

IAEE European Conference

Ljubljana

August 28, 2019

Preferences for environmentally friendly and unfriendly measures to control the climate at home: A stated choice analysis for Germany

Moritz König, Victor von Loessl, Andreas Ziegler
University of Kassel, Germany

Claudia Schwirplies
University of Hamburg, Germany



1. Background

Motivation

- Negative effects of climate change, e.g. due to rising temperatures and heatwaves (e.g. IPCC, 2014)
 - Climate change leads to changes in the energy demand of the residential sector (e.g. IPCC, 2014)
 - Demand for heating decreases
 - Demand for cooling increases
 - Energy demand for cooling also depends on the adaptation behavior of households for the indoor climate (e.g. Auffhammer and Mansur, 2014)
 - Environmentally friendly, e.g. insulation
 - Environmentally unfriendly, e.g. air conditioning system
- Information about individual preferences for measures to control the indoor climate at home is of high interest

Literature review

- Many empirical studies that only consider individual mitigation activities
 - Willingness to pay price premiums for climate-friendlier goods (e.g. Ziegler, 2017; Schwirplies and Ziegler, 2016)
 - Willingness to buy energy efficient home appliances (e.g. Schleich et al., 2018; Bradford et al., 2017; Qiu et al., 2017)
- Few empirical studies on both residential mitigation and adaptation measures (e.g. Achtnicht, 2011; Alberini et al., 2013)
- Even fewer empirical studies that only consider individual adaptation to climate change
 - Tourism-related adaptation (e.g. Schwirplies and Ziegler, 2017; Wu et al., 2017)
 - Flood-related adaptation (e.g. Osberghaus 2015)

Contribution of study

- Analysis of the preferences for different measures to control the indoor climate at home
- Analysis of combined adaptation and mitigation as well as of pure adaptation measures
- Comparison between environmentally friendly and environmentally unfriendly adaptation measures

2. Data and variables

Sample and stated choice experiment

- Large-scale online survey among citizens in Germany
- Subsample of the stated choice experiment: 972 tenants, who implemented or planned to implement a climate control measure

| | Solar control window | Insulation | Ceiling fan | Air conditioning system |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Increase monthly gross cold rent | 2%, 4%, 6% | 6%, 8%, 10%, 30% | 1%, 2%, 4% | 4%, 6%, 8% |
| Improvement indoor climate | Slight, medium | Slight, medium | Slight, medium, strong | Slight, medium, strong, enormous |
| Change annual energy costs in € | -5, -20 | -120, -270 | 3, 5, 8 | 80, 120, 160 |
| Change annual CO₂ emissions in kg | -10, -45 | -280, -590 | 5, 10, 20 | 180, 280, 370 |

Econometric approach

- Application of flexible mixed logit models
- Random parameters
 - Change of the annual energy cost in €
 - Change of the annual CO₂ emission in kg
 - Dummy variables for the improvements of indoor climate
- Parameters are estimated by simulated maximum likelihood method
 - 1,000 Halton draws in simulator
 - Robust estimation of the variance covariance matrix
- Mean WTP is estimated by dividing estimated (mean of random) parameters of latter attributes by estimated (fixed) parameters of the increase of the monthly gross cold rent

Variables

- Possible determinants of environmentally friendly adaptation
 - Environmental values (e.g. Schwirplies and Ziegler, 2016)
 - Political identification (e.g. Neumayer, 2004)
 - Gender (e.g. Ziegler, 2017)
 - Patience (e.g. Qui et al., 2017)
 - Risk preferences (e.g. Schleich et al., 2018)
- Control variables
 - Socio-demographic characteristics (age, educational level, monthly income, monthly rent, household size, type of house, location) and belief in anthropogenic climate change
 - Initial climate control equipment

3. Econometric results

Estimation results: Model 1

Model 1 (Base category: Air conditioning system)

Estimates (robust z-statistics)

| | Mean parameter | Parameter of the standard deviation | Mean WTP (€) |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Alternative specific attributes | | | |
| Monthly rent increase | -0.175 *** (-11.40) | - | (€0.14 * 12 =) €1.68 |
| Change annual energy costs | -0.004 *** (-4.93) | -0.007 *** (-2.70) | -0.14 |
| Change annual CO ₂ emissions | -0.001 *** (-3.17) | -0.001 (-0.73) | -0.03 |
| Medium improvement of indoor climate | 0.462 *** (10.23) | 0.408 *** (4.40) | 14.48 |
| Strong improvement of indoor climate | 0.798 *** (6.37) | 0.555 (1.29) | 25.04 |
| Enormous improvement of indoor climate | 1.043 *** (7.67) | -0.191 (-0.46) | 32.73 |
| Alternative specific constants | | | |
| ASC: Solar control window | 1.109 *** (5.99) | 2.613 *** (10.92) | 34.80 |
| ASC: Insulation | 2.359 *** (4.37) | -3.289 *** (-9.46) | 74.01 |
| ASC: Ceiling fan | -1.360 *** (-5.17) | 2.983 *** (14.62) | -42.66 |
| ASC: Air conditioning system | base category | | |
| Number of observations | 972 | | |

Estimation results: Model 2

Model 2 (Base category: Air conditioning system)

Estimates (robust z-statistics)

| | Mean parameter | Parameter of the standard deviation |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Main explanatory variables | | |
| NEP x solar control window (SCW) | 0.356 ** (2.42) | - |
| NEP x insulation (I) | 0.424 (1.31) | - |
| NEP x ceiling fan (CF) | 0.354 ** (2.38) | - |
| Affinity left-wing parties x SCW | 0.841 ** (2.27) | - |
| Affinity left-wing parties x I | 1.048 (1.21) | - |
| Affinity left-wing parties x CF | 0.856 ** (2.31) | - |
| Female x SCW | 1.075 *** (2.91) | - |
| Female x I | 0.734 (1.14) | - |
| Female x CF | 1.075 ** (2.02) | - |
| Patience x SCW | -0.358 (-0.99) | - |
| Patience x I | -0.138 (-0.22) | - |
| Patience x CF | 0.040 (0.09) | - |
| General risk aversion x SCW | -0.171 (-0.38) | - |
| General risk aversion x I | -0.815 (-1.19) | - |
| General risk aversion x CF | -0.385 (-0.68) | - |
| Control variables | | Included |
| Alternative specific attributes | | Included |
| Number of observations | | 770 |

4. Conclusions

Summary and political implications

- Strong stated preferences for the reduction of CO₂ emissions and for solar control windows and insulations, which are also mitigation measures and thus environmentally friendly
- Positive effects on environmentally friendly measures
 - Environmental values
 - Political-left wing affinity
 - Females
- Directions for future research
 - Analysis of landlords
 - Analysis of owner occupiers
 - Analysis of revealed preferences data

Thank you!