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Abstract

1. This collection presents a comprehensive bibliography of those empirical environmental valuation studies in the German speaking countries which relate to demand oriented measures of utility. Part I is restricted to the valuation of public goods provided by forests.
2. The associated data base (which is provided as a separately downloadable file) contains 54 data sets (studies) by today (March 2007). These data sets are characterised by 46 descriptors for the associated publications, the valuation object, details of the statistical and economic methods applied, the results of the valuation exercise and some other descriptors for study quality. These are explained in detail here.
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The data base associated with this bibliography can be downloaded at the following URL: http://www.bfafh.de/bibl/pdf/iii_07_01.xls
1. Introduction

Is there a black hole in the universe of environmental valuation, right at the centre of Europe? A distant observer might fear so. From the international literature it appears that monetary valuation studies from the German language area are few and far between.

This has several reasons. Indeed, systematic research on the economic value of environmental benefits started not before the 1990s decade in the German speaking countries. As an example, a fairly complete list of contingent valuation studies from this region showed less than 50 entries at the turn of the millennium (Elsasser & Meyerhoff 2001). In contrast, an international bibliography contained more than 2000 such studies already in 1995 (Carson et al. 1995), and a decade later this number even exceeded some 5000 (Carson 2004). But a still more important reason for the limited visibility of valuation research in our countries is the language barrier: most of the respective studies are published in German. Until recently, many academic departments required PhD theses to be published in German, and research funding institutions as well as public administrations would not accept any other language for the final reports commissioned by them. Finally, most valuation studies from here in fact are either academic theses or reports to funding organisations. Even someone capable of reading German might not easily trace this scattered kind of literature.

The present bibliography and database is intended to surmount obstacles which are caused by such linguistic, institutional and practical barriers. Its goals are:

- to ease the access to the existing valuation studies from the German language area;
- to facilitate the exchange between environmental valuation researchers within our countries and abroad; and
- to increase the awareness about methodological qualities of valuation studies.

2. Structure of the collection

The present collection of valuation studies consists of a bibliography (as part of this paper) and an associated data base (which is provided as a separately downloadable file). Part I covers studies focussed on forests; it will be complemented at a later stage with a second part on non-forestry studies.

By today (March 2007), the forestry part of the bibliography contains about 50 literature sources which cover 30 different studies; obviously there are partial intersections. On the other hand, many studies addressed more than one target population or more than one good, or they applied more than one valuation method. Therefore it proved sensible to subdivide the data base into ‘data sets’ which are distinct from each other. As a result, the data base comprises of 54 different ‘data sets’ (rows). For each ‘data set’ there are 46 descriptors (columns) which characterise the associated publication(s), the valuation object, details of the statistical and economic methods applied, the results of the valuation exercise and some other descriptors for study quality. Details are explained below.

3. Principles for the inclusion of studies in the collection

Studies are included in part I either if they solely address forest benefits or address benefits from areas which are mainly shaped by forests; all other studies will be covered by part II. Geographically the collection is restricted to valuations of objects in Austria, Germany and
Switzerland (that is, studies are excluded which may have been conducted in one of the German speaking countries, but which address environmental values outside this area). Another restriction applies to the methodology used: the collection concentrates on studies which have a welfare theory foundation and relate to demand oriented measures of utility (however, the bibliography additionally lists some further studies which do not fit these narrow criteria; yet these latter studies are not covered by the data base).

Apart from these restrictions, we hope that the collection embraces nearly all studies which have been conducted by today, including grey literature and some unpublished papers (as far as we came to know about these). We apologise if we have overlooked something, and for any mistakes which probably will be present in the descriptions of the studies – any amendments or corrections will be most welcome!

4. Bibliography of forest valuation studies

4.1. Forestry studies covered in the data base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>main source [related sources]</th>
<th>valuation object</th>
<th>data sets</th>
<th>region (country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLÜCK &amp; KUEN 1977</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grosser Ahornboden (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHELBERT et al. 1988</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zürich (CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERGEN &amp; LÖWENSTEIN 1992</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Südzeharz (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIELSEN 1992 [NIELSEN 1991]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lugano (CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forest health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLEIN 1994 [KLEIN &amp; ELSASSER 1994]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruhr District (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÖWENSTEIN 1994</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Südzeharz (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHWATLO 1994 [SCHRÖDER 1997]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mühlheim/Ruhr (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÖWENSTEIN 1995</td>
<td>avalanche protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allgäu (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUTTMANN &amp; SCHRÖDER 1995</td>
<td>recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lüneburger Heide (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHÜSSELE 1995 [VON SPERBER et al. 1996; SCHRÖDER 1997]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ziegenhagen (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFLACKER 1995 [VON SPERBER et al. 1996; SCHRÖDER 1997]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaufunger Wald (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST et al. 1999</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thüringen (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSASSER 1996 [ELSASSER 1999]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hamburg; Pfälzerwald (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOSZ 1996a [KOSZ 1998; BÜRG et al. 1999]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wienerwald (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHÖNBÄCK et al. 1997 [KOSZ 1996b]</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Donauauen (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAUNE 1998</td>
<td>forest condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lübeck (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMMEL 1998 [ROMMEL 2000]</td>
<td>biosphere reserve development programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schorfheide (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Further forestry studies (not covered by the data base)

Beyond the literature quoted above, there are other “non-wood” valuation studies which have not been included in the data base, either because they applied a methodology which does not fit the present classification system (e.g. studies estimating producer surplus values), or because they did not aim at deriving welfare theory related measures at all (e.g. studies which investigated cost based measures or prices). The following table lists such studies, without trying to be exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>valuation object</th>
<th>region (county)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOOG &amp; PÜTTMANN 1986</td>
<td>soil protection</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFISTER 1991</td>
<td>landscape change due to afforestation</td>
<td>Niedernjesa (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFTER 1996</td>
<td>non-wood goods and services</td>
<td>Switzerland (CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSASSER &amp; THOROE 1997</td>
<td>non-wood benefits</td>
<td>Germany (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPICKE &amp; SCHÄFER 1997</td>
<td>nature protection</td>
<td>Isarmündung (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLSCHEWSKI 1997</td>
<td>drinking water protection</td>
<td>Holdorf (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTTKER 1999</td>
<td>flood protection</td>
<td>Vicht (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTOW 2000</td>
<td>forest recreation</td>
<td>Pfälzerwald (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTOW &amp; SCHRÖDER 2000</td>
<td>drinking water protection</td>
<td>Kastellaun (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÖWENSTEIN 2000</td>
<td>microclimate protection</td>
<td>Avelsbach, Serrig (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIETER &amp; ELSASSER 2002</td>
<td>carbon sequestration</td>
<td>Germany (D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Annotations to the descriptors in the data base

5.1. Study descriptors

study/data set
Short descriptor of data set (not identical with publication, since one publication may have addressed several different target populations and/or different goods, or it may have applied different methods)

study qualification
Academic theses at undergraduate level (diploma) or at graduate level (PhD), or other research projects. Diploma theses typically are not thoroughly reviewed and are often not publicly available; PhD theses must be published and are reviewed by at least two senior researchers which normally must be university professors or people with a “Habilitation” (venia legendi).

study funding
Studies may be funded by independent organisations (labelled as “research grant”) or commissioned by administrations, or not funded at all (i.e. financed by an institute’s or an individual researcher’s own resources).
Administrations may try to influence study results to some degree, but this need not necessarily be the case.

5.2. Publication descriptors

authors, year, title, details
Since a data set may be analysed in several different publications, these entries apply to the “main source”, i.e. typically the publication which contains the most comprehensive description of the data set. This is sometimes grey or unpublished literature. Most entries in the data base refer to the main source, but this may be supplemented by data from “related publications”. In cases where the main source was not available, entries are only based at “related publications”. (Keep in mind that details may occasionally differ between sources).

related publications
Other publications which relate to the same data set (often methodological analyses about specific problems, or shorter summaries). These entries may often not be complete since it is not easy to trace every publication. Again, keep in mind that details may occasionally differ between sources.

type
Refers to main source.

language
First entry refers to main source; if (related) publications exist in other language, this is noted as a second entry.

review
If any of the publications related to the data set have been formally reviewed (as a journal peer review or as a PhD review), this is noted here. Keep in mind that only some of the publications related to the data set may have been reviewed, others not. (A review typically encourages researchers to stick to some technical rules, but it is no guarantee for quality. Inversely, the lack of a review needs not necessarily indicate lower precision).
5.3. Valuation object descriptors

land use form
In part I, forest or a mix of land use forms which include forestry.

service valued
A short label for the service (or good) valued, as typically defined in the texts of publications.

object valued
A more concrete description of what has been valued in the study. This is mainly based on the description of the good in the questionnaire. If this description has been vague, you will find a vague entry here, too. (In some cases, “service valued” and “object valued” do not completely correspond. Keep in mind that here is some level of interpretation here. We might have interpreted the questionnaire differently from the authors of the original studies – and there might have been a third interpretation by the survey respondents).

scope
Local, regional (i.e. including several study sites, or addressing a larger area), or nationwide.

region, country
Localisation of the valued good or service.

5.4. Statistical method descriptors

primary/secondary
Primary studies are based on separately collected data, secondary studies on previously existing data. Some studies used a combination of primary and secondary data.

target population
Population which has been sampled.

sampling type
This is often not well described in the studies. For example, samples chosen by commercial survey institutes are often described as “random” even if the institutes applied some kind of systematic or quota sampling. Therefore these entries are rather rough.

data collection mode
Again, this is not always well described in the studies; on the other hand, the details of the sampling procedures actually applied may sometimes be too complicated to be aggregated in this data base. Hence these are again rather rough indicators. It is highly recommended to consult the original studies on this.

gross sample size
Total number of elements of the target population which have been attempted to include in the sample (i.e. before any sample losses, e.g. due to interview refusals), but except of sample neutral losses. Not reported in many cases.

net sample size
Number of elements of the target population which are actually included in the sample (i.e. after sample losses e.g. due to interview refusals).

utilisable for valuation
Number of elements of the target population for which usable valuation data exist (i.e. after losses e.g. due to question specific refusals).
data collection dates
Year and months of data collection.

survey method
Mostly face-to-face, mail, telephone, or a combination of these.

5.5. Valuation method descriptors

method
Short descriptor for the applied valuation approach (BT: Benefit Transfer [including benefit function transfer]; CBM: Contingent Behaviour Method; CE: Choice Experiment [or Contingent Choice]; CVM: Contingent Valuation Method; TCM: Travel Cost Method).
Concerning the TCM, there is sometimes a confusion between the welfare theoretic approach (i.e. estimating consumer surplus as the area below the demand curve by using travel cost data) and a cost-based approach (i.e. interpreting travel costs as some indicator of “value”). This is indicated under “specification” and “measure”.

reference method
Alternative method of value estimation (if any). Same abbreviations as above.

specification
Specification of the valuation method. For the TCM this is either “zonal” or “individual”. For stated preference methods, an indication is given what kind of estimate is given under “results” (e.g., mean estimates, mean estimates based on regression analysis, weighted means).

measure
Abbreviations: CS (Consumer Surplus); WTA (Willingness To Accept); WTP (Willingness To Pay; different Hicksian measures not distinguished); ‘WTP to avoid’ (WTP to avoid a proposed environmental change).

payment vehicle
Method by which the payment for the valued commodity would take place in the hypothetical market. For revealed preference methods, this does not apply (marked as ‘−’).

elicitation method
Stated preference methods: Dichotomous Choice (DC) is used as a generic term, including variants of this approach (e.g. double/triple bounded DC).
The term PC (Payment Card) approach is used with various meanings in the literature. Here it refers to a separate card (most of the respective studies used a variant of a card with some graphical elements at the centre and bid proposals arranged around which has been developed and tested to avoid anchoring biases; see ELSASSER 1996:65ff.). Other lists of proposed bits which were part of the questionnaire are labelled “choice between xy bids”. Additionally it is indicated whether answers are analysed with DC techniques or as open-ended responses.
Revealed preference methods: it is indicated whether travel costs do or do not include time costs (or both, in different calculation variants).

zeros/protests
(Does not apply to revealed preference methods). Respondents stating a zero WTP either may have a genuine zero WTP or may have refused the valuation question. If a study has tried to distinguish these by additional questions (and accordingly by different treatment in the analysis), this is labelled as “distinguished”. Exclusion of all zeros likely biases results upwards; the other way round, accepting all dubitable zeros likely biases results downwards.
MEYERHOFF & LIEBE (2006) analysed the relation between WTP and attitudes towards protest motives (labelled as “analysed”). Their results suggest that the average true WTP of people stating a “protest zero bid” might be higher than zero, but indeed lower than the full sample’s WTP. This additionally backs the arguments against an exclusion.

**regression**
Indicates whether results have been analysed by regression techniques, and type of regression approach used.

**validity experiments**
Number of separate experiments to test for validity of results associated with the data set.

**sensitivity analysis**
Indicates whether and which different calculations were conducted in order to reveal influence of necessary assumptions.

**focus group**
A preceding small study in order to develop questionnaire; may range from very informal (e.g. KÜPKER 2007) to very elaborate (e.g. MEYERHOFF et al. 2006). Often not reported or not fully described in studies.

**pilot**
A preceding small study in order to test whether questionnaire design works under field conditions.

**questionnaire available**
Indicates whether questionnaire is printed in publication or at least available from authors.

**valuation question disclosed**
Indicates whether the valuation question (as part of the questionnaire) is printed in the publication. (It is not possible to interpret stated preferences without knowledge of the valuation question).

### 5.6. Results

**mean**
Average CS/WTP.

**dispersion measure, dispersion value**
CI: Confidence Intervals (95%, if not otherwise noted); CV: Coefficient of Variation (in % of the mean); SD: Standard Deviation of the mean. (It is not possible to interpret statistical reliability without any of these values).

**aggregated result**
Mean estimates aggregated to whole population (if aggregated to hectares, this is indicated).

**data available**
Indicates whether data are available for further analyses.

**remarks**
Other observations characterising the study which did not fit the preceding inventory scheme (necessarily more subjective in some cases).
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