



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/129373/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Kjær, T., Nielsen, J. and Hole, A.R. (2018) An investigation into procedural (in)variance in the valuation of mortality risk reductions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 89. pp. 278-284. ISSN: 0095-0696

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.04.004>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1  
2  
3  
4 **An investigation into procedural (in)variance in the valuation of mortality risk reductions**  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 **Trine Kjær<sup>1</sup>, Jytte Seested Nielsen<sup>2</sup>, Arne Risa Hole<sup>3</sup>**  
11

12  
13  
14  
15 <sup>1</sup>Trine Kjær (corresponding author) [tkj@sdu.dk](mailto:tkj@sdu.dk)  
16

17 COHERE, Department of Public Health

18 University of Southern Denmark

19 J.B. Winsløvsvej 9B, 1.

20 DK-5000

21 Odense C

22 Phone: 0045-65504085  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 <sup>2</sup>Jytte Seested Nielsen [jytte.nielsen@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:jytte.nielsen@ncl.ac.uk)  
29

30 Newcastle University Business School  
31

32  
33 <sup>3</sup>Arne Risa Hole [a.r.hole@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:a.r.hole@sheffield.ac.uk)  
34

35 Department of Economics

36 University of Sheffield  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Acknowledgement**  
42

43  
44 This work was carried out as part of the project IMPROSA (Improving Road Safety) supported by  
45 the Danish Research Council. The opinions expressed in the article are solely the responsibility of  
46 the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the research project's sponsors. The authors  
47 have no conflicts of interests to declare. We thank Editor Roger von Haefen, Professor Dorte Gyrd-  
48 Hansen and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118

## 1. Introduction

Valuation of mortality risk reductions constitutes an important input to cost-benefit analysis of many environmental policies such as air pollution reducing initiatives. The welfare economic approach to valuing reductions in mortality risk requires an estimate of the individual's rate of substitution between wealth and risk (Jones-Lee et al., 1985). Several methods can be used to estimate this trade off including stated preference (SP) methods such as contingent valuation and choice experiments. The estimated absolute value of a marginal risk reduction, defined as the Value of Statistical life (VSL) is obtained by dividing the estimated willingness to pay (WTP) by the corresponding risk reduction. While some SP studies have investigated (in)sensitivity to the magnitude of risk reduction (see e.g. Andersson et al., 2016), studies on the effect of different but outcome equivalent presentation formats are scarce. Gyrd-Hansen et al. (2003) and others have found individuals to be sensitive to whether risk information is presented as absolute or relative risk reductions, and Zhai and Suzuki (2008) have found that the larger denominator of the fraction (e.g. 1/100 versus 10/1000), the less the WTP for a given risk reduction.

The benefit of public risk reducing initiatives can either be presented as a change in the risk of dying (expressed as frequencies or probabilities) or as the equivalent expected total number of fatalities avoided/lives saved over a given population<sup>1</sup>. The latter has also been termed the 'community analogy' (Calman and Royston, 1997). To illustrate, a reduction in risk from 2 in 10,000 to 1 in 10,000 in a community with 500,000 individuals can be presented as either a standard frequency (1 in 10,000) or a relative risk reduction (50%) or presented as a 'community analogy' frequency based on the number of individuals in the community (50 fatalities avoided). According to the assumption of *procedural invariance* (Tversky and Thaler,

---

<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking, a life cannot be saved but can be extended. On the other hand, a fatality can be avoided.

119  
120  
121 1990), presentation format should not matter as long as the expected outcome is the same. The  
122 risk reduction format (frequency and/or relative risk reduction) has been used in previous SP  
123 studies, see eg. Jones-Lee et al. (1985) and Alberini and Scasny (2011), whereas the  
124 community analogy has been used for estimating WTP in eg. Andersson et al. (2016) and  
125 Rheinberger (2011). No study has so far attempted to systematically compare the effect of these  
126 different presentation formats on the implied valuations of outcomes, and the choice of  
127 presentation format appears to be rather idiosyncratic.  
128  
129

130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137 There is a large literature showing that risks and risk changes are not always perceived correctly  
138 by individuals, and that individuals have difficulties understanding how probabilities influence  
139 risk assessments. It has been proposed that affect (i.e. risk as feelings) may serve as a cue for  
140 many important judgments involving risk, and that different representations of risks are  
141 associated with affect to varying degrees (Finucane et al., 2000). Studies by Slovic and  
142 colleagues have showed that presentation of risks in the form of frequencies (e.g. 1 out of 100)  
143 created more frightening images than probabilities (Slovic et al., 2002). In addition,  
144 Rottenstreich and Hsee (2001) found a more pronounced overweighting of small probabilities  
145 relating to affect-rich outcomes compared to affect-poor outcomes. According to Slovic et al.  
146 (2002) affective responses occur rapidly and automatically and reliance on such feelings can be  
147 characterized as an ‘affect heuristic’.  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160

161 Furthermore, research in psychology has demonstrated that numeracy skills have important  
162 consequences for judgement and decision making, and that inadequate numeracy may be an  
163 important barrier to an individual’s understanding of risks. There is evidence that numerate  
164 individuals are likely to pay more attention to numbers associated with a risk as they  
165 comprehend them better and use them in decisions. On the other hand, the less numerate are  
166 likely to be informed more by other sources of information such as emotions, implying that they  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177

178  
179  
180 are more susceptible to how messages are framed and how numbers are formatted (Peters et al.,  
181 2006; Reyna et al., 2009).  
182  
183

184  
185 We extend the current literature on valuation of mortality risk reductions by systematically  
186 investigating the potential influence that different presentation formats have on the elicited  
187 values. For this purpose, a three-way split sample discrete choice experiment (DCE) was  
188 conducted that include two types of risk information presented either separately or jointly.  
189 Respondents were asked to express their WTP for risk reducing initiatives keeping the size of  
190 the outcomes constant across splits (all in the context of traffic). To further our understanding of  
191 the underlying causes of variation across formats, we investigate whether numerical abilities  
192 and affective feelings can explain some of the observed discrepancies in marginal WTP. As a  
193 proxy for the former we use subjective numerical skills whereas for the latter, we use survey  
194 responses relating to level of concern for traffic accidents.  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205

206 We find that presentation format significantly affects preferences and that marginal willingness  
207 to pay for a risk reduction increases significantly when framed in terms of avoided fatalities  
208 compared to corresponding frequencies. Furthermore, we find evidence that the sensitivity to  
209 format is impacted by the numerical ability of the respondents as well as their affective reaction.  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215

## 216 **2. Materials and methods**

### 217 **2.1. Data**

218  
219  
220 The sample was obtained from the Nielsen Company's online panel database in May 2013. The  
221 survey sample was representative of the adult Danish population with respect to gender and age.  
222 3600 individuals were invited (by email) to participate in the survey. The response rate in the  
223 survey was 17% resulting in a sample of 600 equally split across three treatment groups. For  
224 those who started the survey, the completion rate was 77%. Prior to the actual data collection,  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239 the survey was tested in an online pilot study (n=200).  
240  
241

242 The first part of the final questionnaire contained socio-demographic questions as well as  
243 questions related to respondents own traffic behaviour including the following question; ‘I am  
244 very concerned of being in a car accident’, measured on a 1-5 point Likert scale ranging from  
245 highly disagree (1) to highly agree (5). Information about annual baseline traffic mortality risk  
246 was then provided followed by risk communication explaining the corresponding number of  
247 lives lost out of 100,000 randomly selected Danish citizens. The full risk communication text  
248 can be found in the accompanying online Appendix.  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257

258 The risk reducing initiative was described as a mandatory public 10-year traffic safety  
259 intervention with annual payments and annual risk reductions. The DCE comprised of two  
260 attributes; the annual mortality risk reduction and a price attribute (framed as extra taxation).  
261 The attributes and levels are shown in Table 1 below. A D-efficient Bayesian design was  
262 developed using Ngene software (ChoiceMetrics, 2009) with priors from the pilot study. This  
263 led to a final design with a total of 10 choice sets consisting of two hypothetical alternatives (A  
264 and B) and one opt-out (i.e. no initiative). Respondents were randomly assigned to one of three  
265 treatment groups that only varied in terms of the representation of the risk reduction. In  
266 treatment group FATAL, respondents were given information about the number of fatalities  
267 avoided in the given population. In treatment group RISK, respondents were given information  
268 about the equivalent absolute change in mortality risk expressed in terms of frequencies of  
269 100,000 individuals, and in treatment group BOTH, respondents were provided with both types  
270 of information. By including BOTH we can examine the effect of adding/removing information  
271 and not just replacing information, which therefore allows us to assess the relative salience of  
272 the two types of information. See Figure 1 for an example of the DCE format for treatment  
273 group BOTH.  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295

296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354

FIGURE 1 AROUND HERE

TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

Subsequent to the DCE, respondents were asked a range of debriefing questions. These included self-assessed numerical skills measured on a 1-10 Likert scale ranging from poor numerical skills (1) to good numerical skills (10).

## 2.2. Econometric specification

The DCE data were analysed using a mixed logit model (Train, 2009). The model was estimated on the pooled sample with interactions for each treatment group. The utility function  $U$  of individual  $n$  for intervention  $i$  in choice set  $t$  is specified as

$$U_{nit} = \beta_1 EFFECT_{nit} + \gamma_1 PRICE_{nit} + [\beta_2 EFFECT_{nit} + \gamma_2 PRICE_{nit}] RISK_n + [\beta_3 EFFECT_{nit} + \gamma_3 PRICE_{nit}] FATAL_n + \varepsilon_{nit} \quad (1)$$

Where EFFECT and PRICE are the two attributes,  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$  and  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$  are coefficients to be estimated, and  $\varepsilon_{nit}$  is an error term which is assumed to be independent and identically distributed (IID) type I extreme value. The utility function for the opt-out alternative is specified as a linear function of a status-quo constant, interactions between the status-quo constant and RISK and FATAL, and an IID error term<sup>2</sup>. The coefficient on the status quo constant is specified to be normally distributed, which allows for correlation across the choices made by the same respondent. The remaining coefficients in the model are specified as fixed.

We also estimated a restricted form of the above model without the treatment group interactions, in which the variance of the error term can vary by treatment group. This allowed

---

<sup>2</sup> We have also run models interacting socio-demographics with the status-quo. This did not change our results.

355  
356  
357 us to carry out a Likelihood Ratio test of the restricted model versus the unrestricted model in  
358  
359 equation (1) testing for parameter homogeneity across the three treatment groups (Swait and  
360  
361 Louviere 1993). These regression results can be found in the online Appendix.  
362

363  
364  
365 The marginal WTP (MWTP) for a mortality risk reduction (i.e. the marginal rate of substitution  
366  
367 between income and risk) can be calculated as the ratios of the estimated parameters. Hence  
368

369  
370 
$$\text{MWTP}_{\text{BOTH}} = -\frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{\hat{\gamma}_1}, \text{MWTP}_{\text{RISK}} = -\frac{\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_2}{\hat{\gamma}_1 + \hat{\gamma}_2} \text{ and } \text{MWTP}_{\text{FATAL}} = -\frac{\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_3}{\hat{\gamma}_1 + \hat{\gamma}_3}$$
 give the estimated  
371

372  
373 WTP for a mortality risk reduction for the three treatment groups respectively. Confidence  
374  
375 intervals for the WTP estimates were obtained using the delta method. Previous literature  
376  
377 suggests that risk representation might influence elicited WTP values since different  
378  
379 representations might trigger different affective reactions. In addition, evidence exist that  
380  
381 numeracy influences risk decisions. To examine further any differences in sensitivity to  
382  
383 presentation format across individuals, we perform a series of sub-group analyses in which  
384  
385 respondents are categorized according to two explanatory factors; 1) self-assessed numerical  
386  
387 skills, and 2) level of concern for being in a traffic accident as a proxy for affective feelings. In  
388  
389 keeping with previous findings, we expect the more numerate individuals to be better able to  
390  
391 understand the communication of risk and to be less susceptible to how the risk is presented. On  
392  
393 the other hand, we expect respondents who express a higher level of concern for traffic  
394  
395 accidents to perceive risks to be greater (i.e. acting more in affect) and therefore to be more  
396  
397 susceptible to the presentation format. It is important to emphasise that we also expect  
398  
399 concerned respondents legitimately to value risk-reducing initiatives higher than less concerned  
400  
401 respondents for all presentation formats<sup>3</sup>. Respondents were categorized into two sub-groups  
402  
403 according to their answer to the question on self-assessed numerical skills, with good skills  
404  
405

406  
407  
408 <sup>3</sup> This will not influence our test results as we only test for procedural invariance within sub-groups and not  
409 between sub-groups.  
410

414 defined as those with skills above the median, i.e. expressing >7 (43%).<sup>4</sup> Similarly respondents  
415 were split into two sub-groups according to their concern of being involved in a traffic accident  
416 with the very concerned sub-group defined as those expressing ‘agree’ or ‘highly agree’ to the  
417 question (25%). Only a small and non-significant correlation (0.0053) was observed between  
418 the two generated variables thus resulting in two distinctively defined measures. Two additional  
419 models were estimated by adding a full set of interactions between the existing explanatory  
420 variables, as described above, and a dummy for either high self-assessed numerical skills or for  
421 being concerned about traffic accidents. All models were estimated in Stata using 500 Halton  
422 draws to approximate the log-likelihood function.<sup>5</sup>  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435

### 436 **2.3. Testing for procedural invariance**

437 The assumption of procedural invariance (Tversky and Thaler, 1990) is tested by examining the  
438 effect of different but outcome-equivalent representations of risk reductions on the elicited  
439 marginal WTP values. Specifically, we test the following hypothesis;  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445

$$446 H_0: MWTP_{FATAL} = MWTP_{RISK}$$

447  
448 A rejection of the null-hypothesis implies that the two presentation formats lead to different  
449 valuations of the same outcome and hence imply differences in VSL estimates. To supplement  
450 this main comparison, we also test for any significant difference resulting from combining  
451 information about risk and fatalities in the presentation (thereby adding information instead of  
452 replacing). Hence, we test  $H_0: MWTP_{FATAL} = MWTP_{BOTH}$  and  $H_0: MWTP_{RISK} = MWTP_{BOTH}$ ,  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460

---

461 <sup>4</sup> We find that our results are similar when using a score greater than 6 instead of 7 as the threshold, although they  
462 are sensitive to increasing the threshold to 8. Only 21% percent of the sample report a score higher than 8, while  
463 57% and 43% report a higher score than 6 and 7, respectively. This means that by using 8 as the threshold we are  
464 carrying out a different comparison, i.e. individuals in the top-fifth of the self-reported numerical skills distribution  
465 versus the rest, instead of (roughly) the top half versus the bottom half of the distribution when using 6 or 7 as  
466 thresholds.  
467

468 <sup>5</sup> Increasing the number of draws to 1,000 did not have a qualitative impact on the results.  
469  
470  
471  
472

473  
474  
475 respectively. Including this second step enables us to investigate what type of information  
476  
477 respondents base their choices on, and whether this differs across segments. All hypotheses  
478  
479 were tested using Wald tests adjusted for clustering at the individual level.  
480  
481  
482

### 483 484 **3. Results**

485  
486 Descriptive statistics can be found in the online Appendix. No significant differences were  
487  
488 found with respect to gender, age, household income, number of individuals in household, and  
489  
490 proportion with higher education across the three treatment groups (with the exception of age  
491  
492 between FATAL and BOTH). Estimated marginal WTP and 95% CIs are reported in Table 2  
493  
494 whereas Table 3 presents the test statistics for our primary and secondary hypotheses. Finally,  
495  
496 regression results are reported in Table 4 both for the full sample as well as for respondents  
497  
498 segmented according to numerical skills and concerns for traffic accident.  
499

500  
501 Overall, our results suggest that the marginal WTP estimates are affected by presentation  
502  
503 format. According to the Swait-Louviere test we reject the null hypothesis of parameter  
504  
505 homogeneity across the treatment groups. The Wald test rejects our main procedural invariance  
506  
507 hypothesis that  $WTP_{FATAL} = WTP_{RISK}$ , implying that presenting risks in terms of avoided  
508  
509 fatalities or reduced mortality risks (frequency format) significantly influences the trade off  
510  
511 between income and risk. Looking at the size of the estimates we see that WTP values are  
512  
513 considerably higher (in most cases more than double) when the risk reduction is framed in terms  
514  
515 of fatalities avoided rather than in terms of frequencies. All our findings are robust to  
516  
517 conducting separate regression analyses for each treatment group<sup>6</sup>.  
518  
519  
520

521  
522 INSERT TABLE 2 AROUND HERE  
523

---

524  
525 <sup>6</sup> Given that the average household size in our sample is 2.3 our WTP results correspond to VSL estimates of DKK  
526  
527 24-54 million (EUR 3.2-7.2). This range of VSL estimates are well within the interval observed more recently in  
528  
529 the literature (Lindhjelm et al., 2011; Hultkrantz & Svensson, 2012).  
530  
531

532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584

INSERT TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

Focusing on the full sample, the following pattern in WTP estimates is observed:  $MWTP_{FATAL} > MWTP_{BOTH} > MWTP_{RISK}$ . Hence adding information about risk (fatalities) has a negative (positive) impact on marginal WTP estimates. In addition, comparing RISK to BOTH we see that marginal WTP is altered significantly (at the 10% level), indicating that the new information of fatalities causes an inflation of stated WTP<sup>7</sup>.

We divided respondents into two sub-groups according to numerical skills and find some interesting patterns. First, we find that both segments are sensitive to the presentation format with larger observed differences in absolute WTP across treatment groups for poorer numerically skilled respondents (here  $MWTP_{FATAL}$  is over three times as large as  $MWTP_{RISK}$ ). Furthermore, for the less numerate, we find no difference between  $MWTP_{FATAL}$  and  $MWTP_{BOTH}$  but a significant difference (at the 5% level) between  $MWTP_{BOTH}$  and  $MWTP_{RISK}$ , implying that the following pattern is;  $MWTP_{FATAL} = MWTP_{BOTH} \neq MWTP_{RISK}$ . Our results suggest that additional information about mortality risk, in the form of frequencies, does not alter perceived preferences for this sub-group, indicating that less numerate individuals most likely base their choices on the information about ‘avoided fatalities’. In contrast, we do not observe any difference between  $MWTP_{RISK}$  and  $MWTP_{BOTH}$  for the sub-group of respondents who see themselves as numerate ( $p=0.92$ ). Hence, these respondents do not appear to be sensitive to the additional inclusion of information about ‘avoided fatalities’. This suggests that respondents with high self-perceived numerical skills base their valuation on the risk information when provided with both types of information. Furthermore, we are not able to reject the null-hypotheses of equal WTPs between FATAL and RISK as well as FATAL and BOTH for the

---

<sup>7</sup> As our Wald tests are adjusted for clustering at the individual level this and other reported results should be viewed as conservative in the direction of not detecting significant differences.

591  
592  
593 numerate respondents suggesting that they overall are less affected by format<sup>8</sup>. Focusing on  
594 RISK, we see a relative large difference in marginal WTP according to numerical skills,  
595 indicating a pronounced variation in how the two sub-groups comprehend information on risk  
596 reductions. Specifically, we observe a significant lower WTP in RISK among the less numerate  
597 respondents suggesting a potential underestimation of marginal WTP due to difficulties in  
598 understanding changes in frequencies (p=0.12). In our study, we use a question on subjective  
599 numerical skills as a proxy for numeracy. Although previous literature has found a correlation  
600 between subjective and objective measurements of numeracy (Fagerlin et al., 2007), inclusion  
601 of a validated and more precise measure would have been preferred. Despite this we do observe  
602 some interesting and significant differences across samples that are consistent with the  
603 accumulating body of literature (referenced previously) demonstrating that peoples' ability to  
604 assess risks is correlated with numeracy.  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618

619 Furthermore, we examined whether the level of concern for being in a car accident influenced  
620 sensitivity to presentation format. Our a priori expectation was that more concerned individuals  
621 are also more likely to be steered by affect in their decision-making process. To the extent that  
622 the FATAL format leads to a more affective reaction we would argue that more concerned  
623 respondents would be more sensitive to information on avoided fatalities, thus increasing their  
624 WTP when this information is provided; i.e.  $MWTP_{FATAL} = MWTP_{BOTH} > MWTP_{RISK}$ . We would  
625 also expect to observe the opposite pattern for the less concerned, as they are expected to be less  
626 steered by feelings and not as likely to change their answers when provided with additional  
627 information about avoided fatalities i.e.  $MWTP_{RISK} = MWTP_{BOTH} < MWTP_{FATAL}$ . According to  
628 Table 3, these patterns are confirmed, suggesting that affect is likely to explain part of the  
629 overall divergence in the elicited preferences for risk reductions across formats. Furthermore,  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642

---

643  
644 <sup>8</sup> It should be noted that the size of the WTP values are very different<sup>8</sup> suggesting that our non-significant test  
645 results could be driven by sample size and therefore should be interpreted with caution.  
646  
647  
648  
649

650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708

we find that WTP is higher for the more concerned respondents. This is not surprising as more concerned respondents are likely to value risk-reducing initiatives more strongly. The higher valuation is consistently observed across all three formats, with the largest discrepancy in WTP for BOTH, which reinforces the earlier finding that the two sub-groups rely on different risk information in their valuation. More specifically, concerned respondents focus their attention on the information on avoided fatalities whereas less concerned encompasses the information on frequencies and thus adjust their valuation accordingly.

TABLE 4 AROUND HERE

In this study, we use a DCE which previously has been externally validated in another public good context (Carlsson and Martinsson, 2001) and shown to produce scope sensitivity to risk (Alberini and Ščasný 2011). In our study, we also find the parameter for the marginal utility of risk to be significant for all sub-samples implying that respondents in general have exhibited sensitivity to scope. Our results thus seem to support previous findings that people in general are capable of making accurate risk comparisons, but differ in their ability to assess risk magnitude and understand risk formats (leading to a biased estimate of true risk exposures) (Reyna et al., 2009).

**4. Conclusions**

The present study contributes to the broad literature on valuation of mortality risk reductions highlighting another source of the observed disparity in VSL estimates found across SP studies (Lindhjem et al., 2011). We find that the framing of mortality risk plays an important role in the valuation of mortality risk reductions. More specifically, our results demonstrate that describing the effect *only* in terms of ‘avoided fatalities’ could be argued to cause an overestimation of

709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767

respondents' true valuation due to a more affective reaction suggesting that information on avoided fatalities creates more 'frightening images' than information on frequencies. Furthermore, we find that the observed discrepancies at least partly are influenced by numerical ability of the respondents. In particular, our results seem to indicate that less numerate individuals have difficulties comprehending risk information and thus focus their attention on the 'easy-to-evaluate' avoided fatalities information. The same pattern is observed for respondents who express a higher degree of concern for traffic accidents; they too are more susceptible to information about avoided fatalities. We do not intend to postulate that one framing approach is inherently superior to, or less susceptible of bias, than the other. Moreover, our study does not provide an answer on how to mitigate the influence of presentation format on risk valuations. We believe that it is a question for future research to examine whether learning mechanisms (such as a 'rationality spillover device' similar to the one used in Nielsen et al. (2010)) could help respondents perceive the risks levels in the same way across different presentation formats, or whether respondents ultimately differ in the type of assistance they need in making decisions. Our findings suggest that there is an additional challenge for researchers valuing changes in risks to understand how numerical skills and affect interacts with presentation format to influence the comprehension and use of numbers. This is a finding that should be of broad relevance to all areas where risk information to the public is pivotal, including decisions about the environment and health.

**Acknowledgement**

Blinded

768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826

## References

- Alberini, A., Ščasný, M., 2011. Context and the VSL: Evidence from a stated preference study in Italy and the Czech Republic. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 49(4), 511-538.
- Andersson, H., Hole, A. R., Svensson, M., 2016. Valuation of small and multiple health risks: A critical analysis of SP data applied to food and water safety. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 75, 41-53.
- Calman, K.C., Royston, G., 1997. Risk Language and Dialects. *British Medicine Journal* 315, 939-942.
- Carlsson, F., Martinsson, P., 2001. Do hypothetical and actual marginal willingness to pay differ in choice experiments?: Application to the valuation of the environment. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 41(2), 179-192.
- ChoiceMetrics, 2009. Ngene 1.0 User manual & reference guide. The cutting edge in experimental design.
- Fagerlin, A., Zikmund-Fisher, B. J., Ubel, P. A., Jankovic, A., Derry, H. A., Smith, D. M., 2007. Measuring numeracy without a math test: development of the Subjective Numeracy Scale. *Medical Decision Making* 27(5), 672-68.
- Finucane, M.L., Alhakami, A., Slovic, P., Johnson, S.M., 2000. The affect heuristic in judgments of risks and benefits *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 13, 1-17.
- Gyrd-Hansen, D., Kristiansen, I.S., Nexøe J., Nielsen, J.B., 2003. How do individuals apply risk information when choosing amongst health care interventions? *Risk Analysis* 23(4), 697-704.
- Hultkrantz, L., Svensson, M., 2012. The value of a statistical life in Sweden: A review of the empirical literature. *Health Policy* 108, 302-310
- Jones-Lee, M. W., Hammerton, M., Philips, P. R., 1985. The value of safety: results of a national sample survey. *The Economic Journal* 95(377), 49-72.
- Lindhjem, H., Navrud, S., Braathen N.A., Biaisque, V., 2011. Risk Analysis, Valuing Mortality Risk Reductions from Environmental, Transport, and Health Policies: A Global Meta-Analysis of Stated Preference Studies. *Risk Analysis* 31(9), 1381-1406.
- Nielsen, J. S., Chilton, S., Jones-Lee, M., Metcalf, H., 2010. How would you like your gain in life expectancy to be provided? An experimental approach. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 41(3), 195-218.
- Peters, E., Västfjäll, D., Slovic, P., Mertz, C. K., Mazzocco, K., Dickert, S., 2006. Numeracy and decision making. *Psychological Science* 17(5), 407-413.
- Reyna, V. F., Nelson, W. L., Han, P. K., Dieckmann, N. F., 2009. How numeracy influences risk comprehension and medical decision making. *Psychological Bulletin* 135(6), 943.
- Rheinberger, C. M., 2011. A mixed logit approach to study preferences for safety on alpine roads. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 49(1), 121-146.

827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885

Rottenstreich, Y., Hsee, C.K., 2001. Money, kisses and electric shocks: On the Affective Psychology of Risk. *Psychological Science* 12(3), 185-190

Slovic, P., Finucane, M.L., Peters, E., MacGregor, D.G., 2002. The affect heuristic. In: Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., Kahneman, D. (Eds.), *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive judgement*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Swait, J., Louviere, J., 1993. The Role of the Scale Parameter in the Estimation and Comparison of Multinomial Logit Models. *Journal of Marketing Research* 30(3), 305-314.

Train, K., 2009. *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge. University Press, Cambridge.

Tversky, A., Thaler R.H., 1990. Anomalies: Preference Reversals. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4 (2), 201-21.

Zhai, G., Suzuki T., 2008. Effects of Risk Representation and Scope on Willingness to Pay for Reduced Risks: Evidence from Tokyo Bay, Japan. *Risk Analysis* 28(2), 513-522.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Tables and figures**  
5  
6  
7

8 Table 1. Attributes and levels in the DCE  
9

Attributes	Treatment group	Description	Levels
EFFECT	FATAL	Number of avoided fatalities every year <sup>1</sup>	60
			120
			180
	RISK	Annual mortality risk reduction <sup>1</sup>	1/100,000
			2/100,000
			3/100,000
BOTH	Both types of information (FATAL + RISK)		
PRICE		Extra annual household tax payment (in DKK)	100
			500
			1200
			2000
			5000

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Notes: <sup>1</sup> annual mortality risk of 1/100,000 is equivalent to saving 60 lives (and so forth)  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118

Table 2. Marginal WTP [95%CI] per 1/100,000 risk reduction. Reported in DKK (2013).

Treatment group	All	Numerical skills		Very concerned for car accident	
		Poor skills	Good skills	Agree	Disagree/Neutral
FATAL	1236 (N=200) [925;1547]	1269 (N=109) [895; 1642]	1186 (N=91) [649; 1723]	1679 (N=53) [932; 2426]	1105 (N=147) [768; 1442]
RISK	560 (N=200) [348;772]	415 (N=116) [146; 684]	761 (N=84) [411; 1111]	637 (N=49) [188; 1086]	531 (N=151) [292; 770]
BOTH	888 (N=200) [602;1175]	1049 (N=118) [575;1521]	735 (N=82) [392; 1078]	1586 (N=49) [632; 2540]	700 (N=151) [424; 975]

Notes: CIs are adjusted for clustering at the individual level.

119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177

Table 3. Test statistics. P-values are reported.

	All	Numerical skills		Very concerned for car accident	
		Poor skills	Good skills	Agree	Disagree/neutral
$WTP_{FATAL} = WTP_{RISK}$	<0.01***	<0.01***	0.19	0.02**	<0.01***
$WTP_{FATAL} = WTP_{BOTH}$	0.11	0.47	0.16	0.88	0.07*
$WTP_{RISK} = WTP_{BOTH}$	0.07*	0.02**	0.92	0.08*	0.36
$WTP_{FATAL} = WTP_{FATAL}$			0.80		0.17
$WTP_{RISK} = WTP_{RISK}$			0.12		0.68
$WTP_{BOTH} = WTP_{BOTH}$			0.29		0.08*

Notes: Significance levels are shown as \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05, \*\*\*p<0.01. Test statistics are adjusted for clustering at the individual level.

178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218

Table 4. Regression results

Variable	Model 1: Baseline model		Model 2: Good numerical skills interactions				Model 3: Concerned about traffic accidents interactions			
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Interaction	SE	Coefficient	SE	Interaction	SE
<i>EFFECT</i>	50.964***	7.290	49.219***	9.753	5.103	14.688	49.159***	8.617	7.913	16.645
<i>PRICE</i>	-0.057***	0.006	-0.047***	0.007	-0.027**	0.014	-0.070***	0.009	0.034***	0.012
<i>sq</i> <sup>1</sup> (mean)	-1.344***	0.302	-1.352***	0.408	-0.006	0.601	-1.084***	0.340	-1.223	0.766
<i>sq</i> <sup>1</sup> (SD)	3.969***	0.225	3.978***	0.225			3.955***	0.224		
<i>RISK</i> <sup>2</sup> × <i>EFFECT</i>	-7.040	10.447	-16.721	14.115	22.779	20.909	-8.147	12.056	2.978	24.487
<i>RISK</i> × <i>PRICE</i>	-0.021**	0.011	-0.031**	0.013	0.026	0.022	-0.007	0.013	-0.038	0.025
<i>RISK</i> × <i>sq</i>	0.611	0.443	0.362	0.577	0.623	0.898	0.450	0.509	0.837	1.052
<i>FATAL</i> <sup>3</sup> × <i>EFFECT</i>	20.176*	10.601	26.383*	14.243	-15.790	21.392	18.165*	12.532	8.353	23.645
<i>FATAL</i> × <i>PRICE</i>	0.000	0.008	-0.013	0.010	0.032*	0.018	0.009	0.011	-0.023	0.017
<i>FATAL</i> × <i>sq</i>	-0.076	0.425	-0.085	0.560	0.039	0.866	-0.281	0.489	1.008	1.020
Respondents	600		600				600			
Observations	6000		6000				6000			
Swait-Louviere test P-value	0.000		0.000				0.000			
Log-likelihood	-4695.0		-4681.2				-4663.5			

Notes: Columns 2 and 3 report the results from the baseline model without either numerical skills or traffic accident interactions, while columns 4-7 and 8-11 report the results from the models with numerical skills and traffic accident interactions, respectively.

Significance levels are shown as \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05, \*\*\*p<0.01. Reported SEs are adjusted for clustering at the individual level.

<sup>1</sup> status quo constant; <sup>2</sup> treatment group RISK; <sup>3</sup> treatment group FATAL

219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277

Figure 1. An example of a DCE for treatment group BOTH presenting both types of risk information

**Which initiative do you choose?**

<b>Initiative A</b>	<b>Initiative B</b>
<b>60</b> traffic fatalities avoided each year	<b>180</b> traffic fatalities avoided each year
The corresponding yearly risk reduction is <b>1 in a 100,000</b> for all citizen	The corresponding yearly risk reduction is <b>3 in a 100,000</b> for all citizen
Your household's extra tax payment is <b>100 DKK</b> a year	Your household's extra tax payment is <b>500 DKK</b> a year

Initiative A  
 Initiative B  
 None

Notes: the text about annual risk reduction is dropped in treatment group FATAL whereas the text about fatalities is dropped in treatment group RISK

## ONLINE APPENDIX

### Appendix 1: Descriptive statistics (selected). Mean values (SD)/median reported

	All	Treatment group		
		FATAL	RISK	BOTH
Males	50.0%	47.0%	54.0%	48.0%
Number of individuals in household	2.3 (1.2)	2.4 (1.2)	2.2 (1.1)	2.2 (1.2)
Age	47.93 (16.8)	45.85 <sup>1</sup> (17.0)	48.39 (16.1)	49.56 (17.4) <sup>1</sup>
Yearly household income in DKK	334,118 (197,536)	324,850 (194,183)	351,462 (203,385)	325,872 (194,183)
Higher education	45.5%	41.5%	45.5%	49.5%
Very concerned of being in a car accident	3.26(1.18)/3	3.20(1.19)/3	3.30 (1.19)/3	3.28 (1.14)/3
<i>Highly agree (1)</i>	8.61%			
<i>Agree (2)</i>	16.89%			
<i>Neutral (3)</i>	31.42%			
<i>Disagree (4)</i>	26.18%			
<i>Highly disagree (5)</i>	16.89%			
Numerical skills <sup>2</sup>	6.72 (2.2) /7	6.6(2.1) /7	6.8 (2.2)/7	6.7 (2.4) /7

<sup>1</sup>Significant difference between FATAL and BOTH (p=0.03)

<sup>2</sup>1-10 Likert scale from poor (1) to good (10)

## **Appendix 2: Survey text (selected). Translated by the authors**

### ***Text on risk communication***

In recent years, around 240 Danes have died in the traffic every year. There are approximately 5.5 million people living in Denmark. This means that every year 4 individuals out of 100,000 people in Denmark will die in a traffic accident.

As a comparison, you can think about the population in Aalborg which is around 100,000. It is therefore the same as saying that every year, 4 people in Aalborg would die as a result of a traffic accident. 100,000 is also twice the population in Roskilde or Vejle. Or twice the number of seats in Parken, Copenhagen.

### ***Introductory text to DCE***

Imagine that the government is considering implementing one of two potential interventions. Both will reduce the risk of dying in a traffic accident for you, your family and others over the next decade. The intervention could be one of the following:

- more street lightening in mornings and evenings
- initiatives to decrease the number of bicycle accidents caused by a lorry turning right when bicyclists are driving straight ahead
- better marking of pedestrian walkways and road lanes
- better signage

In the following 10 questions, you will be presented with a choice between two different initiatives which will deliver different reductions in the number of fatalities at different prices. The interventions will for an extra tax payment per household reduce the risk of dying in the traffic. The risk of a traffic accident with non-fatal outcomes will not be reduced by the interventions. We will ask you to choose which of the initiatives you would prefer the government to implement. You can also choose to indicate that the government shouldn't implement any initiatives.

Remember that the risk of dying in a traffic accident as you are presented for in this survey is only one form of risk you face in life. Therefore, we will also ask you to think about how

important you think it is to reduce exactly this risk and how much you would be willing to pay out of your household's annual budget over the next decade.

### Appendix 3: Regression results – restricted models used in Swait-Louviere tests

Variable	Model 1:			Model 2:			Model 3:				
	Baseline model			Good numerical skills interactions			Concerned about traffic accidents interactions				
	Coefficient	SE		Coefficient	SE	Interaction	SE	Interaction	SE	Interaction	SE
<b>Utility</b>											
EFFECT	48.819***	3.912		43.398***	4.816	13.625*	7.270	50.070***	4.565	1.271	8.559
PRICE	-0.058***	0.003		-0.052***	0.004	-0.015**	0.006	-0.067***	0.004	0.023***	0.006
sq <sup>1</sup> (mean)	-1.128***	0.188		-1.224***	0.242	0.204	0.355	-1.039***	0.218	-0.595	0.423
sq <sup>1</sup> (SD)	3.696***	0.256		3.722***	0.258			3.827***	0.267		
<b>Scale of error term</b>											
RISK <sup>2</sup>	0.304***	0.076		0.365***	0.098	-0.151	0.130	0.192**	0.082	0.221	0.168
FATAL <sup>3</sup>	-0.072	0.077		0.004	0.098	-0.197	0.131	-0.163*	0.084	0.220	0.162
Number of respondents	1800			1800				1800			
Number of observations	18000			18000				18000			
Log-likelihood	-4722.162			-4718.420				-4700.542			

Notes: Significance levels are shown as \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05, \*\*\*p<0.01. The scale of the error term  $\mu_i$  is inversely related to the error

variance:  $\text{var}(\varepsilon_{mi}) = \pi^2 / 6 \mu_i^2$ .  $\mu_i$  is modelled as an exponential function of the variables listed under 'Scale of error term'.

<sup>1</sup> status quo constant; <sup>2</sup> treatment group RISK; <sup>3</sup> treatment group FATAL