Ju-Chin Huang

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/9407325/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

28 papers

1,275 citations

840776 11 h-index 27 g-index

28 all docs

28 docs citations

times ranked

28

1052 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Can Markets Value Air Quality? A Meta-Analysis of Hedonic Property Value Models. Journal of Political Economy, 1995, 103, 209-227.	4.5	534
2	Measuring recreation benefits of quality improvements with revealed and stated behavior data. Resources and Energy Economics, 2000, 22, 339-354.	2.5	140
3	Willingness to Pay for Quality Improvements: Should Revealed and Stated Preference Data Be Combined?. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 1997, 34, 240-255.	4.7	114
4	An Hedonic Analysis of the Effects of Lake Water Clarity on New Hampshire Lakefront Properties. Agricultural and Resource Economics Review, 2002, 31, 39-46.	1.1	97
5	Information and Risk Perception: A Dynamic Adjustment Process. Risk Analysis, 1998, 18, 689-699.	2.7	78
6	Environmental Conditions, Reservation Prices, and Time on the Market for Housing. Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics, 2001, 22, 203-219.	1.5	74
7	Economic Valuation of Beach Erosion Control. Marine Resource Economics, 2007, 22, 221-238.	2.0	40
8	Weather conditions and outdoor recreation: A study of New England ski areas. Ecological Economics, 2014, 106, 56-68.	5.7	34
9	Decentralized water collection systems for households and communities: Household preferences in Atlanta and Boston. Water Research, 2019, 167, 115134.	11.3	26
10	Construct Validity of Dichotomous and Polychotomous Choice Contingent Valuation Questions. Environmental and Resource Economics, 1998, 11, 107-116.	3.2	25
11	Information and Risk Perception: A Dynamic Adjustment Process. Risk Analysis, 1998, 18, 689-699.	2.7	22
12	Partâ€Whole Bias in Contingent Valuation: Will Scope Effects Be Detected with Inexpensive Survey Methods?. Southern Economic Journal, 1998, 65, 160-168.	2.1	12
13	Improving the estimation precision for a selected parameter in multiple regression analysis: an algebraic approach. Economics Letters, 1999, 62, 261-264.	1.9	11
14	Weak complementarity and production. Economics Letters, 1998, 60, 329-333.	1.9	10
15	Correcting On-Site Sampling Bias: A New Method with Application to Recreation Demand Analysis. Land Economics, 2018, 94, 459-474.	0.9	10
16	Semi-parametric discrete choice measures of willingness to pay. Economics Letters, 2008, 101, 91-94.	1.9	8
17	Monte Carlo Benchmarks for Discrete Response Valuation Methods: Reply. Land Economics, 2002, 78, 617-623.	0.9	7
18	Sustainable and Resilient Design of Interdependent Water and Energy Systems: A Conceptual Modeling Framework for Tackling Complexities at the Infrastructure-Human-Resource Nexus. Sustainability, 2018, 10, 1845.	3.2	7

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Risk Valuation in the Presence of Risky Substitutes: An Application to Demand for Seafood. Journal of Agricultural & Conomics, 2004, 36, 213-228.	1.4	5
20	Valuing Environmental Resources through Demand for Related Commodities. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 2016, 98, 231-253.	4.3	4
21	ESTIMATING DEMAND FOR GOOD CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY IN TAIWAN. Climate Change Economics, 2021, 12, 2150003.	5.0	4
22	Postâ€Injury Work Outcomes Revisited. Southern Economic Journal, 2009, 76, 47-66.	2.1	3
23	Property tax shifting under imperfect competition. Applied Economics, 2011, 43, 139-152.	2.2	3
24	The Representative Consumer Approximation Bias in Discrete Choice Welfare Analysis. Environmental and Resource Economics, 2018, 71, 969-984.	3.2	3
25	Households' preferences for hydrological services in Veracruz, Mexico: The importance of outcomes vs. program design. Journal of Environmental Management, 2021, 300, 113763.	7.8	2
26	Precision of dichotomous choice contingent valuation welfare measures: some simulation results. Applied Economics, 2001, 33, 91-101.	2.2	1
27	Model selection and misspecification in discrete choice welfare analysis. Applied Economics, 2015, 47, 4153-4167.	2.2	1
28	Analyzing Unit Pricing of Waste Management Using Treatment Effects Models. International Advances in Economic Research, 2007, 13, 401-402.	0.8	0