A Additional results

Table A.1: Bootstrapped scaled random effects probit estimates

	Biased sample		Full sample	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
WTP for elect. voucher	8.866***	-2.357	4.009**	3.586*
	(2.51)	(3.17)	(1.93)	(1.93)
Order within MPL				5.803***
				(1.96)
Order within choice				0.436
				(0.63)
SD of individual error	20.944	26.335	23.383	23.373
SD of RE	39.555	44.461	42.114	41.679
N(choices)	2,710	2,350	5,060	5,060
N(subjects)	271	235	506	506

Notes: Replication of Table 2, bootstrapping the estimates and standard errors.

Table A.2: WTP estimates for three MPL, separately and jointly

	Separate samples			Full sample		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
WTP for elect. voucher	3.590*			3.416*	3.467*	5.578*
	(2.00)			(1.84)	(1.85)	(3.01)
WTP 1 v. over 2 v.		7.181***		8.556***	8.684***	8.224***
		(1.24)		(1.41)	(1.42)	(3.02)
WTP 2v over cash			-0.209	0.017	0.054	2.548
			(2.10)	(1.95)	(1.96)	(3.01)
Order within choice	0.435	-0.437	0.367	0.071	0.094	0.071
	(0.65)	(0.50)	(0.59)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Order within MPL	5.811***	2.459**	5.267**	4.402***		
	(2.00)	(1.19)	(2.09)	(1.00)		
Order within MPL (1 voucher)						3.140
						(3.02)
Order within MPL (cash)						7.596**
						(3.01)
Order within MPL (2 vouchers)						2.505
						(3.01)
Order within MPL (t=1)					1.506	
					(1.88)	
Order within MPL (t=2)					2.407*	
					(1.44)	
Order within MPL (t=3)					5.509***	
					(1.31)	
Order within MPL (t=4)					5.968***	
					(1.32)	
Order within MPL (t=5)					5.755***	
					(1.31)	
Order within MPL (t=6)					7.024***	
					(1.37)	
Order within MPL (t=7)					7.741***	
					(1.37)	
Order within MPL (t=8)					5.662***	
					(1.33)	
Order within MPL (t=9)					2.557*	
					(1.38)	
Order within MPL (t=10)					0.062	
					(1.68)	
SD of individual error	23.377	20.333	21.336	21.655	21.599	21.655
SD of random effect	41.676	24.009	44.548	36.231	36.513	36.212
N(choices)	5,060	4,990	5,110	15,160	15,160	15,160
N(subjects)	506	499	511	1,516	1,516	1,516

Notes: Scaled random effects probit estimates from three MPLs implemented on a single subject pool in South Africa. All subjects (N=1,516) saw two of the three MPLs. Column 1 reproduces the estimates from column 4 of Table 2. Column 2 shows estimates from MPL comparing one or two electricity vouchers. Column 3 shows estimates from MPL involving two electricity vouchers or cash. Column 4 estimates all three MPLs jointly.

B List of papers considered

Table B lists 23 papers that measure WTP using an MPL format, sorted by publication year and within year alphabetically by author. These were discovered and classified in an extensive literature search that served both to understand how the method of MPL has developed and how it is used today. We note that the list is not representative or exhaustive, and due to a snowball search by citations may focus more strongly on recent papers. Part of the challenge was that many papers that elicit WTP do not mention the exact elicitation method they use or describe the approach as BDM, and researchers may use alternative terms for willingness to pay, such as contingent valuation, value, price, etc. On the other hand, a very large number of papers that do mention MPL use it to elicit risk or time preferences. Nonetheless, the large number of papers that measure WTP using MPL from 2020 onward shows that the method is routinely used in current applied research.

The table prioritizes examples from low and middle income countries (LMIC) that were incentivized and carried out "in the field," meaning with a representative sample of the population of interest, often as part of an RCT or larger survey. We do list a few influential papers from high-income countries, often conducted in the laboratory. Several of them were early studies that focus on the method of MPL and compare different elicitation methods or formats.

Most MPL were conducted in lab-in-the-field or laboratory experiments, but we also include three surveys (meaning MPL-style questions were asked but the answers were not incentivized) and two hybrid cases: an experiment carried out on Amazon MTurk with hired participants and a classroom experiment. Many studies elicit WTP for everyday items such as mugs, pens, chocolate or soap.

We also include whether the data collection instrument or data is publicly available. In most recent papers, both are made available at publication. In many of the papers listed, detailed sections in the paper or in an appendix describe the instrument and experimental procedure. Papers in italics were unpublished at the time of writing, so the data may become available at a later date.

Paper	WTP for	Country	Purpose	Data collection	Data/instr. available
Berkouwer et al. 2021	Electricity transfer, electricity or cash loan	Ghana	WTP	Survey	No/Yes
Berkouwer and Dean (2021)	Efficient stove	Kenya	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Burchardi et al. (2021)	Induced value, everyday items	Uganda	Method	Lab-in-the-field	Yes/Yes
Burchardi et al. (2021)	Remedial education program	Tanzania	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Channa et al. (2021)	Moisture detection device for maize	Kenya	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	Yes/Yes
Fuller and Ricker-Gilbert (2021)	Third-party grain quality testing	Kenya	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	Yes/Yes
Lang and Lanz (2021)	Efficient heating appliance	Switzer-land	WTP	Survey	Yes/Yes
Squires (2021)	Hiding experimental income	Kenya	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Asioli et al. (2021)	Everyday items	Norway	Method	Laboratory	Yes/No
Bénabou et al. (2020)	Moral action (donation)	Germany	WTP	Laboratory	No/Yes
Björkegren (2020)	Change mobile phone provider	Rwanda	WTA	Survey	No/Yes
Cole and Fernando (2020)	Agricultural extension service by phone	India	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/No
Maffioli et al. (2020)	Business training	Jamaica	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Allcott and Kessler (2019)	Home energy reports	USA	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	Yes/Yes
Bursztyn et al. (2018)	Status good (Armani gift card)	USA	WTP	Amazon MTurk	Yes/Yes
Guiteras and Jack (2018)	Piece rate contract	Malawi	WTA	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Ben Yishay et al. (2017)	Improved latrines	Cambodia	WTP	Lab-in-the-field	No/No
Alphonce and Alfnes (2017)	Organic and conventional tomatoes	Tanzania	Method	Lab-in-the-field	No/Yes
Cassar et al. (2016)	Book voucher	China	WTP	Laboratory	No/Yes
Bartling et al. (2015)	Induced value, everyday items	Switzer-land	WTP/ WTA	Laboratory	No/Yes
Exley (2016)	Charitable giving	USA	WTP	Laboratory	No/Yes
Andersen et al. (2007)	Everyday items	USA	Method	Laboratory	No/No
Kahneman et al. (1990)	Induced value, everyday items	USA	WTP/ WTA	Classroom	No/No