

**Appendix B: Value Consistency between Estimation Methods and Consistency in DBDC Response Data before and after Learning**

**Table B1**

**WTP for first good by estimation method, in Chilean Pesos**

Treatment	SBDC	DBDC	Constrained Bivariate Probit (rho value)
Control	4,777	3,878	4,654 (0.67)
Informed DBDC + DR	3,425	3,350	4,037 (0.66)

**Table B2**

**WTP for second good by estimation method, in Chilean Pesos**

Treatment	SBDC	DBDC	Constrained Bivariate Probit (rho value)
Control	5,122	4,674	5,318 (0.62)
Informed DBDC + DR	4,383	4,359	5,222 (0.59)

**Table B3**

**YES-NO (YN) and NO-YES (NY) responses to reverse ordering of the same bids in DBDC data for first good valued with control (no advance information) Treatment.**

(Test for independence of ordering of YN and NY responses in DBDC, after McFadden 1994)

YN 500 : 1000 16.1%	NY 1000 : 500 2.3%
YN 1000 : 2000 18.6%	NY 2000 : 1000 8.1%
YN 2000 : 3000 19.8%	NY 3000 : 2000 14.9%

**Table B4**

**YES-NO (YN) and NO-YES (NY) responses to reverse ordering of the same bids in DBDC data for second good valued with advance information treatment**

(Test for Independence of ordering of YN and NY responses in DBDC after McFadden 1994)

YN 1000 : 2000 18.2%	NY 2000 : 1000 19.7%
YN 2000 : 3000 26.2%	NY 3000 : 2000 21.3%
YN 3000 : 6000 26.7%	NY 6000 : 3000 26.3%