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1. Introduction
Information on respondents’ perceptions about survey consequentiality is typically collected close to the end of the survey, following the preference elicitation. We inquire whether—and if so, how—the location and repetition of a consequentiality perception elicitation question matter for stated consequentiality perceptions and for stated preferences. To that end, we use data from a discrete choice experiment survey conducted in Germany, in which respondents evaluated a project of expanding urban green areas.

2. Literature: Consequentiality in stated preference
- Literature defines conditions for truthful preference disclosure in stated preference surveys (Carson and Groves 2007; Carson et al. 2014; Vossler et al. 2012; Vossler and Holladay 2018).
- One of the conditions: The survey is consequential.
  "Consequentiality describes a condition in which an individual faces or perceives a non-zero probability that their responses will influence decisions related to the outcome in question and they will be required to pay for that outcome if it is implemented." (Contemporary Guidance for Stated Preference Studies, Johnston et al. 2017).
- How are consequentiality perceptions elicited in stated preference surveys?
  - Usually a single question. Or two questions for policy and payment consequentiality (Zawojska, Bartczak and Czajkowski 2019).
  - Response scale: typically a Likert scale, from two to several levels.
  - Location: after preference elicitation

>> Our research question: How does location and repetition of the consequentiality elicitation impact stated consequentiality perceptions and stated preferences?

3. Discrete Choice Experiment
Survey questionnaire

- Explanation of attributes
- 2. Discrete choice experiment
- Option 1
  - Street trees: 8 trees per 100 meters of city street
  - Green areas: 25% of the city area is green space
  - Non-natural green areas: 30% of the green area is non-natural
  - Population and cycling opportunities: 60% of the green ways are greenways
- Option 2
  - Street trees: 2 trees per 100 meters of city street
  - Green areas: 15% of the city area is green space
  - Non-natural green areas: 20% of the green area is non-natural
  - Population and cycling opportunities: 40% of the green ways are greenways
- Current status: 3 trees per 100 meters of city street

3. Follow-up questions

4. Behavior, attitudes, socio-demographic characteristics

5. Econometric Approach

6. Results

7. Conclusions
  - Findings are the same for three cities Augsburg, Karlsruhe, Nürnberg.
  - The way how consequentiality is elicited (here: location and repetition) seems to matter for stated consequentiality.
  - Also stated preferences seem to be sensitive to the way of elicitation. »Caution in designing the consequentiality elicitation.
  - WTP values increasing corrected by consequentiality perceptions. These corrections might be sensitive to the way of elicitation.
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