively insensitive to income levels (see e.g. Johnston, Besedin et al. 2005; Jacobsen and Hanley 2009). One reason for this is the low variation in income levels in MA studies conducted within the same country or in Western countries with similar income levels. In our case we have a fairly large variation in income levels, so should expect that WTP may increase with income.

Finally, we include a proxy variable for study quality; whether a study is a published or unpublished paper (i.e. a journal article or research report/working paper). Though published studies may be expected to apply more stringent and perhaps conservative methods, it is not

¹² We also considered using population density of the country of study as a variable, for example as done by Brander et al. (2006) for wetlands. However, we think link between nature conservation and population density may be overly tenuous, and excluded this variable in our analysis.

clear if this would result in lower WTP. There may also be publication bias with unknown influence on WTP (Rosenberger and Johnston 2009). A way to limit the potential impact of publication bias is also to include unpublished studies. To account for trends in WTP values over time that are not captured by income (or other coded variables), we include a trend variable for the year of the study (rather than publication year). Some MA studies find WTP to increase over time, reflecting, perhaps, both increased nature scarcity and “greener” preferences. Others argue that increased methodological prudence should result in lower WTP estimates in more recent studies. Since a portion of our studies is funded by the same institution, Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA), and may share similarities we have not otherwise coded, we include a dummy (“EEPSEA”) to control for that. This procedure is similar to Bateman and Jones (2003) who find indications of similarities in WTP estimates from the same authors.

Table 4 Definition of meta-analysis variables and descriptive statistics

Variables	Description	Mean (SD)*
Dependent variable:		
WTP 2006	WTP in 2006 prices (US\$)	133 (461)
Methodological variables:		
SP	Binary: 1 if stated preference, 0 if otherwise	.84 (.35)
DC	Binary: 1 if SP using dichotomous choice, 0 if otherwise	.51 (.50)
TCM	Binary: 1 if travel cost method, 0 if otherwise	.07 (.25)
Hholdpay	Binary: 1 if household's WTP, 0 if individual	.67 (.46)
Month	Binary: 1 if payment is a monthly payment, 0 if otherwise	.35 (.47)
Nonpara	Binary: 1 if estimate is non-parametric (Turnbull), 0 otherwise	.07 (.25)
Interview	Binary: 1 if it is an in-person interview, 0 otherwise	.60 (.48)
Mandatory	Binary: 1 if it is a mandatory payment vehicle, 0 if voluntary	.69 (.88)
Good characteristics variables:		
Mammal	Binary: 1 if it is a mammal, 0 otherwise	.04 (.20)
Turtle	Binary: 1 for sea turtle, 0 otherwise	.06 (.24)
Species	Binary: 1 for species, 0 if other habitats/services	.23 (.42)
Terrestrial	Binary: 1 for terrestrial habitats, 0 if other habitats/services	.32 (.47)
Marine	Binary: 1 if marine habitat (beach, sea, watercourse, lake, river), 0 other habitats/services	.29 (.45)
Wetland	Binary: 1 for wetlands, 0 if other habitats/services	.07 (.26)
Nonuse	Binary: 1 for primarily non-use, 0 otherwise	.77 (.41)
Socio-economic variables:		
Income	Continuous: Mean household income from sample (PPP adjustment, 2006)	14,318 (17,258)
GDP	Continuous: GDP 2006 from country for survey. Inserted for household income in one model.	14,524 (12,191)
Geographic characteristics (countries and regions):		
Australia	Binary: 1 if the study in Australia, 0 otherwise	.19 (.39)
Philippin	Binary: 1 if a study in the Philippines, 0 otherwise	.22 (.42)
Oceania	Binary: 1 if a study in Oceania, 0 other region	.21 (.40)
East	Binary: 1 if a study in East Asia, 0 other region	.18 (.38)
Southeast	Binary: 1 if a study in Southeast Asia, 0 otherwise	.44 (.48)
Southwest	Binary: 1 if a study in Southwest Asia, 0 otherwise	.04 (.19)
South	Binary: 1 if a study in South Asia, 0 otherwise	.13 (.33)
Other variables:		
EEPSEA**	1 if the study is funded by EEPSEA, 0 otherwise	.39 (.48)
Journal	1 if it is a published paper, 0 otherwise	.47 (.49)
Year	Continuous: from 0 (2006) to 26 (1979)	6.36 (4.07)

Notes: *The Mean (SD) is for overview purposes given for the whole dataset. The scope of the dataset is limited in the model runs in the next section. Further not all variables are used in all models.

**EEPSEA = Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia.

3. Meta-regression model

For our meta-regressions, we divided the dataset into two primary levels of scope, according to level of homogeneity of the good and methods used: Level 1: Species; and Level 2: Biodiversity and nature conservation more generally. The species data include WTP estimates from 16 studies using CV to value the preservation of single or multiple species. These CV studies typically ask how much local/domestic populations are willing to pay for various conservation programs for species (e.g. WTP to conserve a viable population of sea turtles).¹³

10 of the studies are funded by EEPSEA (hence the importance of the control variable discussed above). The species valued in these studies include sea turtles (several countries), black-faced spoonbill (Macau), rhinos (Vietnam), eagles and whale shark (Philippines), and various other species such as Dugong Dugong, elephants, rhinos, dolphins and tigers (Thailand). In addition we found six non-EEPSEA funded studies in the region using CV to value the preservation of the possum (a marsupial species native to Australia) and glider (the Mahogany Glider: a type of endangered possum), giant panda (China), and elephants (India, Sri Lanka). These 16 studies (of species) provide 124 estimates that will be used in the meta-regression analysis. Although the species are different, we consider the preservation of them as a good with many similar attributes in valuation (i.e. a larger degree of homogeneity of the good), as compared to nature and biodiversity conservation more generally. In addition, methodological heterogeneity is reduced since all the studies in this level use CV.

The second level of the data include the studies from Level 1 and all the rest of the studies that value nature conservation more generally, with different types of methods (though the majority

¹³ A small number of studies survey foreign populations, e.g. Bandara and Tisdell (2005) study OECD citizens' WTP for the preservation of the Giant Panda in China.

also use CV here). This dataset includes welfare estimates for a fairly heterogeneous good, however, not more so than many other complex environmental goods in recent MA studies. Further, as almost all non-textbook goods in general (and environmental goods in particular) are heterogeneous to some degree, it is not completely clear from theory where to draw the line in practice.

All in all the Level 2 dataset contains between 67 to 95 studies and 390 to 550 estimates, depending on the cleaning procedures and the subsets of the data used in the meta-regressions. The details of the Level 1 and 2 datasets are given in Tables A1 and A2, respectively, in the supplementary appendix. We will conduct several meta-regression models based on these two levels of data to explain variation in welfare estimates and to investigate effects of different dimensions of heterogeneity.

As most studies provide more than one WTP estimate, the data should most prudently be treated as a panel to account for the correlation between the errors of estimates from the same study¹⁴ (e.g. Nelson and Kennedy 2009). Thus we used the procedure proposed by Rosenberger and Loomis (2000b) to check for panel structures in the data. The panel structure model, our empirical specification of equation (1) above, can be written as:

$$(2) WTP_{ij} = \alpha + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k x_{kij} + \mu_{ij} + \varepsilon_i$$

where WTP is the i 'th observation from the j 'th stratum (here study), α is a constant. The variation in WTP_{ij} is to be explained by a vector of covariates $k = 1, \dots, n$, denoted by x_{kij} (as

¹⁴ We also tested two other stratifications of the data: by survey and by author. Results (available from the authors) show that in many model specifications of the two stratifications equal effects (and random effects) cannot be rejected.

defined in Table 4), with a panel effect μ_{ij} and an error $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$.¹⁵ We also assume that μ_{ij} , ε_i and x_{kij} are uncorrelated within and across studies. A Breusch-Pagan's Lagrange multiplier statistic test of whether panel effects are significant was conducted. The null hypothesis is that an equal effects model is correct ($H_0 : \mu_{ij} = 0$), and the alternative that a panel effects model is correct ($H_1 : \mu_{ij} \neq 0$). If the hypothesis of fixed effects in the Breusch-Pagan Lagrangian multiplier test is rejected, the random effects model assuming heterogeneous effect sizes across studies and within models should be more efficient in estimation. We chose a double-log specification of (2), common in the MA literature, which fitted our data better than linear or other specifications. For a model with income as the only explanatory variable¹⁶, the Breusch and Pagan Lagrange multiplier test showed that a model with equal effects was rejected, confirming the appropriateness of a panel estimation model ($\chi^2 = 274.90$, $p=0.000$ with $N=550$ and $j=95$).

In order to test whether a random effects specification (which has a panel specific error component) is outperformed by a fixed effects model (which keeps the panel specific error component constant), a Hausman χ^2 test was performed for the whole dataset. The null hypothesis is that the random effect specification is correct, i.e. the panel effects are uncorrelated with other regressors, and the alternative that the fixed effect specification is correct (Zandersen and Tol 2009). The results in Table 5 show that the random effects model (B) cannot be rejected and thus is the one we use.

¹⁵ Standard error of WTP estimates was generally not reported, making it impossible to weigh estimates by level of precision in the meta-regressions, a procedure recommended in the MA literature (e.g. USEPA (2006)). Using the sample sizes as proxy would also loose to many observations.

Table 5 Test of random vs. fixed effects panel structure ($N=550, j=95$)

	b Fixed effects model	B Random effects model	b-B	S.E.
Income variable	.0305127	-.0494427	.0799554	.2193994
$p > \chi^2: 0.7155$				

We also performed the Hausman test for all the models used in this study, i.e. for different subsets of the data and different explanatory variables included, and find that a random effects model is the best estimation approach for Level 1 and 2 of our data.

4. Meta-regression results

4.1 Level 1: Species

First, we provide results for different meta-regression models for the Level 1 (species) data. Results of six random effects GLS regression models are reported in Table 6. Starting with Model 5, this is a model that includes all explanatory variables in Table 4 of relevance to the Level 1 data. Only one regional dummy and two species type dummies (instead of the full range of species types) are used, as estimates are thinly spread across categories.

Model 5 shows how a fully specified model including all the most relevant explanatory variables is able to deal with the heterogeneity of the data, for the more homogenous of the two datasets. Models 1-4 (and 6) are versions of Model 5 where adding different subcategories of variables illustrates changes in the explanatory power of the models. Model 1 contains methodological characteristics of the CV method only, Model 2 adds good characteristics, Model 3 adds country variables (instead of region dummy in Model 5), and Model 4 includes income and the survey

¹⁶ A comprehensive test would have included other explanatory variables with different model specifications, but for sake of simplicity and brevity, we only present the model with the income variable here.

year variables. A range of models was tried using combinations of variables in Table 4. Models 1-4 presented here were chosen to avoid collinearity (excluding e.g. the EEPSEA and Journal variables), to include dummies reflecting a significant share of the data (i.e. excluding region dummies for Level 1 data), to obtain best fit and to enhance comparison between models and between Level 1 and Level 2 data.

Going from Model 1 to 4, the models gradually explain more of the variation in WTP for species preservation. The methodological variables in Model 1 explain around 35 percent of the variation ($R^2 = 0.354$), while adding characteristics of the species explain another 15 percent of the variation ($R^2 = 0.500$). Adding country specifics and income and year in Models 3 and 4 help explain another 25-31 percentage points of the variation. Model 4, the best fitting of the models, obtains an overall R^2 of 0.81, which is very high compared to other MA studies. Model 5 obtains nearly the same level of R^2 . It is comforting for our belief in the validity of the data and for the potential use of such value estimates for BT that around half of the explained variation in the best model is due to non-study specific, observable characteristics related to the good, geographical area, year of study and income level of the population surveyed. Model 6, a version of Model 5 where all method variables are excluded, drives home the same point, with a R^2 of 61 percent. This model may be of particular interest for testing in BT how ignoring methodological differences translates into BT errors predicting values for new sites. Note that the models are directly comparable since they all include the same observations.

Individual parameter estimates in the best Model 4 conform fairly well with expectations, where such priors exist. The DC format tends to provide higher estimates than other formats, as expected. Non-parametric estimates are significantly lower than estimates using parametric methods, also as expected. Household payment is significantly higher than WTP from individual payment, though theoretical and empirical expectations here are not clear. Personal interview is

not significantly different than other survey modes in the more fully specified Models 2-5. The mandatory payment vehicle tends to give higher WTP (for Models 2-5). It is not immediately clear from our source studies why we find this result. Jianjun et al. (2008) suggest that if CV respondents are assumed to answer truthfully (as if faced with a true economic choice to contribute voluntarily), free riding effects may predict that stated WTP under a voluntary payment mechanism will be lower than when payments are to be made mandatorily (Champ *et al.* 2002; Wiser 2007).

Table 6 Meta-regression models for Level I: Species studies (standard error of coefficients in parentheses)

Variable [#]	Model 1 Method variables	Model 2 + Species types	Model 3 + Country variables	Model 4 + Income and year	Model 5 All variables	Model 6 No method variables
Constant	1.149 (.757)	2.262*** (.834)	1.010 (1.155)	-9.949*** (3.043)	13.939** (5.510)	-.455 (3.861)
DC	1.462* (.792)	.646 (.819)	1.191 (.782)	1.542*** (.537)	1.300** (.583)	
Hholdpay	.095 (.789)	.103 (.813)	.709 (.785)	1.818*** (.638)	2.162** (.944)	
Month	.176 (.676)	.668 (.629)	1.274* (.718)	.320 (.569)	1.032** (.430)	
Nonpara.	-.257** (.120)	-.277** (.119)	-.271** (.111)	-.278*** (.107)	-.275*** (.107)	
Interview	1.577*** (.506)	.145 (.738)	.970 (.889)	-.701 (.820)	.148 (.587)	
Mandatory	.196 (.121)	.203* (.120)	.241** (.113)	.208* (.109)	.220** (.108)	
Turtle		-.417 (.530)	-.710 (.509)	-1.013*** (.326)	-.867** (.386)	.004 (.469)
Mammal		1.748** (.862)	.788 (.844)	1.498** (.595)	1.620** (.595)	2.574*** (.470)
Australia			1.034 (.937)	-1.723* (.963)		
Philippin			-.987*** (.228)	-.141 (.332)		
Southeast					-.270 (.280)	-.587** (.288)
EEPSEA					-2.768 (2.001)	-.441 (1.720)
LnIncome				.876*** (.266)	.803*** (.225)	.505** (.228)
LnYear				2.145*** (.611)	3.848* (2.074)	-.669 (1.445)
<i>Summary statistics:</i>						
R ² : within	.077	.077	.190	.253	.255	.168
R ² : betw.	.573	.764	.881	.961	.953	.727
R²: overa.	.354	.500	.755	.816	.813	.611
Sigma_u	.801	.712	.674	.386	.442	.630
Sigma_e	.464	.464	.437	.421	.420	.435
Rho	.748	.701	.704	.457	.525	.677
N	124	124	124	124	124	124
# studies	16	16	16	16	16	16

Note: *p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01. STATA 9.2 used. # Blank space means variable not included in regression.

Valuation of turtle preservation is significantly lower than for other species (though insignificant in Models 2, 3 and 6), while mammals are valued significantly higher in four out of five

models.¹⁷ Higher values for mammals can be explained by their higher degree of “charisma” than for other, lower-profile species. Australian studies provide lower WTP estimates than other countries, when controlling for income level in Models 4. This may be because Australian studies value species we have classified as “non-charismatic”, i.e. the possum (see supplementary appendix).

Studies conducted in the Philippines are likely to give lower values (though only significant in Model 3) than studies conducted in other countries. The income parameter, i.e. the income elasticity of WTP in our double-log formulation, is around 0.5- 0.8 and highly significant in the best Models 4 and 5. Income elasticity of WTP in the 0-1 range is commonly found in the CV literature (e.g. Kriström and Riera 1996; Schläpfer 2006). In Model 4 more recent studies yield significantly lower WTP estimates, reflecting perhaps increased prudence in the use of valuation methods over time.

4.2 Level 2: Biodiversity and nature conservation more generally

In Table 7 we present results of five random effects GLS regression models using the more heterogeneous Level 2 data (nature and biodiversity conservation, i.e. Level 1 data are included as part of the Level 2 data). In this case we include the fuller range of explanatory variables (e.g. covering different valuation methods) using different subsets of the data. We keep the same methodological variables (except we include the dummy for stated preference values¹⁸) for the sake of comparing the robustness of the results with Level 1. Further, we include the habitat/good characteristics variables that are significant across at least one of our four models.

¹⁷ We also tried other groupings or specifications of types of species, such as size, degree of “charisma” across types of species etc, but found that using the biological classification “mammal” worked best in our models. Adding dummies for each species is not feasible due to the limited number of observations for each.

¹⁸ The variable mandatory is excluded here as it is collinear with the valuation method variables.

Finally, geographic region dummies were included if significant or if data from these regions dominate our dataset.

Similar to the models in Table 6, we first run a fully specified Model 4 using all variables in Tables 1-4 and then we exclude in Model 5 method variables. Model 1 investigates the full dataset of 550 observations, inserting GDP as proxy for unreported income information, while Model 2 excludes studies that did not report income information. These two models illustrate the difference between a “conservative” meta-analyst who would not accept the imprecision introduced by inserting proxies for unreported variables and a more “pragmatic” approach. Both practices are found in the MA literature. Model 3 contains the Model 2 observations, excluding values estimated using other methods than CV, CM, and TCM (i.e. market price and hedonic pricing methods¹⁹). Excluding such values altogether is an alternative to using covariates (most common approach in the MA literature), as these methods estimate conceptually different welfare measures.

Given the heterogeneity of the good included in the Level 2 data, our fully specified Model 4 does not do very well in controlling for this heterogeneity using the covariates we have coded and included. The model explains only 13.5 percent of the variation. This is only slightly increased for Model 1, to a R^2 of 16 percent, which offers the best combination of covariates for the full dataset. However, it is comparable to the 25-26 percent obtained in two national level MA studies of an apparently more homogenous good; recreation activity days in the USA (see Rosenberger and Loomis (2000a) and Shrestha and Loomis (2003)).²⁰ Our R^2 for the full dataset is

¹⁹ The TCM variable is the “hidden” category in Model 3, now that other non-SP methods are excluded. In Models 1-2 the TCM variable is excluded as it is not significant across models.

²⁰ Since R^2 obtained from random effects models is not directly comparable to standard R^2 OLS, the comparison should be interpreted with caution.

generally higher than the random effects MA models of international biodiversity studies in Jacobsen and Hanley (2009).

Table 7 Meta-regression models for Level 2: Biodiversity and nature conservation (standard error of coefficients in parentheses)

Variable[#]	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	GDP inserted for income	Income reported	Only SP and TCM	All variables	No method variables
Constant	3.455** (1.513)	4.058*** (1.221)	3.448*** (1.104)	6.554*** (1.800)	5.522*** (1.664)
SP	-.450 (.321)	-1.713*** (.279)	-1.769*** (.225)	-2.593*** (.628)	
DC	.580*** (.213)	.011 (.181)	-.065 (.140)	.760*** (.221)	
TCM				-2.657*** (.676)	
Hhldpay	.335 (.290)	.025 (.260)	.008 (.273)	-.085 (.332)	
Month	.606 (.376)	1.377*** (.309)	1.448*** (.310)	1.021** (.404)	
Nonpara	-.252 (.243)	-.209 (.174)	-.220* (.125)	-.267 (.237)	
Interview	.080 (.298)	-.009 (.249)	.176 (.220)	.153 (.309)	
Turtle	-.026 (.665)	-.117 (.490)	-.275 (.495)		
Mammal	1.666*** (.614)	1.885*** (.494)	1.715*** (.495)		
Marine	.888*** (.308)	.562** (.266)	.554** (.272)	.046 (.447)	.134 (.437)
Wetland	-.991** (.429)	1.258*** (.421)	1.218*** (.414)	-1.967*** (.538)	-1.718*** (.528)
Species				-.942** (.439)	-.372 (.423)
Terrestrial				-1.143*** (.446)	-.893* (.442)
Nonuse	.057 (.237)	-.240 (.217)	-.084 (.179)	.175 (.237)	.093 (.210)
Oceania	.755* (.458)	.677* (.405)	.588 (.405)	.994 (.647)	.513 (.630)
East	-.204 (.413)	.180 (.356)	-.105 (.370)	-.421 (.638)	-.646 (.632)
Southeast	-.766* (.412)	-.323 (.356)	-.841** (.382)	-.879 (.670)	-.975 (.665)
South				.131 (.751)	.433 (.731)
EEPSEA	-.449** (.389)	-.561* (.310)	.188 (.368)	-.357 (.403)	-.266 (.406)
Journal	-.318 (.341)	-.263 (.304)	-.017 (.318)	-.096 (.371)	-.354 (.366)
LnIncome	-.022 (.133)	.062 (.107)	.103 (.091)	-.027 (.140)	-.068 (.136)
LnYear	.281 (.236)	.213 (.193)	.180 (.189)	.168 (.262)	.020 (.256)
<i>Summary statistics:</i>					

R ² within	.124	.124	.212	.179	.103
R ² :betwen	.172	.550	.572	.155	.074
R²:overall	.159	.337	.459	.135	.095
Sigma_u	.955	.708	.764	1.032	1.037
Sigma_e	1.083	.809	.582	1.066	1.108
Rho	.437	.434	.632	.484	.466
N	550	431	390	550	550
# studies	95	70	67	95	95

Note: *p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01. STATA 9.2 used. # Blank space means variable not included in regression.

Excluding the studies from Model 1 for which a crude GDP/capita measure was substituted for missing income information, more than doubles the explained variation (Model 2, $R^2 = 0.34$). The coefficient on income turns positive, but is not significant as is the case also for the other models. Hence, the income variable is only significantly positive for the Level 1 data. Insignificant income variable is commonly observed in the MA literature also for less heterogeneous data than our Level 2 data. Enhancing methodological homogeneity in Model 3 increases the explained variation further to 46 percent, the same level as for example found in the MA of Brander *et al.* (2006) of international wetland valuation studies.

Despite a higher degree of heterogeneity than for the Level 1 dataset, the data show some degree of regularity, and many of the parameters have the expected signs. Stated preference (SP) methods tend to give lower estimates than revealed preference (RP) methods, as expected (see e.g. Carson et al. 1996). It is also as expected that monthly payments yield higher estimates than other payment vehicles (Models 2-4) and that non-parametric estimates are lower than parametric ones, like for the Level 1 dataset. Variables such as household's WTP and in-person interview do not significantly influence WTP in any models. Non-parametric estimates are significantly lower than estimates derived by parametric methods only in Model 3. The signs and significance of the mammal coefficients are preserved from the Level 1 models, while the turtle variable is no longer significant in any of the models.

Marine habitats are valued significantly higher than other habitats across Models 1-3, while the wetland coefficient is not robust across models. Value estimates that are primarily non-use related are not significant across models. Studies conducted in Oceania (mostly

Australia) tend to yield significantly higher values (significant in Models 1-2). Studies from Southeast Asia give lower values in Models 1 and 3, but are not significant in the other models. Interestingly, studies funded by EEPSEA give lower values than studies funded by other institutions, though not robust across all models. Year is positive but not significant in any models. Removing the methodological variables from the fully specified Model 4, reduces the explanatory power to a low 9.5 percent in Model 5 – an aspect that may invalidate the model for BT purposes.

Increasing the degree of homogeneity of our data in terms of good characteristics and methods, then, generally increases the conformity with theoretical and empirical expectations and explanatory power of the models, as expected. For the more homogenous Level 1 data, observable characteristics of the type of species, region and other variables (income, year) add significantly to the explanatory power of the models. Even with the fairly heterogeneous Level 2 dataset, two models are still able to explain a significant part of the variation of up to 34 and 46 percent, respectively. This is comparable with other MA studies. For example, the R^2 of 46 percent of the Level 2 Model 3 is only somewhat lower than what was found in the MA of van Houtven *et al.* (2007) of water quality valuation studies in the USA. They screened 300 publications related to water quality valuation and found only 11 studies (96 observations) they considered “sufficiently comparable” to be included in the MA. However, for our most heterogeneous Models 1 and 4, the chosen covariates are not able to control for the heterogeneity in a satisfactory way, judged from the level of explained variation.

5. Discussion and conclusions

Pushing the boundaries of meta-analysis (MA) in environmental economics, we have taken stock of studies estimating willingness to pay (WTP) for conservation of species, biodiversity and nature more generally in Asia and Oceania. Our literature review shows that nature conservation is highly valued, probably more so in many cases than the opportunity costs of increasing conservation efforts in the region, though such a comparison is beyond the scope of our study. The valuation literature in the region covers a wide range of methods and goods, displaying increasing degree of methodological sophistication over time.

Dividing our dataset into two levels of heterogeneity in terms of good characteristics and valuation methods, we show that the degree of regularity and conformity with theory and empirical expectations as well as the explanatory power of our MA models is higher for the more homogenous dataset of species values, as expected. In fact, though the species are different, the values to preserve them generally follow predictable patterns. For example, we find that mammals are generally valued higher than other species, likely due to the “charismatic” nature of this family. Further, WTP increases significantly with income (elasticity is around 0.5 - 0.8). The analysis of the species data show that around half of the variation in the best model is due to non-study specific observable characteristics of the good and population surveyed, boding well for use of such data in benefit transfer (BT) applications. However, importantly, increasing the scope of the MA, i.e. gradually including more heterogeneous observations, generally preserves some of the results: The explanatory power of some of our

models is in the range of other MA studies of goods typically assumed to be more homogenous (such as national water quality, recreation days etc).

Using MA for BT involves transferring one or more estimated meta-regression equations to an unstudied policy site and insert values from this site for the geographic, socio-economic, good characteristics variables and relevant year, and predict or forecast annual WTP per household.²¹ In a preliminary BT investigation subjecting both our dataset levels to a simple check of so-called transfer errors (TE)²², using the MA models to predict observations one-by-one when excluded from the datasets, show for the best models median (mean) TE of 24 (46) percent for the species data and 46 (89) percent for the more heterogeneous nature and biodiversity data (results in Tuan and Lindhjem 2009). In this test, the estimates left out for the MA model to predict work as benchmarks for the “true value” at a policy site while the model prediction is the transferred value. The transfer errors we found are in the low range compared to other MA studies (see e.g. Lindhjem and Navrud 2008). These preliminary results suggest that such levels of forecasting errors may approach acceptable levels for policy use. It is, however, also clear from our results in this paper that for example including values estimated using a more heterogeneous

²¹ The values of methodological variables would typically be set at some best practice level, at the average sample value (Stapler and Johnston 2009) or drawn from the MA sample distribution (Johnston *et al.* 2006), since there is no such information for an unstudied policy site.

²² $TE = \frac{|WTP_T - WTP_B|}{WTP_B}$, where T = Transferred (predicted) value from study site(s), B = Estimated (observed) true value (“benchmark”) at policy site.

set of methods for the Level 2 data, even a fairly broad range of covariates is unable to explain and control for the variation in a satisfactory way, potentially translating into large mean transfer errors.

A more careful testing of explanatory variables and MA models for example including interaction effects, isolating heterogeneity along more dimensions and better specifying or capturing the scope dimension of the valued good, all topics for ongoing research, may be required to better understand if heterogeneous good and method characteristics can be controlled for using classical meta-regression analysis. However, even the most extensive list of explanatory variables in the MA-BT literature we have seen to date in Stapler and Johnston (2009) is still unable to bring mean TE below 150 percent for recreational angling values in North America.

Hence, we are still grappling with the question of how to strike the right balance between screening out studies from the analysis and coding them with the aim of later controlling for increased heterogeneity in regression models. How homogenous is homogenous enough? Fundamentally, there is still much we do not know about people's preferences and how to represent and interpret them in MA models. Increasing clarity and transparency of effect size definitions, data collection and screening protocols offering others the chance to replicate results, is one important way forward for MA (e.g. as pointed out by Nelson and Kennedy 2009 and USEPA 2006). Using sensitivity analysis to investigate the effects of important analyst choices related to the scope and heterogeneity of the MA dataset is another, as exemplified in this study. This paper is, to our knowledge, one of the first attempts to systematically investigate the issue of heterogeneity in MA of environmental valuation. More research for other goods and geographical areas is needed to inform the development of a more

consistent and generally applicable MA methodology, especially as MA is gradually being applied for BT to inform policy. Use of MA in economics is growing and the aim should be to move more of the methodological choices out of the black box.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Vic Adamowicz, Ståle Navrud and Randall Rosenberger for constructive comments. Funding from the Environment and Economy Programme for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA) is greatly appreciated.

1 Supplementary Appendix: Descriptions of and full references for meta-analysis datasets

Table A1 Studies of endangered species used in meta-analysis (MA) – Level 1

Name of references	Country	Year^a	Species	Method^b	Mode	Vehicle^b	Payment format	# of values^c	WTP (USD)^d
Jakobsson and Dragun (2001)	Australia	2000	Possum	CV: DC, PC	Mail	M	Year	12	14-72
Tisdell et al (2005)	Australia	2002	Glider	CV: OE	Mail	V	One-off	3	13-19
Kontoleon and Swanson (2003)	China	1998	Panda	CV: DC	Interview	M&V	Visit	3	5-17
Jianjun et al (2006) ^e	China	2005	Turtles	CV: PL	Drop-off	M	Month	5	5-6
Jianjun (2008)	China	2005	Spoonbill	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	17	4-19
Jianjun et al (2006) ^e	Philippines	2005	Turtles	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	5	1-3
Harder et al (2008)	Philippines	2005	Eagles	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	30	1-3
Indab (2006)	Philippines	2005	Shark	CV: DC	Drop-off	M	Month	5	2-4
Bandara and Tisdell (2004)	Sri Lanka	2002	Elephants	CV: DC	Drop-off	V	Month	4	20-40
Bandara and Tisdell (2005)	Sri Lanka	2001	Elephants ^f	CV: DC	Interview	V	Month	6	34-41
Jianjun et al (2006) ^e	Thailand	2005	Turtles	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	5	3-8
Nabangchang (2006)	Thailand	2005	Multiple ^g	CV: DC	Interview	M&V	One-off	7	43-64

Jianjun et al (2006) ^e	Vietnam	2005	Turtles	CV: DC	Drop-off	M	Month	4	0.2-4
Thuy (2008)	Vietnam	2005	Rhino	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	2	13-14
Tuan et al (2008)	Cn,Pp,Th,Vn ^h	2005	Turtles	CV: DC	Drop-off	M&V	Month	16	1-5
Ninan and Sathyapalan (2005)*	India	2000	Elephants	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	5	341-1830
Total number of studies=16								129	

Notes: *4 of 5 observations from this study were excluded by the screening criterion (2x STD of mean) for the Level 1 data, but included in the Level 2 dataset (see Table B)

^a Year of data.

^b Payment vehicle: mandatory (M) or voluntary (V), Method: PL=Payment ladder.

^c Number of WTP values used in MA.

^d WTP values in US\$. The WTP formats are given as reported (i.e. lump sum, per month, per year, per visit, per individual or household). WTP values in local currencies are converted to US\$ using PPP adjustments; and values from different years are converted to 2006 prices using CPI.

^e Jianjun et al (2006) has four separate country case study components.

^f Abundance of elephants.

^g Multiple species: Dugong Dugong, elephants, rhinos, Irawaddy dolphin, tigers.

^h Multiple countries: China, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam

Table A2 Studies of nature and biodiversity conservation used in meta-analysis (MA) – Level 2

Name of references	Country	Year ^a	Habitat/service type	Method ^a	Mode	Vehicle	Payment format	# of values	WTP (USD)
Jakobsson and Dragun (2001)	Australia	2000	Flora & fauna	CV: DC, PC	Mail	M	Year	7	24-175
Bennett et al (1998)	Australia	1996	Wetlands	CV: DC	Mail	M	One-time	2	122-187
Bennett (1984)	Australia	1979	Nature reserve	CV: OE	Interview	M&V	One-time	1	33
Blamey et al (1999)	Australia	1999	Water	CA	Interview	M	Year	4	29-116
Cameron and Quiggin (1994)	Australia	1991	Parks	CV: IB	Interview	M		4	228-664
Carr and Mendelsohn (2003)	Australia	2000	Reefs	TCM	Interview		Year	1	391
Carson et al (1994)	Australia	1990	parks	CV: DBDC	Interview	M	Year	4	30-129
Hundloe (1990)	Australia	1986	Reefs	TCM	Interview		Year	1	8
Kuosmanen et al (2003)	Australia		Parks	TCM	Mail		Year	6	54-418
Lockwood and Carberry (1998)	Australia	1997	Vegetation	CM, CV	Mail	M	One-time	8	35-90
Lockwood and Tracy (1995)	Australia	1993	Parks	CV: OE	Mail	V	One-time	1	21
Lockwood (1999)	Australia	1995	Parks	CV: OE	Computer	V		4	14-450
Lockwood (1996)	Australia		Natural environm.	CV: DC	Mail	V		9	5-123
Loomis et al (1993)	Australia		Forests	CV: OE, DC	Mail		Year	6	34-89
Morrison et al (2002)	Australia	1997	Wetlands	CM	Mail	M	One-time	18	25-117

Nillesen et al (2005)	Australia		Parks	TCM	Mail		Year	1	86
Streever et al (1998)	Australia	1996	Wetlands	CV: OE	Mail	M		1	151
Greiner and Rolfe (2004)	Australia	2000	Parks	CV: OE	Interview	M	Visit	3	23-39
Campbell and Reid (2000)	Australia	1996	Fisheries	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	3	212-517
Flatley and Bennett (1995)	Vanuatu	1994	Forest	CV	Interview	V	One-time	2	33-36
Flatley and Bennett (1996)	Vanuatu	1994	Forest	CV	Interview	V	One-time	1	18
Chen et al (2004)	China	1999	Beaches	TCM	Interview	M	Visit	1	64
Day and Mourato (2002)	China	1997	Rivers	CV: DBDC	Interview	M		4	51-94
Gong (2004)	China	2002	National reserve	CV: BG	Interview	M		2	5-16
Guo et al. (2001)	China	1997	Ecosystem services	TCM	Interview		Visit	3	20-40
Jim and Chen (2006)	China	2003	Urban spaces	green CV: PC	Interview			1	15
Yaping (1998)	China	1996	Lakes	CV:OE& TCM	Interview	M	Visit	7	77-114
							Year		6-15
Zhongmin et al (2003)	China	2001	Ecosystem services	CV: PC	Interview	M&V	Year	3	8-87
Zhongmin et al (2006)	China	2003	Watershed	CV:DC, DBDC	Interview	M&V	Year	2	71
Wang et al (2007)	China	2006	Water	CV:DC	Interview	M	Month	2	
Xu et al (2007)	China	2002	Eco-services	CM	Interview	M	Year	7	51-134
Gundimeda and Kathuria (2003)	India	2003	Water	HPM	Interview			2	149-377

Hadker et al (1997)	India	1995	Parks	CV: DC	Interview	V	Month	2	6-8
Kohlin (2001)	India	1995	Woodlots	CV: DC, OE	Interview		Month	11	4-6
Maharana et al (2000)	India	1998	Lakes	CV: IB & TCM	Interview		Year	4	5-43
Nallathiga and Paravastu (2004)	India	1995	Rivers	CV: PC	Interview	M	Year	2	22-25
Butry and Pattanayak (2001)	Indonesia	1996	Forests	CV:OE, PC & MP	Interview	M	Year	3	23-2006
Pattanayak (2001)	Indonesia	1996	Ecological services	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	1	20
Pattanayak and Kramer (2001)	Indonesia	1996	Watershed	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	10	7-21
Walpole et al (2001)	Indonesia	1995	Parks	CV: DBDC	Interview	M	Year	1	78
Amirnejad et al (2006)	Iran	2004	Forests	CV: DC	Interview	M	Month	1	9
Fleischer and Tsur (2000)	Israel	1997	Landscapes	TCM	Interview		Year	2	179-367
Shechter et al (1998)	Israel	1993	Parks	CV: OE, DC	Telephone	V	One-time	12	28-57
Tsuge and Washida (2003)	Japan	1998	Natural areas of the Sea.	CV: DC	Internet		One-time	6	132-159
Nishizawa et al (2007)	Japan	2003	Eco-services	CVM:DC	Mail	M		2	13-14
Kwak et al (2003)	Korea	2001	Forests	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	4	3-6
Lee (1997)	Korea	1996	Nature-based tourism resources	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	2	12-13
Lee and Han (2002)	Korea	1999	Parks	CV: DC	Interview	M	Year	10	8-23

Lee and Mjelde (2007)	Korea	2005	Eco-services	CV:DC	Interview	M	Year	2	22-26
Lee and Chun (1999)	Korea	1994	Forest recreation	CV:DC	Mail	V	Year	3	445-787
Eom and Larson (2006)	Korea	2000	Water	CV	Interview	M	Year	2	35-62
Othman et al (2004)	Malaysia	1999	Forests	CM	Interview		Year	5	0.5-8
Yeo (2002)	Malaysia	1998	Parks	CV: OE	Interview		Year	6	6-12
Mourato (2002)	Malaysia	1997	Water	CV: PL	Interview	M	Month	2	3
Naylor and Drew (1998)	Micronesia	1996	Mangroves	CV	Interview	M	Month	4	174-556
Khan (2004)	Pakistan	2003	Parks	TCM	Interview		Visit	2	13-18
Manoka (2001)	P.N.Guinea	1999	Forests	CV: OE, DC	Mail	V	Year	10	11-101
Arin and Kramer (2002)	Philippines	1997	Marine sanctuary	CV: PC	Interview	M	Year	3	21-34
Calderon et al (2005)	Philippines	2003	Watersheds	CV: DC	Interview	M	Month	36	2-6
Choe et al (1996)	Philippines	1992	Water	CV: DC, BG, OE	Interview		Month	18	0-13
Pattanayak and Mercer (1998)	Philippines	1994	Soil	MP	Interview		Year	2	195-306
Rodelio and Subade (2007)	Philippines	2002	Reefs	CV: DC	Interview & drop-off	V	Year	12	15-83
Amponin et al (2007)	Philippines	2006	Watershed	CV:DC	Interview	M	month	9	3-6
Wei-Shiuen and Robert (2005)	Singapore	2002	Beaches	TCM & CV	Interview		Year	14	0.1-485
Bogahawatte (1999)	Sri Lanka	1997	Forests	MP	Interview	Year	Year	30	1-437

Ekanayake and Abeygunawardena (1994)	Sri Lanka	1992	Forests	CV: OE	Interview		Year	2	41-131
Chang and Ying (2005)	Taiwan	2001	Agri. lands	CV: DBDC	Telephone	M	Year	1	103
Chen (1998)	Taiwan		Agri. lands	CV:OE, DC	Mail		Month	6	0.3-7
Hammit et al (2001)	Taiwan	1993	Wetlands	CV: DC, OE	Interview	V	Year	4	46-173
Cushman (2004)	Thailand	2001	Beaches	CM	Interview	M	Year	5	17-526
Isangkura (1998)	Thailand	1996	Parks	CR & CV: OE	Interview	M	Year	9	2-28
Seenprachawong (2008)	Thailand	2002	Coastal ecosystem	CM	Interview	V	Year	5	9-188
Seenprachawong (2001)	Thailand	2000	Reefs	CV:DC &TCM	Interview	V	Year	3	31-555
Tapvong and Kruavan (1999)	Thailand	1998	Rivers	CV: DC	Interview	M	Month	2	9-10
Pham and Tran (2001)	Vietnam	2000	Reefs	CV:PC & TCM	Interview	M	Year	5	7-170
Pham et al (2005)	Vietnam	2003	Reefs	TCM	Interview	M	Year	4	17-390
				CV					
Phuong and Gopalakrishnan (2004)	Vietnam	2001	Water	CV: PC	Interview	M	Year	7	4-40
Do (2007)	Vietnam	2006	Wetlands	CM	Interview		Year	2	4-12
Nam et al (2001)	Vietnam	1999	Forests	CV & MP	Interview	M	Year	9	24-1807
Total number of observations*								421	

Notes: * The total number of observations using the least strict screening criterion ($WTP > 0$ and within $2x$ STD of the mean), i.e. 129 (Level 1) + 421 (Level 2) = 550 observations. Blank space means that information was not reported in the study. See also notes to Table A above. ^a Method: BG = Bidding game, PL = Payment ladder, MP = Market price approach

2 References of studies included in the meta-analysis

- Amirnejad, H., Khalilian, S., Assareh, M.H. and Ahmadian, M. (2006). Estimating the existence value of north forests of Iran by using a contingent valuation method, *Ecological Economics* 58, 665-675.
- Amponin, J.A.R., Bennagen, M.E.C., Hess, S. and Cruz, J.D.S.d. (2007). Willingness to pay for watershed protection by domestic water users in Tuguegarao City, Philippines, *PREM 07/06 Working paper*.
- Arin, T. and Kramer, R.A. (2002). Divers' willingness to pay to visit marine sanctuaries: an exploratory study, *Ocean Coastal Manage.* 45, 171-183.
- Bandara, D. and Tisdell, C. (2004). The net benefit of saving the Asian elephant: a policy and contingent valuation study, *Ecological Economics* 48, 93- 107.
- Bandara, R. and Tisdell, C. (2005). Changing Abundance of Elephants and Willingness to Pay for their Conservation, *Journal of Environmental Management* 76, 47-59.
- Bennett, J., Morrison, M. and Blamey, R. (1998). Testing the validity of responses to contingent valuation questioning, *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 42, 131-148.
- Bennett, J.W. (1984). Using Direct Questioning to Value the Existence Benefits of Preserved Natural Areas *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 28, 136-152.
- Blamey, R., Gordon, J. and Chapman, R. (1999). Choice Modelling: Assessing the Environmental Values of Water Supply Options, *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 43, 337 - 357.
- Bogahawatte, C. (1999). Forestry Policy, Non-timber Forest Products and the Rural Economy in the Wet Zone Forests in Sri Lanka, *Research report, EPPSEA*.
- Butry, D.T. and Pattanayak, S.K. (2001). Economic Impacts of Tropical Forest Conservation: The Case of Logger Households around Ruteng Park, *Working Paper 01-01, Environment and Natural Resource Economics Program*. Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.
- Calderon, M.M., Camacho, L.D., Carandang, M.G., Dizon, J.T., Rebugio, L.L. and Tolentino, N.L. (2005). A Water User Fee For Households in Metro Manila, Philippines, *EPPSEA research report, No. 2005-RR2*.
- Cameron, T.A. and Quiggin, J. (1994). Estimation Using Contingent Valuation Data From A Dichotomous Choice With Follow-Up Questionnaire, *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.* 27, 218-234.
- Campbell, H.P. and Reid, C.R.M. (2000). Consumption externalities in commercial fishery: The Queensland beam trawl fishery, *Economi Record* 76, 1-14.
- Carr, L. and Mendelsohn, R. (2003). Valuing Coral Reefs: A Travel Cost Analysis of the Great Barrier Reef, *Ambio* 32, 353-357.
- Carson, R.T., Wilks, L. and Imber, D. (1994). Valuing The Preservation Of Australia Kakadu Conservation Zone, *Oxf. Econ. Pap.-New Ser.* 46, 727-749.
- Chang, K. and Ying, Y. (2005). External Benefits of Preserving Agricultural Land: Taiwan's Rice Fields, *The Social Science Journal* 42, 285-293.
- Chen, Y. (1998). Biodiversity in the Framework of Ecological Economics, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin Milwaukee.
- Chen, W., H. Hong, Y. Liu, L. Zhang, X. Hou, M. Raymond (2004), Recreation demand and economic value: An application of travel cost method for Xiamen Island, China *Economic Review* 15 (2004) 398-406
- Choe, K.A., Whittington, D. and Lauria, D.T. (1996). The economic benefits of surface water quality improvements in developing countries: A case study of Davao, Philippines, *Land Econ.* 72, 519-537.

- Cushman, C. (2004). External costs from increased island visitation: case study from Southern Thailand, *Working paper, Department of Resource Economics*. University of Massachusetts.
- Day, B. and Mourato, S. (2002). Valuing River Water Quality in China in Pearce, D., Pearce, C. and Palmer, C. (eds.), *Valuing the Environment in Developing Countries: Case Studies*. Edward Elgar.
- Do, N.T. (2007). *Impacts of dykes on wetland values in Vietnam's mekong river delta: a case study in the plain of reeds*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Ekanayake, E.R.M. and Abeygunawardena, P. (1994). Valuation of Conservation Commodity of the Sinharaja Forest: Towards Total Economic Value, *Sri Lanka Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2, 115-129.
- Eom, Y.-S. and Larson, D.M. (2006). Valuing housework time from willingness to spend time and money for environmental quality improvements, *Review of the Economics of the Household* 4, 205-227.
- Flatley, G. and Bennet, J. (1995). International Values of Tropical Forest Conservation: A Cross-cultural Contingent Valuation Experiment, *Paper presented to the 39th Australian Agricultural Economic Society Annual Conference*, Perth, Western Australia, .
- Flatley, G.W. and Bennet, J.W. (1996). Using Contingent Valuation to Determine Australian Tourists' Values for Forest Conservation in Vanuatu, *Economic Analysis and Policy* 26, 111-127.
- Fleischer, A. and Y. Tsur (2000), Measuring the recreational value of agricultural landscape, *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 27 (3) (2000) pp. 385-398
- Gong, Y. (2004). Distribution of Benefits and Costs among Stakeholders of a Protected Area: An Empirical Study from China, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Greiner, R. and Rolfe, J. (2004). Estimating consumer surplus and elasticity of demand of tourist visitation to a region in North Queensland using contingent valuation, *Tourism Economics* 10, 317-328.
- Gundimeda, H. and Kathuria, V. (2003). Estimation of Economic Value of Water scarcity and quality in Chennai, India: The Hedonic Approach, *South Asian Network of Economic Initiatives Project*.
- Guo, Z., Xiao, X., Gan, Y. and Zheng, Y. (2001). Ecosystem functions, services and their values - a case study in Xingshan County of China, *Ecological Economics* 38, 141-154.
- Hadker, N., Sharma, S., David, A. and Muraleedharan, T.R. (1997). Willingness-to-pay for Borivli National Park: Evidence from a contingent valuation, *Ecol. Econ.* 21, 105-122.
- Hammit, J.K., Liu, J.-T. and Liu, J.-L. (2001). Contingent Valuation of a Taiwanese Wetland, *Environment and Development Economics* 6, 259-268.
- Harder, D.S., Labao, R. and Santos, F.I. (2008). Saving the Philippine eagles: How much will this cost and are Filipinos willing to pay for it? in Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (ed.), *Willingness to pay for the conservation of endangered species in four Asian countries*. EEPSEA, Singapore, pp 77-120.
- Hundloe, T. (1990). Measuring the Value of the Great Barrier Reef, *Australian Parks and Recreation* 26, 11-15.
- Indab, A.L. (2006). Rationalizing WTP for whale shark conservation in Sorsogon province. in Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (ed.), *Willingness to pay for the conservation of endangered species in four Asian countries*. EEPSEA, pp 55-75.
- Isangkura, A. (1998). Environmental Valuation: An Entrance Fee System for National Parks in Thailand, *Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia*. IDRC
- Jakobsson, K.M. and Dragun, A.K. (2001). The Worth of a Possum: Valuing Species with the Contingent Valuation Method, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 21, 287-302.
- Jianjun, J., Indab, A., Nabangchang, O., Thuy, T.D., Harder, D. and Subade, R. (2006). Willingness to Pay for Marine Turtle Conservation: A Cross-country Comparison in Asia Paper presented at the Third world congress of Environmental and Natural resource economists, Kyoto, Japan, 2006.

- Jianjun, J., Zhishi, W. and Xuemin, L. (2008). Valuing black-faced spoonbill conservation in Macao: A policy and contingent valuation study, *Ecological Economics* 68, 328-335.
- Jim, C.Y. and Chen, W.Y. (2006). Recreation - Amenity Use and Contingent Valuation of Urban Greenspaces in Guangzhou, China, *Landscape and Urban Planning* 75, 81-96.
- Khan, H. (2004). Demand of eco-tourism: estimating recreational benefits from the Margalla Hills national park in the northern Pakistan, *SANDEE working paper, No. 5-04*.
- Kohlin, G. (2001). Contingent valuation in project planning and evaluation: the case of social forestry in Orissa, India, *Environment and Development Economics* 6, 237-258.
- Kontoleon, A. and Swanson, T. (2003). The Willingness to Pay for Property Rights for the Giant Panda: Can a Charismatic Species Be an Instrument for Nature Conservation?, *Land Economics* 79, 483-499.
- Kuosmanen, T., Nillesen, E. and Wesseler, J. (2003). Does Ignoring Multi-Destination Trips in the Travel Cost Method Cause a Systematic Downward Bias?, *Discussion Paper No. 9 2003, Mansholt Graduate School*.
- Kwak, S.J., Yoo, S.H. and Han, S.Y. (2003). Estimating the public's value for urban forest in the Seoul metropolitan area of Korea: A contingent valuation study, *Urban Studies* 40, 2207-2221.
- Lee, C.-K. and Han, S.-Y. (2002). Estimating the use and preservation values of national parks' tourism resources using a contingent valuation methods, *Tourism Management* 23, 531-540.
- Lee, C.-K. and Mjelde, J.W. (2007). Valuation of ecotourism resources using a contingent valuation method: The case of the Korean DMZ, *Ecological Economics* 63, 511-520.
- Lee, C.K. (1997). Valuation of nature-based tourism resources using dichotomous choice contingent valuation method, *Tourism Management* 18, 587-591.
- Lee, H.-C. and Chun, H.-S. (1999). Valuing environmental quality change on recreational hunting in Korea: A contingent valuation analysis, *Journal of Environmental Management* 57, 11-20.
- Lockwood, M. (1996). Non-compensatory preference structures in non-market valuation of natural area policy, *Aust. J. Agric. Econ.* 40, 85-101.
- Lockwood, M. (1999). Preference structures, property rights, and paired comparisons, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 13, 107-122.
- Lockwood, M. and Carberry, D. (1998). Stated Preference Surveys of Remnant Native Vegetation Conservation. Johnstone Centre, Albury, NSW.
- Lockwood, M. and Tracy, K. (1995). Nonmarket Economic Valuation Of An Urban Recreation Park, *Journal of Leisure Research* 27, 155-167.
- Loomis, J., Lockwood, M. and Delacy, T. (1993). Some Empirical-Evidence On Embedding Effects In Contingent Valuation Of Forest Protection, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 25, 45-55.
- Maharana, I., Rai, S.C. and Sharma, E. (2000). Valuing ecotourism in a sacred lake of the Sikkim Himalaya, India, *Environmental Conservation* 27, 269-277.
- Manoka, B. (2001). Existence Value: A Re-appraisal and Cross-Cultural Comparison, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Morrison, M., Bennett, J., Blamey, R. and Louviere, J. (2002). Choice modeling and tests of benefit transfer, *Am. J. Agr. Econ.* 84, 161-170.
- Mourato, S. (2002). Valuing Improvements to Sanitation in Malaysia. in Pearce, D., Pearce, C. and Palmer, C. (eds.), *Valuing the Environment in Developing Countries: Case Studies*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp 67 - 113.
- Nabangchang, O. (2006). Motivations for Charitable Behavior for Protection of Wildlife and Endangered Species of Thailand, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).

- Nallathiga, R. and Paravastu, R.B. (2004). Benefit Estimation of River Water Quality Conservation Using Contingent Valuation Survey: a Case-Study in the Yamuna River Sub-basin, *European Association of Environmental and Resource Economics Thirteenth Annual Conference*, Budapest, Hungary.
- Nam, M.V., Nhan, N.T., Trinh, B.V. and Thong, P.L. (2001). Forest Management Systems in the Mekong River Delta, Vietnam, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Naylor, R. and Drew, M. (1998). Policy Options: Valuing mangrove resources in Kosrae, Micronesia, *Environment and Development Economics* 3, 471-490.
- Nillesen, E., Wesseler, J. and Cook, A. (2005). Estimating the Recreation-Use Value for Hiking in Bellenden Ker National Park, Australia, *Environmental Management* 36, 311-316.
- Ninan, K.N. and Sathyapalan, J. (2005). The economics of biodiversity conservation: a study of a coffee growing region in the Western Ghats of India, *Ecological Economics* 55, 61-72.
- Nishizawa, E., Kurokawa, T. and Yabe, M. (2007). Policies and resident's willingness to pay for restoring the ecosystem damaged by alien fish in Lake Biwa, Japan, *Environmental Science & Policy* 9, 448-456.
- Othman, J., Bennet, J. and Blamey, R. (2004). Environmental values and resource management options: a choice modelling experience in Malaysia, *Environment and Development Economics* 9, 803-824.
- Pattanayak, S. K. (2001), How Green Are These Valleys? Combining Revealed and Stated Preference Methods to Account for Ecosystem Costs of Deforestation, Working paper, February 2001, Research Triangle Institute.
- Pattanayak, S.K. and Kramer, R.A. (2001). Pricing ecological services: Willingness to pay for draught mitigation from watershed protection in eastern Indonesia, *Water Resour. Res.* 37, 771-778.
- Pattanayak, S.K. and Mercer, D.E. (1998). Valuing soil conservation benefits of agroforestry: contour hedgerows in the Eastern Visayas, Philippines, *Agricultural Economics* 18, 31-46.
- Pham, K.N., Son, T.V.H. and Cesar, H. (2005). Economic valuation of the Honmun marine protected area, lessons learn for other marine parks in Vietnam, *PREM online working paper (15/13)*, December 2005.
- Pham, K.N. and Tran, V.H.S. (2001). Recreation Value of the Coral-surrounded Hon Mun Islands in Vietnam, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Phuong, D.M. and Gopalakrishnan, C. (2004). Optimal Management of Water for Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture, *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 20, 493-506.
- Rodelio, F. and Subade, R.F. (2007). Mechanisms to capture economic values of marine biodiversity: The case of Tubbataha Reefs UNESCO World Heritage Site, Philippines, *Marine Policy* 31, 135-142.
- Seenprachawong, U. (2001). An Economic Analysis of Coral Reefs in the Andaman Sea of Thailand, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Seenprachawong, U. (2008). An Economic Valuation of Coastal Ecosystems in Phang Nga Bay, Thailand, *NIDA Economic Review* 3.
- Shechter, M., Reiser, B. and Zaitsev, N. (1998). Measuring Passive Use Value: Pledges, Donations and CV Responses in Connection with an Important Natural Resource, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 12, 457-478.
- Streever, W., Callaghan-Perry, J.M., Searles, A., Stevens, T. and Svoboda, P. (1998). Public attitudes and values for wetland conservation in New South Wales, Australia, *Journal of Environmental Management* 54, 1-14.
- Tapvong, C. and Kruavan, J. (1999). Water Quality Improvements: A Contingent Valuation Study of the Chao Phraya River, *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).

- Thuy, T.D. (2008). Willingness to Pay for Conservation of Vietnamese Rhinoceros. in Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (ed.), *Willingness to pay for the conservation of endangered species in four Asian countries*. EEPSEA.
- Tisdell, C., Wilson, C. and Nantha, H.S. (2005). Policies for Saving a Rare Australian Glider: Economics and Ecology, *Biological Conservation* 123, 237-248.
- Tsuge, T. and Washida, T. (2003). Economic valuation of the Seto Inland Sea by using an Internet CV survey, *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 47, 230-236.
- Tuan, T.H., Thuy, T.D., Jianjun, J., Indab, A. and Nabangchang, O. (2008). WTP for Marine Turtle Conservation in Four Countries: Benefit Transfer Testing. Final report submitted to EEPSEA, July, 2008.
- Walpole, M.J., Goodwin, H.J. and Ward, K.G.R. (2001). Pricing policy for tourism in protected areas: Lessons from Komodo National Park, Indonesia, *Conserv. Biol.* 15, 218-227.
- Wang, X., Bennett, J., Xie, C., Zhang, Z. and Liang, D. (2007). Estimating non-market environmental benefits of the conversion of cropland to forest and grassland program: A choice modelling approach, *Ecological Economics* 63, 114-125.
- Wei-Shiuen, N. and Robert, M. (2005). The impact of sea level rise on Singapore, *Environment and Development Economics* 1002, 201-215.
- Xu, Z.M., Cheng, G.D., Bennet, J., Zhang, Z.Q., Long, A.H. and Kunio, H. (2007). Choice modeling and its application to managing the Ejina Region, China, *Journal of Arid Environments* 69, 331-343.
- Yaping, D. (1998). The Value of Improved Water Quality for Recreation in East Lake, Wuhan, China: Application of Contingent Valuation and Travel Cost Methods, , *Research Report*. Published by Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA).
- Yeo, B.H. (2002). Valuing a Marine Park in Malaysia. in Pearce, D., Pearce, C. and Palmer, C. (eds.), *Valuing the Environment in Developing Countries: Case Studies*. Edward Elgar.
- Zhongmin, X., Guodong, C., Zhiqiang, Z., Zhiyong, S. and Loomis, J. (2003). Applying Contingent Valuation in China to Measure the Total Economic Value of Restoring Ecosystem Services in Ejina Region, *Ecological Economics* 44, 345-358.
- Zhongmin, X., Loomis, J., Zhiqiang, Z. and Hamamura, K. (2006). Evaluating the performance of different willingness to pay question formats for valuing environmental restoration in rural China, *Environment and Development Economics* 11, 585-601.

References (main paper)

Bandara, R. and Tisdell, C. (2005). Changing Abundance of Elephants and Willingness to Pay for their Conservation, *Journal of Environmental Management* 76, 47-59.

Barrio, M. and Loureiro, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of contingent valuation forest studies, *Ecological Economics* 69, 1023-1030.

Bateman, I.J., Carson, R.T., Day, B., Hanemann, W.M., Hanley, N., Hett, T., Jones-Lee, M., Loomes, G., Mourato, S., Ozdemiroglu, E., Pearce, D.W., Sugden, R. and Swanson, T. (2002). *Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques: A Manual*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 480pp.

Bateman, I.J. and Jones, A.P. (2003). Contrasting conventional with multi-level modeling approaches to meta-analysis: Expectation consistency in UK woodland recreation values, *Land Economics* 79, 235-258.

Bergstrom, J.C. and Taylor, L.O. (2006). Using meta-analysis for benefits transfer: Theory and practice, *Ecological Economics* 60, 351-360.

Brander, L.M., Florax, R.J.G.M. and Vermaat, J.E. (2006). The Empirics of Wetland Valuation: A Comprehensive Summary and a Meta-Analysis of the Literature, *Environmental & Resource Economics* 33, 223-250.

Brander, L.M., van Beukering, P. and Cesar, H. (2007). The recreational value of coral reefs: a meta-analysis, *Ecological Economics* 63, 209-218.

Carson, R.T., Flores, N.E., Martin, K.M. and Wright, J.L. (1996). Contingent valuation and revealed preference methodologies: Comparing the estimates for quasi-public goods, *Land Economics* 72, 80-99.

Champ, P.A., Flores, N.E., Brown, T.C. and Chivers, J. (2002). Contingent Valuation and Incentives, *Land Economics* 78, 591–604.

Desvousges, W.H., Johnson, F.R. and Banzhaf, H.S. (1998). Environmental policy analysis with limited information: Principles and applications of the transfer method. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Engel, S. (2002). Benefit Function Transfer versus Meta-analysis as Policy-Making Tools: A Comparison. in Florax, R.J.G.M., Nijkamp, P. and Willis, K.G. (eds.), *Comparative environmental economic assessment*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, U.K. and Northampton, Mass., pp 133-153.

Freeman, A.M.I. (2003). *The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values*. Resource for the Future Press.

Fromm, O. (2000). Ecological structure and functions of biodiversity as elements of its total economic value, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 16, 303-328.

Glass, G.V., McGaw, B. and Smith, M.L. (1981). *Meta-analysis in Social Research*. Sage, Beverly Hills.

Hoehn, J.P. (2006). Methods to address selection effects in the meta regression and transfer of ecosystem values, *Ecological Economics* 60, 389-398.

Jacobsen, J.B., Boiesen, J.H., Thorsen, B.J. and Strange, N. (2008). What's in a name? The use of quantitative measures versus 'Iconised' species when valuing biodiversity, *Environmental & Resource economics* 39: 247-263.

Jacobsen, J.B. and Hanley, N. (2009). Are there income effects on global willingness to pay for biodiversity conservation, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 43, 137-160.

Jianjun, J., Zhishi, W. and Xuemin, L. (2008). Valuing black-faced spoonbill conservation in Macao: A policy and contingent valuation study, *Ecological Economics* 68, 328-335.

Johnston, R.J., Besedin, E.Y., Iovanna, R., Miller, C.J., Wardwell, R.F. and Ranson, M.H. (2005). Systematic variation in willingness to pay for aquatic resource improvements and implications for benefit transfer: a meta-analysis, *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 53, 221-248.

Johnston, R.J., Besedin, E.Y. and Ranson, M.H. (2006). Characterizing the effects of valuation methodology in function-based benefits transfer, *Ecological Economics* 60, 407-419.

Kriström, B. and Riera, P. (1996). Is the income elasticity of environmental improvements less than one?, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 7, 45-55.

Lindhjem, H. (2007). 20 Years of stated preference valuation of non-timber benefits from Fennoscandian forests: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Forest Economics* 12, 251-277.

Lindhjem, H. and Navrud, S. (2008). How reliable are meta-analyses for international benefit transfers?, *Ecological Economics* 66, 425-435.

Lindhjem, H. and Navrud, S. (2009). Asking for Individual or Household Willingness to Pay for Environmental Goods: Implication for aggregate welfare measures. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 43, 11-29.

Lindhjem, H. and Navrud, S. (2011a). Are Internet surveys an alternative to face-to-face interviews in contingent valuation?, *Ecological Economics* 70: 1628-1637.

Lindhjem, H. and Navrud (2011b). Using Internet in Stated Preference Surveys:

A review and comparison of survey modes. *International Review of Environmental and Resource Economics*. Forthcoming

Metrick, A. and Weitzman, M.L. (1996). Patterns of behavior in endangered species preservation, *Land Economics* 72, 1-16.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Synthesis Report. Island Press, Washington DC.

Moeltner, K., Boyle, K. and Paterson, R.W. (2007). Meta-analysis and benefit transfer for resource valuation - addressing classical challenges with Bayesian modeling, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 53, 250-269.

Navrud, S. and Ready, R., (eds.) (2007). *Environmental Value Transfer: Issues and Methods*

Nelson, J.P. and Kennedy, P.E. (2009). The Use (and Abuse) of Meta-Analysis in Environmental and Natural Resource Economics: An Assessment, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 42, 345-377.

Pearce, D. (2005). Economists and biodiversity conservation: What can we contribute?, EAERE, Bremen.

Richardson, L. and Loomis, J. (2009). The total economic value of threatened, endangered and rare species: An updated meta-analysis, *Ecological Economics* 68, 1535-1548.

Rosenberger, R. and Loomis, J. (2000b). Panel stratification in meta-analysis of economic studies: an investigation of its effects in the recreation valuation literature, *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 32, 131-149.

Rosenberger, R.S. and Johnston, R.J. (2009). Selection effects in meta-analysis and benefit transfer: Avoiding unintended consequences, *Land Economics* 85, 410-428.

Rosenberger, R.S. and Loomis, J.B. (2000a). Using meta-analysis for benefit transfer: In-sample convergent validity tests of an outdoor recreation database, *Water Resources Research* 36, 1097-1107.

Schläpfer, F. (2006). Survey protocol and income effects in the contingent valuation of public goods: A meta-analysis, *Ecological Economics* 57, 415-429.

Shrestha, R.K. and Loomis, J.B. (2003). Meta-Analytic Benefit Transfer of Outdoor Recreation Economic Values: Testing Out-of-Sample Convergent Validity, *Environmental & Resource Economics* 25, 79-100.

Smith, V.K. and Pattanayak, S.K. (2002). Is Meta-Analysis a Noah's Ark for Non-Market Valuation?, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 22, 271-296.

Stanley, T.D. and Jarrel, S.D. (2005). Meta-Regression Analysis: A Quantitative Method of Literature Surveys, *Journal of Economic Surveys* 19, 299-308.

Stapler, R.W. and Johnston, R.J. (2009). Meta-analysis, benefit transfer, and methodological covariates: Implications for transfer error, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 42, 227-246.

Tuan, T.H. and Lindhjem, H. (2009). Meta-analysis of nature conservation values in Asia & Oceania: Data heterogeneity and benefit transfer issues. in Lindhjem, H. (ed.), *Methodological issues in meta-analysis, benefit transfer and environmental valuation*. PhD Thesis. Department of Economics and Resource Management, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, As.

USEPA (2006). Report of the EPA work group on VSL meta-analysis, Report NCEE-0494. National Center for Environmental Economics, EPA, Washington.

Van Houtven, G., Powers, J. and Pattanayak, S.K. (2007). Valuing water quality improvements using meta-analysis: Is the glass half-full or half-empty for national policy analysis?, *Resource and Energy Economics* 29, 206-228.

Wiser, R. (2007). Using contingent valuation to explore willingness to pay for renewable energy: a comparison of collective and voluntary payment vehicles, *Ecological Economics* 62, 419-432.

Zandersen, M. and Tol, R.S.J. (2009). A Meta-Analysis of Forest Recreation Values in Europe, *Journal of Forest Economics* 15, 109-130.