

## Appendix C

**Table C1. Heckman model explaining the actual donated amount in treatment 3**

	Basic model	+ Individual factors (Revealed, attitude, legitimacy)	+Social factors (warm glow, expectations)
<b>Step 2: Donated amount (revealed)</b>			
Constant	1.13 (1.70)	-0.51 (1.90)	-0.81 (2.05)
Respondent above 50	0.91 (0.65)	0.81 (0.66)	0.86 (0.67)
Distance to Twente in km	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Disposable income/head	0.003 (0.00)***	0.002 (0.00)**	0.002 (0.00)***
Respondent is highly educated	-0.04(0.66)	-1.15 (0.70)*	-1.17 (0.71)*
Respondent donates to nature		0.05 (0.70)	-0.06 (0.72)
% ecologically certified groceries consumed/week		0.08 (0.02)***	0.08 (0.02)***
Respondent believes biodiversity should be better protected		1.64 (0.66)**	1.58 (0.68)**
Respondent believes it just to co-finance conservation		3.04 (0.74)***	2.99 (0.75)***
Respondent receives warm glow from giving			0.52 (0.67)
Expected % donating households			0.003 (0.02)
<b>Step 1: Prob. Response</b>			
Constant	-1.24 (0.61)**	-1.30 (0.61)**	-1.32 (0.62)**
Age	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Distance to Twente in km	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Log gross income	0.01 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)
Respondent is highly educated	0.17 (0.07)**	0.19 (0.07)**	0.20 (0.07)**
# funds respondent donates too	0.01 (0.006)**	0.01 (0.006)**	0.01 (0.007)**
Respondent consumes green products	0.13 (0.07)*	0.13 (0.07)*	0.14 (0.07)**
# observations	1890	1890	1890
# censored observation	1518	1518	1518
Inverse Mills ratio	-1.24 (1.00)	-1.11 (1.11)	-1.04 (1.18)