Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Method

Results

Conclusion

SPATIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS FOR BATTERY ELECTRIC VEHICLE ADOPTION

Gracia Brückmann Fabian Willibald Victor Blanco

Institute of Science, Technology and Policy ETH Zurich

42nd IAEE International Conference

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

	Motivation 2
Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption	
Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco	 Transport is major green house gas emitter In Switzerland 32 % of CO2 emissions —> Needs reduction
Motivation	
Data & Methods	

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ →□ ◆○◆

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Methods

Results

Conclusion

- Transport is major green house gas emitter
- In Switzerland 32 % of CO2 emissions \longrightarrow Needs reduction
- Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) beneficial

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

- Transport is major green house gas emitter
- In Switzerland 32 % of CO2 emissions \longrightarrow Needs reduction
- Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) beneficial
- Market-based uptake: slow

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

- Transport is major green house gas emitter
- In Switzerland 32 % of CO2 emissions \longrightarrow Needs reduction
- Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) beneficial
- Market-based uptake: slow
- BEV uptake influence factors [Sierzchula et al., 2014]:
 - Individual characteristics
 - Context

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ つ へ ()

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

- Transport is major green house gas emitter
- \blacksquare In Switzerland 32 % of CO2 emissions \longrightarrow Needs reduction
- Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) beneficial
- Market-based uptake: slow
- BEV uptake influence factors [Sierzchula et al., 2014]:
 - Individual characteristics
 - Context
- Joint understanding \longrightarrow Policy Design

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のへで

Contribution

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Method

Results

Conclusion

- Revealed preference data
- BEVs vs. all other cars
- Fine-grained spatial data
- \blacksquare Area without strong EV policies \longrightarrow market-based adoption

Hypotheses

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Individual characteristics:

- Higher household income & high education & owner-occupied house
- High environmentalism
- Party preferences

Contextual:

- Population density
- Public charging availability

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Swiss Cantons



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ●□ ● ●

Data & Methods

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Data from car registries

- Census of BEV holders, random sample ICEV holders
- Approx. 11 % response rate, 2412 complete cases
- Zip code level information (charging stations, population density)
- 567 BEV holders and 1847 ICEV holders
- Method
 - Logit regression
 - Jointly regressing all potential influence factors
 - Controlling for socio-demographics

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のへで

Household Income



Figure: AME household income, baseline = 'below CHF 4000'

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲園▶ ▲園▶ 「園」 釣ん(で)

High Education



Home Ownership



Figure: AME home ownership, baseline = 'own house'

◆□> <圖> < => < => < => < => < <</p>

Environmental Concern



Figure: AME environmental concern, baseline = 'low'

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

Party Preferences



Figure: AME party preferences, baseline = 'SVP'

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

Population Density

Individual: BEV Adoption Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco Motivation Hypotheses Data & Methods Results Conclusion

Spatial &



Figure: AME population density, baseline = 'rural', DEGURBA classification based on ZIP code population density

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへ⊙

Charger Availability



Figure: AME charger availability, numbers of chargers per zip code

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Conclusion 14 Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption Findings: BEV owners are environmentally concerned home owners, with high income & education Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivatior

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Findings:

- BEV owners are environmentally concerned home owners, with high income & education
- Green party preferences

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Findings:

- BEV owners are environmentally concerned home owners, with high income & education
 - Green party preferences
 - Residential population density does not matter

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Findings:

- BEV owners are environmentally concerned home owners, with high income & education
 - Green party preferences
 - Residential population density does not matter
 - Charger access matters: the more, the better

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ つ へ ()

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Policy implications:

• Contextual factors as policy target \longrightarrow charging infrastructure

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Policy implications:

■ Contextual factors as policy target → charging infrastructure

Scientific novelty:

Policy preferences matter in expensive purchase decisions

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Policy implications:

 \blacksquare Contextual factors as policy target \longrightarrow charging infrastructure

Scientific novelty:

- Policy preferences matter in expensive purchase decisions
 Potential further research:
 - Neighborhood effects
 - Different energy efficient BEVs
 - Potential early mainstream adopters

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

Thank you!

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivatior

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

Main take-away: Revealed preference study

- \blacksquare Education $\uparrow,$ income $\uparrow,$ owner-occupied house \uparrow
- environmental concern ↑, (green) party preferences ↑,
- charging infrastructure ↑
- $\blacksquare \Longrightarrow$ unforced BEV adoption \uparrow

The research has been carried out with the support of the ETH Zurich ISTP Mobility Research Incubator Program and the Swiss Federal Office of Energy (SFOE). The authors bear sole responsibility for the conclusions and findings.

	Bibliography	16		
Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco				
Motivation Hypotheses Data & Methods	 Sierzchula, W., Bakker, S., Maat, K., and Van Wee, B. (2014). The influence of financial incentives and other socio-economic factors on electric vehicle adoption. <i>Energy Policy</i>, 68:183–194. 			
Results				
Conclusion				

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ →□ ◆○◆

Results



Figure: Logistic regression results

Results



Figure: Logistic regression results

Results

C

Spatial & Individual: BEV	Groups		Estimate	$\Pr(> z)$	
Adoption	Higher education	Yes	0.432	0.000	***
	Monthly household income	>16000	2.185	0.001	***
Brückmann,		12001-16000	1.798	0.005	**
Willibald,		8001-12000	1.525	0.015	*
Blanco		4001-8000	1.096	0.081	
Dianeo	Property ownership	Owner-occupied flat	0.921	0.000	***
		Own house	1.313	0.000	***
Aotivation	Environmental concern	medium	0.282	0.037	*
		high	0.854	0.000	***
lypotheses	Party preference	Green Liberal Party (GLP)	1.000	0.000	***
.		Green Party (GPS)	1.534	0.000	***
Data &		Conservative Democratic (BDP)	-0.540	0.175	
/lethods		CVP	-0.497	0.083	
Results		The Liberals (FDP)	-0.118	0.573	
esuits		Social Democratic Party (SP)	0.157	0.524	
Conclusion		Other	1.238	0.000	***
		None	0.100	0.630	
	Population Density	Agglo	0.130	0.433	
	. ,	Urban	0.066	0.744	
	Charging availability	Charging	0.303	0.054	

 $N=2412,\ McFadden$ Pseudo R2: 0.198 Signif. codes: '***' 0.001, '**' 0.01, '*' 0.05, '.' 0.1 Controlling for age, gender, car fleet, household persons, other parties and employment status.

Table: Logistic regression results

Robustness Checks

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ □ のQ@

Spatial & Individual: BEV Adoption

Brückmann, Willibald, Blanco

Motivation

Hypotheses

Data & Methods

Results

Conclusion

More spatial variables

- share of built up area per municipality,
- share of single-family houses per municipality
- job accessibility
- PT grade
- municipality type
- Spatial clustering of SE
- Canton by canton analysis
- Inclusion/Omission of SES control variables

Results did not change substantially.

Results: Aargau



Figure: Logistic regression results Aargau only

Results: Schwyz



Figure: Logistic regression results Schwyz only

Results: Zug



Figure: Logistic regression results Zug only

Results: Zurich



Figure: Logistic regression results Zurich only