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Appendix S1 Source of preference heterogeneity

To identify possible sources of preference heterogeneity, we estimated a third RPL model which includes interactions of the socio demographic characteristics and attitudes with the coefficients of the different attributes. We considered the following variables and assumptions:

1. Donation for conservation: respondents who donated in the past for nature conservation would more likely choose alternatives offering higher conservation outcome.
2. Donation for charity: respondents who donated for charity have a higher preference for alternatives favoring low-income households or at least equal distribution than others.
3. Low income respondents: we created a dummy variable for low income respondents which equals 1 if the net income of the respondent is below 50,000 ariary per month and 0 otherwise, with the following hypotheses:
   * Low income respondents would be more likely affected by the amount of donation, and prefer to avoid costly alternatives,
   * Low income respondents would be also more sensitive to alternatives favoring low-income households,
   * Low income respondents would avoid alternatives offering no information regarding the way of distribution of the monetary compensation.
4. Poor important: respondents who find that poor households should receive more compensation would more likely choose alternatives favoring low-income households. This aspect was captured in the questionnaire by a debriefing question, which asks respondents about their statement regarding the importance of poor households receiving the highest compensation. We created a dummy variable, which equals 1 if the respondent states that this aspect is very important or quite important and 0 otherwise.
5. Equal important: respondents who find that the compensation should be distributed equally among households in the local community would more likely choose alternatives favoring equal distribution. This aspect is addressed in the questionnaire by a debriefing question, which asks respondents about their statement regarding the importance of equal distribution of the compensation. We created a dummy variable, which equals 1 if the respondent states that this aspect is very important or quite important and 0 otherwise. Respondents who gave more weights to distributional issues (either equal or favoring the poor) rather than conservation might choose alternatives having these characteristics at the expense of conservation.
6. Compensation high: respondents who think that the amount of monetary compensation should be high enough in order that the local population should not be disadvantaged would more likely choose alternatives favouring either low-income households or equal distribution. We included in the questionnaire a debriefing question, which asks respondents about their statement concerning the importance of this feature. We created a dummy variable, which equals 1 if the respondent states that high amount of compensation is very important or quite important and 0 otherwise.