

Relevant Literature “Spatial Dimensions of Stated Preferences”

- Anselin L (2010) Thirty years of spatial econometrics. *Papers in Regional Science* 89:3–25. doi: 10.1111/j.1435-5957.2010.00279.x
- Bateman IJ, Day BH, Georgiou S, Lake I (2006) The aggregation of environmental benefit values: Welfare measures, distance decay and total WTP. *Ecological Economics* 60:450–460. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.04.003
- Bateman IJ, Langford IH (1997) Non-users’ Willingness to Pay for a National Park: An Application and Critique of the Contingent Valuation Method. *Regional Studies* 31:571–582. doi: 10.1080/00343409750131703
- Bivand R (2017) Geographically weighted regression.
- Brouwer R, Martin-Ortega J, Berbel J (2010) Spatial Preference Heterogeneity: A Choice Experiment. *Land Economics* 86:552–568. doi: 10.3368/le.86.3.552
- Budziński W, Campbell D, Czajkowski M, et al (2016) Using geographically weighted choice models to account for spatial heterogeneity of preferences.
- Cameron TA (2006) Directional heterogeneity in distance profiles in hedonic property value models. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 51:26–45. doi: 10.1016/j.jeem.2005.03.003
- Campbell D, Hutchinson WG, Scarpa R (2009) Using Choice Experiments to Explore the Spatial Distribution of Willingness to Pay for Rural Landscape Improvements. *Environment and Planning - Part A* 41:97–111. doi: 10.1068/a4038
- Campbell D, Scarpa R, Hutchinson W (2008) Assessing the spatial dependence of welfare estimates obtained from discrete choice experiments. *Letters in Spatial and Resource Sciences* 1:117–126. doi: 10.1007/s12076-008-0012-6
- Czajkowski M, Budziński W, Campbell D, et al (2016) Spatial Heterogeneity of Willingness to Pay for Forest Management. *Environ Resource Econ* 1–23. doi: 10.1007/s10640-016-0044-0
- Fischer MM, Wang J (2011) *Spatial Data Analysis: Models, Methods and Techniques*. Springer Science & Business Media
- Franceschinis C, Scarpa R, Thiene M, et al (2016) Exploring the Spatial Heterogeneity of Individual Preferences for Ambient Heating Systems. *Energies* 9:407. doi: 10.3390/en9060407
- Hanley N, Schlöpfer F, Spurgeon J (2003) Aggregating the benefits of environmental improvements: distance-decay functions for use and non-use values. *Journal of Environmental Management* 68:297–304. doi: 10.1016/S0301-4797(03)00084-7
- Hannon B (1994) Sense of place: geographic discounting by people, animals and plants. *Ecological Economics* 10:157–174. doi: 10.1016/0921-8009(94)90006-X

- Holland BM, Johnston RJ (2017) Optimized quantity-within-distance models of spatial welfare heterogeneity. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 85:110–129. doi: 10.1016/j.jeem.2017.04.006
- Interis MG, Petrolia DR (2016) Location, Location, Habitat: How the Value of Ecosystem Services Varies across Location and by Habitat. *Land Economics* 92:292–307. doi: 10.3368/le.92.2.292
- Johnston RJ, Duke JM (2009) Willingness to Pay for Land Preservation across States and Jurisdictional Scale: Implications for Benefit Transfer. *Land Economics* 85:217–237. doi: 10.3368/le.85.2.217
- Johnston RJ, Jarvis D, Wallmo K, Lew DK (2015) Multiscale Spatial Pattern in Nonuse Willingness to Pay: Applications to Threatened and Endangered Marine Species. *Land Economics* 91:739–761. doi: 10.3368/le.91.4.739
- Johnston RJ, Ramachandran M (2013) Modeling Spatial Patchiness and Hot Spots in Stated Preference Willingness to Pay. *Environ Resource Econ* 59:363–387. doi: 10.1007/s10640-013-9731-2
- Jørgensen SL, Olsen SB, Ladenburg J, et al (2013) Spatially induced disparities in users' and non-users' WTP for water quality improvements—Testing the effect of multiple substitutes and distance decay. *Ecological Economics* 92:58–66. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.07.015
- Knapp L, Ladenburg J (2015) How Spatial Relationships Influence Economic Preferences for Wind Power—A Review. *Energies* 8:6177–6201. doi: 10.3390/en8066177
- Liekens I, Schaafsma M, De Nocker L, et al (2013) Developing a value function for nature development and land use policy in Flanders, Belgium. *Land Use Policy* 30:549–559. doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.04.008
- Lizin S, Brouwer R, Liekens I, Broeckx S (2016) Accounting for substitution and spatial heterogeneity in a labelled choice experiment. *Journal of Environmental Management* 181:289–297. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.06.038
- Luisetti T, Turner RK, Bateman IJ, et al (2011) Coastal and marine ecosystem services valuation for policy and management: Managed realignment case studies in England. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 54:212–224. doi: 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.11.003
- Martin-Ortega J, Brouwer R, Ojea E, Berbel J (2012) Benefit transfer and spatial heterogeneity of preferences for water quality improvements. *Journal of Environmental Management* 106:22–29. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.03.031
- Meyerhoff J (2013) Do turbines in the vicinity of respondents' residences influence choices among programmes for future wind power generation? *Journal of Choice Modelling* 7:58–71. doi: 10.1016/j.jocm.2013.04.010
- Moore R, Provencher B, Bishop RC (2011) Valuing a Spatially Variable Environmental Resource: Reducing Non-Point-Source Pollution in Green Bay, Wisconsin. *Land Economics* 87:45–59. doi: 10.3368/le.87.1.45

- Morrison M, Bennett J (2004) Valuing New South Wales rivers for use in benefit transfer. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 48:591–611. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8489.2004.00263.x
- Pate J, Loomis J (1997) The effect of distance on willingness to pay values: a case study of wetlands and salmon in California. *Ecological Economics* 20:199–207. doi: 10.1016/S0921-8009(96)00080-8
- Rolfe J, Bennett J (2002) Assessing Rainforest Conservation Demands. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 32:51–67. doi: 10.1016/S0313-5926(02)50018-7
- Rolfe J, Bennett J, Louviere J (2002) Stated values and reminders of substitute goods: Testing for framing effects with choice modelling. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 46:1–20. doi: 10.1111/1467-8489.00164
- Rolfe J, Windle J (2012) Distance Decay Functions for Iconic Assets: Assessing National Values to Protect the Health of the Great Barrier Reef in Australia. *Environ Resource Econ* 53:347–365. doi: 10.1007/s10640-012-9565-3
- Sagebiel J, Glenk K, Meyerhoff J (2017) Spatially explicit demand for afforestation. *Forest Policy and Economics* 78:190–199. doi: 10.1016/j.forpol.2017.01.021
- Schaafsma M, Brouwer R, Gilbert A, et al (2013) Estimation of Distance-Decay Functions to Account for Substitution and Spatial Heterogeneity in Stated Preference Research. *Land Economics* 89:514–537. doi: 10.3368/le.89.3.514
- Schaafsma M, Brouwer R, Rose J (2012) Directional heterogeneity in WTP models for environmental valuation. *Ecological Economics* 79:21–31. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.04.013
- Smith VK (1993) Nonmarket Valuation of Environmental Resources: An Interpretive Appraisal. *Land Economics* 69:1–26. doi: 10.2307/3146275
- Söderberg M, Barton DN (2014) Marginal WTP and Distance Decay: The Role of ‘Protest’ and ‘True Zero’ Responses in the Economic Valuation of Recreational Water Quality. *Environ Resource Econ* 59:389–405. doi: 10.1007/s10640-013-9735-y
- Sutherland RJ, Walsh RG (1985) Effect of Distance on the Preservation Value of Water Quality. *Land Economics* 61:281–291. doi: 10.2307/3145843
- Tait P, Baskaran R, Cullen R, Bicknell K (2012) Nonmarket valuation of water quality: Addressing spatially heterogeneous preferences using GIS and a random parameter logit model. *Ecological Economics* 75:15–21. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2011.12.009
- Tobler WR (1970) A Computer Movie Simulating Urban Growth in the Detroit Region. *Economic Geography* 46:234–240. doi: 10.2307/143141
- Valck JD, Broekx S, Liekens I, et al (2017) Testing the Influence of Substitute Sites in Nature Valuation by Using Spatial Discounting Factors. *Environ Resource Econ* 66:17–43. doi: 10.1007/s10640-015-9930-0