Introduction to Contingent Valuation Using Stata

Alejandro López-Feldman

CIDE

May 3 2013

 A big challenge to do cost-benefit analysis is the need to place monetary values on non-marketed goods and services.

- A big challenge to do cost-benefit analysis is the need to place monetary values on non-marketed goods and services.
- Valuation methods for non-marketed goods can be divided in:

- A big challenge to do cost-benefit analysis is the need to place monetary values on non-marketed goods and services.
- Valuation methods for non-marketed goods can be divided in:
 - Indirect (e.g., travel cost method, hedonic pricing, averting behavior)

- A big challenge to do cost-benefit analysis is the need to place monetary values on non-marketed goods and services.
- Valuation methods for non-marketed goods can be divided in:
 - Indirect (e.g., travel cost method, hedonic pricing, averting behavior)
 - Direct (e.g., contingent valuation, choice modelling)

- A big challenge to do cost-benefit analysis is the need to place monetary values on non-marketed goods and services.
- Valuation methods for non-marketed goods can be divided in:
 - Indirect (e.g., travel cost method, hedonic pricing, averting behavior)
 - Direct (e.g., contingent valuation, choice modelling)
- Contingent valuation implies asking to a sample of the population about their willingness to pay.

 Originally contingent valuation was basically an intellectual exercise with limited practical relevance.

- Originally contingent valuation was basically an intellectual exercise with limited practical relevance.
- This changed after the State of Alaska requested a contingent valuation exercise to get an estimate of the non-use value loss associated with the Exxon Valdez oil spill (Carson et al., 1992).

- Originally contingent valuation was basically an intellectual exercise with limited practical relevance.
- This changed after the State of Alaska requested a contingent valuation exercise to get an estimate of the non-use value loss associated with the Exxon Valdez oil spill (Carson et al., 1992).
- Widely used and discussed in environmental economics literature.
- There is still debate about its validity:
 - Carson (2012). Contingent Valuation: A Practical Alternative when Prices Aren't Available. Journal of Economic Perspectives
 - Hausman (2012). Contingent Valuation: From Dubious to Hopeless. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*

 The objective of this presentation is to show how to econometrically analyse data obtained from a contingent valuation survey using Stata.

- The objective of this presentation is to show how to econometrically analyse data obtained from a contingent valuation survey using Stata.
- One of the most common ways to elicit WTP using contingent valuation is to use a dichotomous choice question.

- The objective of this presentation is to show how to econometrically analyse data obtained from a contingent valuation survey using Stata.
- One of the most common ways to elicit WTP using contingent valuation is to use a dichotomous choice question.
- In the simplest case the individual is asked: will you be willing to pay t for the program that I just described?

- The objective of this presentation is to show how to econometrically analyse data obtained from a contingent valuation survey using Stata.
- One of the most common ways to elicit WTP using contingent valuation is to use a dichotomous choice question.
- In the simplest case the individual is asked: will you be willing to pay t for the program that I just described?
- The dichotomous answer ($y_i = 0$ if the individual answers no and $y_i = 1$ if the answer is yes), given a question about paying a previously determined amount (t_i , that varies randomly across individuals), allows us to to estimate the WTP.

Estimating WTP (I)

Estimating WTP (I)

 It is possible to estimate the WTP assuming that it can be modelled as the following linear function:

$$WTP_i(z_i, u_i) = z_i \beta + u_i \tag{1}$$

Estimating WTP (I)

 It is possible to estimate the WTP assuming that it can be modelled as the following linear function:

$$WTP_i(z_i, u_i) = z_i \beta + u_i \tag{1}$$

- where z_i is a vector of explanatory variables, β is a vector of parameters and u_i is an error term.
- It is expected that the individual will answer yes when his WTP is greater than the suggested amount, i.e., when $WTP_i > t_i$.

Estimating WTP (II)

WTP from the previous model can be estimated using probit with some minor modifications or directly using the command singleb (see López-Feldman (2013a) or López-Feldman (2013b) for details).

Estimating WTP (II)

- WTP from the previous model can be estimated using probit with some minor modifications or directly using the command singleb (see López-Feldman (2013a) or López-Feldman (2013b) for details).
- A problem with this method is that each individual provides very few information with respect to her WTP.
- Hanemman et al. (1991) suggest an alternative to improve efficiency of the estimation.

Estimating WTP (II)

- WTP from the previous model can be estimated using probit with some minor modifications or directly using the command singleb (see López-Feldman (2013a) or López-Feldman (2013b) for details).
- A problem with this method is that each individual provides very few information with respect to her WTP.
- Hanemman et al. (1991) suggest an alternative to improve efficiency of the estimation.
- The alternative is known as the double-bounded model or dichotomous question with follow-up.

 If the individual answers yes to the first question he is asked about his willingness to pay for a higher amount.

- If the individual answers yes to the first question he is asked about his willingness to pay for a higher amount.
- If he answers no to the first question a lower amount is offered.

- If the individual answers yes to the first question he is asked about his willingness to pay for a higher amount.
- If he answers no to the first question a lower amount is offered.
- Let's look more carefully at the information that is gathered with this strategy.

- If the individual answers yes to the first question he is asked about his willingness to pay for a higher amount.
- If he answers no to the first question a lower amount is offered.
- Let's look more carefully at the information that is gathered with this strategy.
- Let's call the first bid amount t^1 and the second one t^2 , then each individual will be in one of the following categories:

- If the individual answers yes to the first question he is asked about his willingness to pay for a higher amount.
- If he answers no to the first question a lower amount is offered.
- Let's look more carefully at the information that is gathered with this strategy.
- Let's call the first bid amount t^1 and the second one t^2 , then each individual will be in one of the following categories:
 - 1 The individual answers yes to the first question and no to the second, then $t^2 > t^1$. In this case we can infer that $t^1 \le WTP < t^2$.
 - 2 The individual answers yes to the first question and yes to the second, then $t^2 \le WTP < \infty$.
 - The individual answers no to the first question and yes to the second, then $t^2 < t^1$. In this case we have that $t^2 \le WTP < t^1$.
 - The individual answers no to the first and second questions, then we have that $0 < WTP < t^2$.

Econometric estimation using the double-bounded model

• Let's define y_i^1 and y_i^2 as the dichotomous variables that capture the response to the first and second closed questions, then the probability that an individual answers yes to the first question and no to the second can be expressed as:

Econometric estimation using the double-bounded model

- Let's define y_i^1 and y_i^2 as the dichotomous variables that capture the response to the first and second closed questions, then the probability that an individual answers yes to the first question and no to the second can be expressed as:
- $Pr(y_i^1 = 1, y_i^2 = 0|z_i) = Pr(s, n).$

Econometric estimation using the double-bounded model

- Let's define y_i^1 and y_i^2 as the dichotomous variables that capture the response to the first and second closed questions, then the probability that an individual answers yes to the first question and no to the second can be expressed as:
- $Pr(y_i^1 = 1, y_i^2 = 0|z_i) = Pr(s, n).$
- Given this and under the assumption that $WTP_i(z_i, u_i) = z_i'\beta + u_i$ and $u_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, we have that the probability of each one of the four cases is given by:

1 $y_i^1 = 1$ and $y_i^2 = 0$.

$$Pr(s,n) = Pr(t^{1} \leq WTP < t^{2})$$

$$= Pr(t^{1} \leq z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} < t^{2})$$

$$= Pr\left(\frac{t^{1} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma} \leq \frac{u_{i}}{\sigma} < \frac{t^{2} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= \Phi\left(\frac{t^{2} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t^{1} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right)$$

• Therefore, using symmetry of the normal distribution we have that:

$$Pr(s,n) = \Phi\left(z_i'\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^1}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(z_i'\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^2}{\sigma}\right)$$
 (2)

2 $y_i^1 = 1$ and $y_i^2 = 1$.

$$Pr(s, s) = Pr(WTP > t^{1}, WTP \ge t^{2})$$

= $Pr(z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} > t^{1}, z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} \ge t^{2})$

• Here by definition $t^2 > t^1$ and then $Pr(z_i'\beta + u_i > t^1|z_i'\beta + u_i \geq t^2) = 1$ which implies:

$$Pr(s, s) = Pr(u_i \ge t^2 - z_i'\beta)$$

= $1 - \Phi\left(\frac{t^2 - z_i'\beta}{\sigma}\right)$

so by symmetry we have:

$$Pr(s,s) = \Phi\left(z_i'\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^2}{\sigma}\right)$$
 (3)

3 $y_i^1 = 0$ and $y_i^2 = 1$.

$$= Pr(t^{2} \leq z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} < t^{1})$$

$$= Pr\left(\frac{t^{2} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma} \leq \frac{u_{i}}{\sigma} < \frac{t^{1} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= \Phi\left(\frac{t^{1} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t^{2} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$Pr(s, n) = \Phi\left(z'_{i}\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{2}}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(z'_{i}\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{1}}{\sigma}\right)$$

 $Pr(s, n) = Pr(t^2 < WTP < t^1)$

(4)

 $y_i^1 = 0$ and $y_i^2 = 0$.

$$Pr(n,n) = Pr(WTP < t^{1}, WTP < t^{2})$$

$$= Pr(z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} < t^{1}, z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} < t^{2})$$

$$= Pr(z'_{i}\beta + u_{i} < t^{2})$$

$$= \Phi\left(\frac{t^{2} - z'_{i}\beta}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$Pr(n,n) = 1 - \Phi\left(z_i'\frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^2}{\sigma}\right)$$
 (5)

Maximum likelihood for the double-bounded model

Maximum likelihood for the double-bounded model

- Contrary to the single-bounded case, equations (2) to (5) do not correspond directly to a pre-existent model.
- In order to proceed with the estimation the following likelihood function is used to estimate β and σ

Maximum likelihood for the double-bounded model

- Contrary to the single-bounded case, equations (2) to (5) do not correspond directly to a pre-existent model.
- In order to proceed with the estimation the following likelihood function is used to estimate β and σ

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_{i}^{sn} \ln \left(\Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{1}}{\sigma} \right) - \Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{2}}{\sigma} \right) \right) \\ + d_{i}^{ss} \ln \left(\Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{2}}{\sigma} \right) \right) \\ + d_{i}^{ns} \ln \left(\Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{2}}{\sigma} \right) - \Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{1}}{\sigma} \right) \right) \\ + d_{i}^{nn} \ln \left(1 - \Phi \left(z_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\beta}{\sigma} - \frac{t^{2}}{\sigma} \right) \right) \end{split}$$

• The command doubleb described in López-Feldman (2013a) and López-Feldman (2013b) uses maximum likelihood estimation to get estimates for β and σ that can then be used to estimate *WTP*.

- The command doubleb described in López-Feldman (2013a) and López-Feldman (2013b) uses maximum likelihood estimation to get estimates for β and σ that can then be used to estimate *WTP*.
- The basic syntax of the command is:

- The command doubleb described in López-Feldman (2013a) and López-Feldman (2013b) uses maximum likelihood estimation to get estimates for β and σ that can then be used to estimate *WTP*.
- The basic syntax of the command is:
- doubleb varlist [if] [in] [weight], [level(#) noconstant]

- The command doubleb described in López-Feldman (2013a) and López-Feldman (2013b) uses maximum likelihood estimation to get estimates for β and σ that can then be used to estimate *WTP*.
- The basic syntax of the command is:
- doubleb varlist[if][in][weight],[level(#) noconstant]
- The first and second variables in varlist should be the first and second bid variables, respectively.
- The third and fourth variables should be the dummies for the response to the first and second dichotomous choice questions, respectively. The remaining variables will be interpreted as covariates or control variables.
- Note that the second bid variable refers to the actual bid offered after the individual has answered to the first bid.

Example of the use of doubleb (I)

- A data set for a natural reserve in Portugal is used to illustrate the estimation
- The data set captures willingness to pay to avoid the development of commercial and tourist infrastructure inside the park.

Example of the use of doubleb (I)

- A data set for a natural reserve in Portugal is used to illustrate the estimation
- The data set captures willingness to pay to avoid the development of commercial and tourist infrastructure inside the park.
- The following table presents the definition of some of the variables included in the data.

Table: 1

Name of the variable	Definition
bid1	initial amount (bid) in euros
bid2	second bid in euros
answer1	= 1 if the answer to the first WTP question was y
answer2	= 1 if the answer to the second WTP was yes

Example of the use of doubleb (II)

```
. * Model with explanatory variables
. doubleb bid1 bid2 answer1 answer2 age female
initial:
               log likelihood =
                                    -<inf> (could not be evaluated)
               log likelihood = -940.87306
feasible:
rescale:
               log\ likelihood = -444.64525
rescale eq:
               log\ likelihood = -409.27306
Iteration 0:
              log likelihood = -409.27306
Iteration 1:
               log likelihood = -396.34722
Iteration 2:
              log likelihood = -394.56437
               log likelihood = -394.5571
Iteration 3:
             log likelihood = -394.5571
Iteration 4:
                                                  Number of obs =
                                                                            312
                                                  Wald chi2(2)
                                                                          26.28
Log likelihood = -394.5571
                                                   Prob > chi2
                                                                         0.0000
                    Coef.
                            Std. Err.
                                                 P>|z|
                                                           [95% Conf. Interval]
Bet.a
                -8.047011
                                         -4.91
                                                 0.000
                                                          -11.26017
                                                                      -4.833848
         age
                            1.639399
                -6.237376
                             4.81779
                                         -1.29
                                                0.195
                                                          -15.68007
                                                                       3.205319
      female
       cons
                 46.35356
                             5.83763
                                         7.94
                                                0.000
                                                           34.91202
                                                                       57.79511
Sigma
       _cons
                 36.90406
                            2.776473
                                         13.29
                                                0.000
                                                           31.46227
                                                                       42.34585
```

First-Bid Variable: bid1 Second-Bid Variable: bid2 First-Response Dummy Variable: answer1 Second-Response Dummy Variable: answer2

Example of the use of doubleb (III)

Example of the use of doubleb (III)

• The doubleb command directly estimates $\hat{\beta}$. Then, the WTP formula is simply $\tilde{z}'\hat{\beta}$.

Example of the use of doubleb (III)

- The doubleb command directly estimates $\hat{\beta}$. Then, the WTP formula is simply $\tilde{z}'\hat{\beta}$.
- Therefore, for this example the estimate of the mean WTP is:
 - . * WTP for mean values . nlcom (WTP:(_b[_cons]+age_m*_b[age]+female_m*_b[female])), noheader

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
WTP	18.52186	2.425411	7.64	0.000	13.76814	23.27558

References

- López-Feldman (2013a). Introducción a la valoración contingente utilizando Stata. Chapter 4 in Mendoza(2013), Aplicaciones en Economía y Ciencias Sociales con Stata, Stata Press.
- López-Feldman (2013b). *Introduction to contingent valuation using Stata*. MPRA paper 41018. Available here.