

Drivers of consumers' change to an energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA) in households: Evidence from five European countries

Catarina Neves * & Tiago Oliveira

*NOVA Information Management School (NOVA IMS), Universidade Nova de Lisboa,
Campus de Campolide, 1070-312 Lisboa, Portugal*

This is the accepted author *manuscript of the following article published by Elsevier:*

Neves, C., & Oliveira, T. (2021). Drivers of consumers' change to an energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA) in households: Evidence from five European countries. *Applied Energy*, 298, 1-15. [117165].
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117165>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Drivers of consumers' change to an energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA) in households: Evidence from five European countries

Abstract

Residential buildings are significant contributors to global energy consumption. Hence, numerous articles have studied occupants' energy behaviors to promote households' change toward energy efficiency. However, the drivers of these behaviors, analyzed in a unified view of several perspectives, have not been fully explored in the literature. Moreover, the intention to adopt an energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA) has never been investigated in order to understand what drives people to change their current appliances. To fill this gap, our work gathers six relevant contexts (triggers, barriers, engagement, house characteristics, co-benefits, and communication channels) to predict behavior change (both attitude on heating equipment use and intention to change to an EEHA). We tested our model based on a sample of 1611 observations collected in five European countries, using structural equation modeling. Our work reveals the significance of energy efficiency and labeling as motivations, and operation and maintenance as barriers. Co-benefits and communication channels also greatly affect consumer behavior intention, namely organizational and web media channels. Our results also emphasize the importance of consumer engagement in the topic of energy, being the strongest effect on behavior intention. These findings have practical implications for both energy and governmental organizations to increase households' energy efficiency.

Keywords: Efficient energy; Energy efficient heating appliances; Consumer behavior model; Behavior intention to change

Drivers of consumers' change to an energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA) in households: Evidence from five European countries

1. Introduction

Nowadays, in order to mitigate environmental problems consumers must make decisions regarding more efficient energy use [1]. There are many mitigation efforts that should be implemented, from the adoption of renewable energy and energy-efficient appliances, to the adoption of new habits and policy regulations to control and better manage energy behaviors [2]. The residential sector itself represents about one-fifth of global energy consumption [3], revealing the substantial impact on energy savings if efficient energy is largely adopted in the sector, and particularly the household adoption of energy efficient appliances. However, although government regulations strive to promote the adoption of green energy and more energy-saving habits, consumer involvement and willingness are crucial in the process of adopting more efficient energy [4], supporting even more the need for studies of consumer behavior in this regard.

In the scope of EU energy savings, the propensity for purchasing energy-efficient appliances exerts a great influence, and understanding the drivers of appliance purchasing may help governments to better address campaigns and policies toward energy efficiency. However, the change of heating appliances does not occur frequently, as occupants tend to remain with the same heating appliance for long periods of time [5]. Also, the choice of home-heating requires a long-term perspective, as the investment in heating appliances is relatively capital demanding and the benefits may be felt only in a long term. Some analysts may even argue that this should be considered a type of infrastructure investment and, as with other investments, consumers may require a long-term loan [6]. As a result, estimating these determinants might be a challenge [7].

Although the motivation of researchers to understand what the determinants of energy-saving behaviors are [8], most studies in this area generally focus on one perspective at a time. Some of them investigate only the psychological factors, examining pro-environmental, social, and personal norms [9,10], while some others emphasize the physical, technological, and/or socio-demographic components of the dwelling and consumer in order to understand energy consumption and investments [11–13]. Only a few studies have addressed the topic of energy investment from both perspectives [2,3]. Furthermore, those that do address it usually focus on energy behaviors and investments in a general way or are based on individuals who already made a heating appliance purchase in the last few years [5,14]. To fill this gap, we developed a research model to explain behavior change (both attitude on heating equipment use and intention to change to an EEHA) that gathers contexts that are infrequently considered in combination. This model was developed based on literature review and qualitative interviews with experts from five European energy agencies and two European universities. The following contexts emerged from it: (1) triggers, (2) barriers, (3) engagement, and (4) house characteristics. To those, we leveraged the model with two more contexts rarely tested before in energy research: (5) co-benefits and (6) communication channels.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, we followed the suggestion of Venkatesh et al. (2013) to use mixed-methods, i.e., we use a qualitative approach with experts and structural equation modeling to test the emerged model. In doing so, our research is enriched with qualitative

insights that enhance the model and demonstrates the importance of several technical and social components in predicting consumers' intention to change heating appliances. Second, our model includes two dependent variables, attitude on heating equipment use and behavior intention to change to an EEHA, investigating the direct and indirect effects on both variables. Our research thereby provides a more holistic investigation into the factors that affect consumer behavior intention compared with other studies that usually study only one variable individually and direct relations. Finally, for practitioners and policy-makers, this paper highlights important findings for a more effective formulation of campaigns and policies based on the results of the empirical model.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section we provide the theoretical background pertaining to EEHA, as well as some studies about consumer behavior related to efficient energy. Section 3 presents the qualitative study, extending the literature review. In Section 4 the research model is built, and the hypotheses to be tested are described, preceded by empirical evidence regarding each context. Section 5 presents the methods. In Section 6 the results of the research model are presented. In Section 7 we discuss the findings of our work jointly with their theoretical and practical implications as well as limitations. Finally, in Section 8 we present the conclusions.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Energy-efficient heating appliance (EEHA)

In Europe, space heating occupies the first place as the most significant contributor to domestic energy consumption [16]. Space heating accounts for 63.6% of the final energy consumption in households in the European Union, followed by water heating with 14.8%. Energy used for all other purposes, including space cooling, cooking, lighting, or other end uses, end up by representing less than 22% of final household energy consumption, as almost all energy products are used exclusively for space and water heating purposes, varying from 91.2% in oil products to 100% in derived heat [17]. Therefore, there is a growing pressure to change to new fossil fuel reliant alternative forms of domestic heating [18]. The necessity to improve the way energy is used in domestic buildings is affected by householders' energy behaviors [19], which in turn is also profoundly affected by the efficiency of the appliances [5]. In fact, one of the strategies for reducing energy consumption through space heating is the improvement of technologies and buildings [20]. Moreover, structural factors such as the presence of efficient appliances proves to be a factor to increase the efficiency of households [21] and reduce residential energy consumption [22].

2.2. Prior research

In the scope of theoretical foundations, we find some contexts that play an important role in the consumer decision-making process related to energy-efficient appliances. Even though many studies have addressed the determinants of energy-saving behaviors, few of them have focused on energy-saving investments, establishing a framework that encompasses several components (see Table 1). The studies focused on the social and psychological components of consumer behavior are often based on the following theories: theory of planned behavior [14], prospect theory [23], norm activation model [24], and values, beliefs, and norms theory [25]. For example, Heutel [26] concluded that the decision to invest in energy-efficiency entails some risk and

uncertainty by itself, and that people thus behave according to the prospect theory. In other way, and focused more on general energy-saving behaviors, Chen [10], based on the theory of planned behavior, concluded for a significant role of moral obligation to mitigate climate changes, in addition to attitude and subjective norm, while Li [9], complemented by the norm activation model theory, concluded for the strong effect of opportunity followed by motivation [26]. Also, based on careful energy use behaviors, Nie [8] concluded for the relevance of subjective norms, encouraging the diffusion of publicity on energy information and knowledge, creating a social public opinion, and directing pressure on the importance of pro-environmental behaviors. On the other hand, some studies followed the more physical, economic, and/or socio-demographic contexts related to the house and the consumer. For example, Yang and Zhao [27] concluded that family income positively moderates the relationship between energy-efficient and renewable energy equipment purchase attitude and behavioral intention, and in turn, subsidy incentives positively affect the moderator effect of family income. From a more socio-demographic perspective, Baldini [7] concluded that the housing type, number of inhabitants, and age were strong predictors for purchasing energy efficient appliances, which is consistent with the findings of Braun [13], who reported that the dwelling features are significant to determine the choice of the heating appliances. Also, Michelson and Madlener [28] found differences between preferences of residential heating systems according to age of the house, indicating the relevance of socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the house as determinants of energy adoption choices. Besides that, and although few, some papers investigated both components. For example, Niamir [2] found similar importance of monetary factors and the awareness and social norms on energy-related actions, by joining three theories to study energy-saving behaviors and investments in efficient appliances and house insulation. Also, Brounen [3] investigated energy conservation behavior in households joining two perspectives, demographics of household and consumer attitudes toward energy conservation on energy-saving behaviors, finding significance for both. In sum, the adoption of efficient technologies is related not only to technological and economic factors like savings or characteristics, but also has to do with psychological aspects like engagement or social influence [29].

Authors	Theory/Theories	Variables	Method	Data
Niamir et al. [2]	Theory of planned behavior; Norm activation model	Country; Income; Gender; Education; Eco-comfort; Age; Tenure; Energy label; Type; Age of residence; Size; Electricity; Gas; Personal norms; Social norms	Regression (probit)	1790 households in Overijssel and Navarre
Heutel [26]	Prospect theory	Prospect theory parameters and energy consumption variables	Regression	Online survey of 2045 U.S. individuals
Nie et al. [8]	Theory of planned behavior	Attitude; Subjective norm; Perceived behavior control; Careful-use intention; Careful-use behavior	Structural equation modeling (SEM)	396 individuals in Changchun, China through an online survey in 2016
Li et al. [9]	Norm activation model; Theory of planned behavior	Ability; Behavior; Motivations; Opportunity	Structural equation modeling (SEM)	61 office buildings in the U.S.
Timm and Deal [30]	Values beliefs norms theory; Theory of planned behavior	Energy attitudes; Energy behaviors; Demographic variables	Pre-post analysis; Mann-Whitney U test;	Online survey in three colleges - students, faculty

			Wilcoxon signed ranks test	managers, and staff
Yang and Zhao [27]	Based on previous studies about the investment in energy efficiency topic	EERE equipment purchase attitude; EERE equipment Purchase behavioral intention; Socio-demographics; Family income; Subsidy incentive	Hierarchical linear regression	526 valid questionnaires from Beijing, Hefei, and Anyang
Chen [10]	Theory of planned behavior	Mitigation attitude; Subjective norms; Perceived behavioral control; Moral obligation; Behavioral intentions	Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA); Structural equation modeling (SEM)	728 individuals
Brounen et al. [3]	Based on previous studies about environmentalism and consumer choice	Home characteristics; Demographics; Ideology and attitudes; Energy literacy	Regression (logit)	1721 households
Michelsen and Madlener [28]	Based on the most frequent explanatory variables in the reviewed studies about energy	Socio-demographic characteristics; Home characteristics; Spatial characteristics; RHS-specific attributes	Multinomial logit model	2240 responses of homeowners who had received a BAFA grant for installing a new RHS

Table 1. Studies on energy efficiency and energy-efficient appliances

2.3. Drivers emerging from literature

We based our variables' identification on prior research that applied behavior theories and technical components, gathering some of the most significant constructs and considering their relevance for the study of consumer behavior intention. While some works sought to test some of the theories mentioned above, others sought to offer a more holistic view, combining different factors [2]. This latter was the approach we followed.

We identified four contexts: (1) triggers context, in which energetic efficiency was identified, representing the expected increase in the house energetic efficiency derived from changing to an EEHA, and already demonstrated in several works [20,31]. Savings [28] and energetic label [27,32] were also considered relevant; (2) in the context of barriers, operation and maintenance costs were considered relevant [33,34]. In fact, the use of terms such as drivers or barriers has already been mentioned in some studies in the energy area [35,36]; (3) Regarding the engagement context, the level of consumer engagement and interest was considered relevant. This element can be seen as a proxy for energy awareness and literacy regarding energy topics, already studied in several articles [3,37,38]. Social influence, which relates to the well-researched construct of social norms used in several theories, was also identified [2,10]; (4) Referring to the context of house characteristics, house age [3,39], and houses' energy class [2] were also considered relevant.

3. Qualitative study

To increase the understanding of the phenomena of heating equipment change, a mixed-methods methodology was applied [15]. We decided to follow an approach similar to that of Mingers [40].

After identifying the theoretical constructs, we conducted a qualitative exploratory study followed by a confirmatory study. Since the purpose of executing qualitative interviews is to identify and test the theoretical constructs already found in literature and understand the existence of others, a qualitative study followed by a quantitative one is appropriate for this case [15], following a sequential qualitative-quantitative design [41]. This work is quantitative dominant, and the purpose of this mixed-methods approach is developmental. Therefore, after identifying the theoretical constructs an exploratory study based on semi-structured interviews was undertaken.

Since our work is based on five European countries and their characteristics, the sample interviewees were identified with the purpose of meeting the characteristics of those countries. As such, the selected individuals represent different international and European energy agencies. See Appendix A for more information about the interviewees. The interviews were carried out during the HARP project consortium, and the number of interviews was based on saturation [42]. Data saturation is reached when there is enough information to replicate the study, there is no more ability to obtain new information, and further coding is no longer feasible [42]. The method chosen to achieve data saturation was by having a saturation grid in which the researcher listed the major topics vertically and noted the interviews on the horizontal [43]. The personal interviews were equally structured to guarantee the consistency of results. Seven interviews were conducted. Qualitative data were content analyzed based on general themes that represented the constructs of the research model. As a result, the constructs identified were validated based on the frequencies of responses. This qualitative approach also raised the importance of two additional contexts: (5) co-benefits and (6) communication channels (see Table 2 presenting factors of consumer intention to change to an EEHA identified by the interviewees).

Low frequency (1-3 interviews)	Medium frequency (4-5 interviews)	High frequency (6-7 interviews)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habit – it is usual to use EEHAs • Price value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to pay for co-benefits • Energy efficiency • Engagement • Social influence • Operation and maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energetic label • House’s characteristics • EEHA savings • Level of co-benefits (value) • Communication channels

Table 2. Factors of consumer intention to change to an EEHA identified by the interviewees

Concerning co-benefits, the importance of measuring these in terms of value and willingness to pay arose from the interviews with experts. Few articles explore these co-benefits, which can be felt at the building level (e.g., increased thermal comfort, improved aesthetics, fewer problems related to the useful living area) and society level (e.g., health effects, impact on climate change, energy use) [44]. These co-benefits are especially relevant for policymakers in the development of policies and campaigns, taking into consideration the possible crossed impacts on several levels [45]. Co-benefits can be measured from two different perspectives – simple contingent valuation and willingness to pay [44], which is aligned with the interviewees’ visions of evaluating co-benefits in two perspectives. From this, two constructs were created: co-benefits in general and co-benefits investment.

Regarding communication channels, from qualitative interviews this emerged as an important variable that influences consumer awareness, and it is an important tool in the decision-making process of changing to an EEHA. Although few studies encompass the communication

component in the understanding of consumer behavior, the reception of information from mass media or other persons positively impacts the probability of selecting heating systems [46]. Based on the theory of diffusion of innovation [47], Franceschinis et al. [48] suggest several kinds of communication: mass media including TV, radio, and newspaper and interpersonal ones that consists of two-way communication between two or more subjects, and usually is more effective at creating or changing attitudes on subjects. Three factors, namely, media, organizations, and web media, were identified from the expert interviews.

4. Research model

Our holistic research model is grounded on a combination of literature review and qualitative study inputs. Consequently, we consider **six contexts** as potential influencers of behavior intention to change to an EEHA. Based on the literature, we selected **four contexts**: (1) energy efficiency, representing expected increase in house energy efficiency, energetic label and savings as the **triggers' context**; (2) operation and maintenance as the **barriers' context**; (3) Engagement and social influence were nominated in the **engagement context**; (4) house age and house' energetic label for the **house characteristics context**. **Two more contexts** based on a qualitative study emerged: (5) co-benefits in general and co-benefits investment as the **co-benefits' context**; (6) media communication channels, organization communication channels, and web media communication channels as the **communication channels' context**. Figure 1 presents the research model for consumer behavior change. The next sub-sections present the roles of each context and the research hypotheses.




Figure 1. Research model

4.1. Triggers context

The triggers context is based on variables that can be positive drivers for consumers to change their heating appliances, including energy efficiency (EE), savings (Sav), and label (Lab). As the literature suggests, these variables are three of the ones that consumers consistently take into

consideration when adopting energy-saving behaviors or investments. Energy efficiency (EE) stands for the expected increase of the energetic efficiency of the house through the acquisition of an EEHA. According to Wade et al. [20], one of the strategies to reduce energy consumption is via the acquisition of efficient appliances. Also, Prete et al. [49] suggest that implementing energy-efficient measures in residential buildings, which require the use of innovative materials and installation of efficient appliances, is one of the most effective strategies to decrease household energy consumption, emphasizing the importance of this construct. As for energy savings, this is a prevailing factor when studying efficient energy adoption. Michelsen and Madlener [28] suggest that being aware of possible monetary and energetic savings have shown to be great predictors of energy-saving behaviors. Moreover, Ek and Söderholm Patrik [50] conclude that promoting more concrete energy savings measures is more effective than general information, suggesting the importance of this variable in consumers' energy-efficient investments. Also, labeling is seen as one of the strategies to overcome some barriers on appliance purchases [32], since consumers have a high level of awareness of the energy label in appliances [51]. Mills and Schleich [52] suggest that appliance energy-efficiency labels could also be modified to include information on operating costs, reinforcing that they are a sound strategy toward efficient energy adoption and a relevant aspect for energy agencies. Based on this, the hypotheses are:

H1a: Energy efficiency positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H1b: Energy efficiency positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H2a: Savings positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H2b: Savings positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H3a: Label positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H3b: Label positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.2. Barriers context

Regarding the context of barriers, many articles report an impact of operation and maintenance (OM) on efficient energy investments. For example, Tsoka et al. [34] conclude that maintenance issues are constraints to the investment in efficient appliances, in the case of efficient building facades. Also, Steg [53] suggests that when saving energy involves, among others, high costs in terms of effort or convenience, then this will negatively affect energy-saving behaviors. In addition, the ease of use and maintenance issues were also studied by Michelsen and Madlener [28], suggesting the importance of these in the decision to purchase the heating appliance. Based on this, two additional hypotheses are:

H4a: Operation and maintenance negatively influence the attitude on heating equipment use.

H4b: Operation and maintenance negatively influence the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.3. Engagement context

Several studies demonstrate that consumer engagement has a significant effect in energy-saving behaviors. In our work, we study the role of engagement (EG) and social influence (SI) in consumer behavior change. The engagement variable stands for individuals' awareness of and interest in the topic of efficient energy and EEHA. Literature has shown the relevance of personal interest and awareness among the behavior factors in energy choices [2]. Many researchers have

studied environmental awareness and energy literacy as an important factor toward energy-saving choices [3,13,19]. Also, social influence presents an impact on consumer energy-saving behaviors. Fornara et al. [29] posit that the role of social influence is important in predicting the intention to invest in household renewable energy devices. Furthermore, the work of Chen [10] refers to both factors of engagement and social influence, concluding that individuals who have a more positive attitude toward the mitigation of global climate change show some interest in the topic, and when people important to them encourage them to adopt that kind of behavior the intention to engage in energy savings will increase. Therefore, the following is also hypothesized:

H5a: Engagement positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H5b: Engagement positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H6a: Social influence positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H6b: Social influence positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.4. House characteristics context

Regarding house characteristics, several studies report the relevance of this context toward heating appliance choice and efficient energy choices. These characteristics refer to the structural attributes well studied in several articles [3,39]. For example, Niamir et al. [2] concluded that the residence characteristics such as house age (HA) and house's energy class (HEC) were important factors that influence the willingness to switch to a green provider, while the owners of older residences are more likely to switch as well as if the residence has a lower energy label. Also, Braun [13] concluded that the dwelling attributes are important determinants of the space heating appliance type. Thus, additional hypotheses are:

H7a: House age positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H7b: House age positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H8a: House's energy class negatively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H8b: House's energy class negatively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.5. Co-benefits

From the qualitative study, the importance of co-benefits emerged as a driver for consumers' intention to change to an EEHA – both co-benefits (CB) in general and co-benefits investment (CBInv). Co-benefits are related to the benefits that the change to an EEHA can bring to individuals as well as buildings [44]. This can be measured either qualitatively by seeking to understand the importance of the co-benefits (co-benefits) or quantitatively by understanding the willingness to pay for those same benefits (co-benefits investment), which sometimes may not be the same [44]. Several studies have also sought to determine the most-valued consumer benefits on heating appliance purchase and consumption [54,55]. From the qualitative study emerged the constructs co-benefits, measuring the value of co-benefits, and co-benefits investment, representing the willingness to pay for these. These constructs are formative since their items are not necessarily correlated as a reflection of the construct. Instead, they cause the construct. Based on this, the following hypotheses are made:

H9a: Co-benefits positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H9b: Co-benefits positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H10a: Co-benefits investment positively influences the attitude on heating equipment use.

H10b: Co-benefits investment positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.6. Communication channels

From the qualitative study, the importance emerged of including three types of communication channels in the model: media communication channels (MCC), organization communication channels (OCC), and web media communication channels (WCC). Knowing that communication channels have a considerable impact on how information is made available, it is important to measure the effect of those channels on consumers when it concerns buying efficient heating appliances, especially for energy organizations and agencies responsible for campaigns and incentives toward efficient energy investments. Although not deeply explored, it is expected that information sourced from other people and from media should be influential for individuals [46]. Moreover, not only may the media and web media have an impact, but organizations related to energy may also, including both energy agencies or professionals and installers. Indeed, Wade [20] studied how these professionals play a bridging role between heating systems and consumers, understanding their substantial influence in the selection of heating products. From these domains, media, organization, and web media communication channels emerged. These constructs are formative since their items are not necessarily correlated as a reflection of the construct. Instead, they cause the construct. From this, the following hypotheses are advanced:

H11a: Media communication channels positively influence the attitude on heating equipment use.

H11b: Media communication channels positively influence the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H12a: Organization communication channels positively influence the attitude on heating equipment use.

H12b: Organization communication channels positively influence the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

H13a: Web media communication channels positively influence the attitude on heating equipment use.

H13b: Web media communication channels positively influence the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.7. Behavior change context

This context comprises attitude on heating equipment use (Att) and behavior intention to change (BIC). When studying the behavior intention of individuals, it is usual to study the individuals' attitudes. For example, Yang and Zhao [27] used purchase attitude as an explanatory construct of purchase behavioral intention. In many studies attitude is seen to be a significant predictor of behavior [29,56]. According to the theory of planned behavior [23], attitude is an explanatory variable of intention. Attitudes are not directly related to behavior, but rather with intentions [52] and can be seen as the evaluation of individuals regarding some behavior [27]. In our case it refers to the positive or negative evaluation of actually changing to an EEHA.

H14: Attitude on heating equipment use positively influences the behavior intention to change to an EEHA.

4.8. Controls

The study of consumer behavior is usually controlled for some variables, especially socio-demographic parameters, and in the particular case of energy, household demographics [27,57–59] that use age, gender, education level, and also the age of the household and the presence of children. The number of years of education, the presence of children in the household, and the country were selected as control variables in our model.

5. Materials and methods

5.1. Measurement

The confirmatory study involved the collection of quantitative data through a survey approach to test the research model. An online survey was conducted in order to collect the responses from all five countries. The questionnaire was composed of the items of each construct identified (see Appendix B). Constructs were adapted from published literature regarding efficient energy and consumer behavior and the findings of the qualitative study. Most of the questions have a seven-point numerical scale (ranging from 1 – completely disagree to 7 – completely agree). Initially, the questionnaire was developed in English and Portuguese with a review of academic researchers and university staff that validated both questionnaires. Then the questionnaire was translated into the other four main languages of the countries in the study – French, Italian, German, and Spanish. Several versions were reworded from each language to English and vice versa, guaranteeing the equivalence of meaning in all translated versions [60]. In addition, we undertook a pilot survey with 200 responses. These first results showed that the items were adequate and measured the constructs well, demonstrating the validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

5.2. Data

The questionnaire was administered in the five European countries in the study over five months, from October 2019 to February 2020. Residents from each country were randomly selected in each country. A total of 2371 responses were collected. After data cleansing and the removal of incomplete responses, a sample of 1611 individuals were retained. We also examined the common-method bias in two ways. First, using Harman's one-factor test [61] none of the indicators individually explain more than 50% of the variance. Second, a theoretically irrelevant marker variable was added [62], presenting a maximum shared variance with other variables of 0.055 (5.5%), which is a reasonable value [63]. As a result, no significant common method bias was indicated.

As shown in Table 3, 31% of respondents range from 18 to 39 years, and 69% are older than 40. Quotas were set in order to have similar proportions between each country sample and the respective populations. In addition, a Chi-squared test was conducted for differences in probabilities. Also, to ensure that samples were sufficiently income balanced, median equivalized monthly household net income per country was also considered. The confidence interval for this measure was calculated for each country, showing in all countries except for Portugal, no differences, as the population parameter is in the confidence interval calculated with the samples of each country (see Appendix C – Table C.1). Only Portugal presents a slight difference in age and income. This may be due to the fact that this is a very aged country and with much lower incomes when compared to the other countries under study. However, the target population in these types of studies of energy appliances tends to have a somewhat higher income [27], which

implies a slightly higher income in the Portuguese sample when compared to the general population. Also, Portugal is characterized by a low level of digital literacy, especially among the elderly, which is the main reason for having more young individuals who answered to the online questionnaire. A calculation for the minimum sample size was also performed using the sample size formula for an infinite population. The prevalence (p) for each country as the percentage of respondents that were willing to change their heating appliance was obtained resorting to a study conducted by EUROGAS in October of 2019 [64]. A level of precision (d) of 5% was also assumed [65]. The necessary minimum number of complete responses was achieved using this calculation. As demonstrated in Table C.2 (Appendix C), all countries exceeded the minimum number of complete responses.

The average number of years of education is 15.3 years, showing a somewhat higher level of education compared to the total population, which is usual in studies of energy-efficient investments [8,37]. Also, 40% of respondents have no children. The number of years of education and the presence of children were used as control variables, preserving the impacts of the explanatory variables regardless of the level of education or presence of children. The majority of the respondents were the owners of their house and the ones responsible for the decision of installing or changing their heating equipment solution, which is in accordance with the majority of studies regarding energy-saving behaviors, in which the sample is usually composed of homeowners [37,66,67].

Sample characteristics (n=1611)	Descriptive statistics
Age	
18-39	31%
≥ 40	69%
Gender	
Female	41%
Male	59%
Responsible for the decision to change to an EEHA	77%
Homeowner	78%
Children (1 = have children; 0 = do not have children)	40%
Number of years of education	15.3
Country	
France	23%
Germany	11%
Italy	22%
Portugal	16%
Spain	28%

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the sample

6. Results

The partial least squares (PLS) technique was used to estimate the research model. This method was chosen as it is a technique used to test models that have not been tested before [68], which is the case of our research model as an explanatory research to predict behavior change. PLS is also a technique that allows having formative indicators measuring the constructs [69] and does not

require any restrictive assumption regarding distribution [70]. All of these parameters were satisfied, establishing the suitability of the PLS method. First, the measurement model is analyzed regarding discriminant validity and reliability, and then the structural model is tested. For these purposes, Smart PLS 3.0 was used [71].

6.1. Measurement model

Several measures were analyzed to assess the measurement model. Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviations of the reflective constructs, as well as the composite reliability (CR) and the average variance extracted (AVE). All constructs present a CR higher than 0.7, showing the reliability of scales, and an AVE higher than 0.5, confirming convergent validity [72,73]. The Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loadings, and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) were used to assess discriminant validity. The Fornell-Larcker criterion ensures discriminant validity if the diagonal elements, representing the square root of AVE, are higher than the correlations between the constructs [73]. This criterion is met, as noted in Table 4. Table D.1 (Appendix D) shows the loadings and cross-loadings. All loadings are higher than the cross-loadings, satisfying the condition [74]. Table D.2 (Appendix D) reports the HTMT, whose values are lower than 0.9, confirming discriminant validity between the reflective constructs. Consequently, the reflective constructs can be used to test the structural model.

	Mean	STD	CR	EE	Sav	Lab	OM	EG	SI	HA	HEC	Att	BIC
EE	6.104	1.356	1.000	1.000									
Sav	5.952	1.201	0.894	0.489	0.861								
Lab	6.132	1.135	0.927	0.452	0.491	0.900							
OM	3.162	1.625	0.938	-0.247	-0.143	-0.157	0.914						
EG	4.355	1.541	0.960	0.233	0.120	0.218	-0.184	0.961					
SI	3.710	1.741	0.974	0.195	0.153	0.215	-0.088	0.601	0.962				
HA	4.305	1.924	1.000	0.094	0.066	-0.029	-0.072	-0.026	0.027	1.000			
HEC	3.332	2.600	1.000	0.016	-0.074	0.020	-0.078	0.306	0.249	-0.239	1.000		
Att	3.984	1.725	0.884	0.314	0.263	0.304	-0.159	0.314	0.311	0.056	0.023	0.890	
BIC	4.875	1.660	0.925	0.430	0.320	0.360	-0.287	0.457	0.439	0.084	0.121	0.680	0.897

Table 4. Mean, standard-deviation, CR, and Fornell-Larcker table. The diagonal elements are the square-root of AVE. EE – Energy efficiency; Sav – Savings; Lab – Label; OM – Operation and maintenance; EG – Engagement; SI – Social influence; HA – House age; HEC – Houses’ energy class; Att – Attitude on heating equipment use; BIC – Behavior intention to change.

Concerning formative constructs, it was necessary to assess the multicollinearity, significance, and relevance of indicator weights [72]. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was performed to assess multicollinearity. Table 5 presents the VIF values lower than 3.3, indicating no multicollinearity issues [75]. Table 5 also shows the weights and loading of indicators. All the indicators that do not have significant weights have loadings higher than 0.5, confirming the significance and relevance of indicator weights. Consequently, the formative constructs can also be used to test the structural model.

	Mean	STD	Weights	Loadings	VIF	
Co-benefits	CB1	5.623	1.737	0.274***	0.589***	1.516

	CB2	5.277	1.675	-0.214***	0.227***	1.395
	CB3	5.312	1.696	0.261***	0.591***	1.537
	CB4	5.782	1.476	-0.148*	0.501***	1.819
	CB5	6.081	1.354	0.854***	0.946***	1.634
	CBInv1	252.943	236.461	0.403***	0.801***	2.674
	CBInv2	249.765	234.095	-0.089	0.699***	2.897
	CBInv3	218.981	223.278	0.028	0.658***	3.137
	CBInv4	209.052	222.694	0.125	0.637***	3.077
Co-benefits investment	CBInv5	195.953	207.858	-0.150	0.611***	2.681
	CBInv6	262.967	242.853	-0.042	0.671***	2.356
	CBInv7	186.082	200.868	0.343***	0.652***	2.238
	CBInv8	223.899	223.320	-0.230**	0.550***	2.378
	CBInv9	270.643	236.566	0.134	0.677***	1.982
	CBInv10	297.098	246.125	0.634***	0.902***	2.268
Media communication channels	MCC1	3.672	1.762	0.320*	0.848***	2.144
	MCC2	3.344	1.784	0.295	0.904***	3.046
	MCC3	3.608	1.871	0.498***	0.926***	2.478
Organization communication channels	OCC1	4.627	1.894	0.481***	0.768***	1.207
	OCC2	5.061	1.814	0.573***	0.854***	1.426
	OCC3	4.975	1.653	0.019	0.595***	2.143
	OCC4	4.538	1.691	0.226**	0.577***	1.908
Web media communication channels	WCC1	4.979	1.575	0.624***	0.868***	1.243
	WCC2	3.577	1.802	0.553***	0.829***	1.243

Table 5. Mean, standard-deviation, weights, loadings and VIF of formative construct indicators (* p-value <0.10; ** p-value<0.05; *** p-value<0.01).

6.2. Structural model

Before analyzing the structural model, we tested the multicollinearity between all constructs using the variance inflation factor (VIF). All VIF values are below 3.3, demonstrating no multicollinearity issues among variables [75]. The structural model, represented in Figure 2, presents the total effects and the explained variation. Bootstrapping with 5000 iterations of resampling was performed to assess the significance of total effects [72]. Total effects include the direct effects over behavior intention to change to an EEHA plus the indirect ones through the attitude on heating equipment on use [76].




Figure 2. Structural model for behavior intention to change. Total effects (* p-value <0.10; ** p-value<0.05; *** p-value<0.01).

Our model explains 62.2% of the variation on behavior intention to change to an EEHA. From the triggers' context, the results indicate that energy efficiency is significant for both attitude on heating equipment use ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.135$; $p<0.01$) and behavior intention to change to an EEHA ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.160$; $p<0.01$), verifying H1a and H1b. Savings result being not statistically significant for either attitude on heating equipment use or behavior intention to change to an EEHA. Otherwise, label presents statistical significance for attitude on heating equipment use ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.064$; $p<0.05$) and behavior intention to change to an EEHA ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.067$; $p<0.05$). H3a and H3b are established.

Concerning barriers, operation and maintenance are statistically significant for both dependent variables, verifying H4a and H4b ($\hat{\beta}_a= -0.042$; $p<0.1$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=-0.090$; $p<0.01$). The results also show a statistically significant effect on both constructs of the engagement context. Engagement ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.208$; $p<0.01$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.198$; $p<0.01$) and social influence ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.160$; $p<0.01$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.163$; $p<0.01$) have statistically significant effects for both dependent variables. H5a, H5b, H6a, and H6b are confirmed. House characteristics otherwise showed not to have statistically significant effects, therefore not confirming the effects of house age and houses' energy class (H7a, H7b, H8a, and H8b). Regarding the co-benefits context, this construct has a significant effect only in behavior intention to change ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.083$; $p<0.01$). Co-benefits investment is one of the constructs with a statistically significant high effect in both dependent variables ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.171$; $p<0.01$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.110$; $p<0.01$). From the communication channels, the ones with a statistically significant effect in attitude on heating equipment use and behavior intention to change are the organization communication channels ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.098$; $p<0.01$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.121$; $p<0.01$) and the web media communication channels ($\hat{\beta}_a=0.045$; $p<0.1$) ($\hat{\beta}_b=0.040$; $p<0.05$), validating H12a, H12b, H13a, and H13b. As expected from other studies, attitude on heating equipment is statistically significant for behavior intention to change to an EEHA ($\hat{\beta}=0.506$; $p<0.01$), confirming H14.

7. Discussion

As the need to mitigate environmental problems increases, the need to understand consumer behavior regarding efficient energy also increases. The results of our work allow one to understand what drives consumers to change to an EEHA, findings that to the best of our knowledge are not yet reported in other studies. Understanding the consumer determinants to change to an EEHA is important for an effective formulation of campaigns and communication strategies toward consumer adoption of more efficient heating appliances.

Within the triggers context, our results confirm the importance of the energetic label as well as the awareness of increased energy efficiency in homes if an EEHA is acquired. Energy efficiency has the third-highest impact on behavior intention to change, demonstrating the importance for consumers to have a more energy-efficient house, often by means of efficient/energy appliances acquisition. This result reinforces the increasing interest in obtaining a “smart home” in terms of energy efficiency and environmental friendliness, already studied elsewhere [77]. Also, the presence of the energetic label on the appliance is identified as a driver for people to change their heating equipment. Results prove that consumers engaged in this topic pay attention to appliances’ energetic labels and their awareness is a clear motivation to acquire an EEHA, as confirmed in qualitative interviews. From their experience, experts argued that the energetic label is still a highly-valued factor for acquiring heating appliances. Savings were not statistically significant to both dependent variables. This result suggests that consumers give more importance to benefits related to their personal health and environmental wellbeing, rather than the money they can save with other heating solutions.

From our results, engagement is the context with the strongest effect in both dependent variables. This suggests that the more energy awareness and interest by the consumer in the topic, the more positive is the attitude toward the change of the heating equipment, leading to the intention to change to an EEHA. This finding is supported by earlier works [78]. Additionally, the influence of persons known and valued by the consumer are shown to have a great impact on behavior change. This insight demonstrates the importance of what is usually called word-of-mouth communication, either personal or online. This finding is also supported by earlier research [10]. This demonstrates that the change to an EEHA is related to structural factors, but also with cognitive and affective ones.

Operation and maintenance reveal a negative impact in both variables of the behavior change context, confirming earlier studies [53]. In fact, great efforts relating to the use and maintenance of an appliance will negatively influence the propensity to change to an energy-efficient one. Additionally, our results showed that neither house age nor house energy class have a significant effect in both dependent variables when tested with other contexts.

Concerning co-benefits, the greatest effect proves to be in co-benefits investment. The willingness to pay for co-benefits such as thermal comfort, reduced noise, and avoidance of health problems, is a powerful predictor of attitude and intention to change. This indicates that people are willing to pay to ensure those co-benefits that may be provided by an efficient heating appliance. Moreover, the co-benefits construct also has a positive effect on the behavior intention to change, supporting the importance of the benefits and their promotion.

From communication channels, our results suggest the importance of organization and web media channels for both attitude and intention. This confirms the importance of energy agencies and organizations as well as the professionals and installers already supported in other studies [20]. In the topic of energy and EEHA, this type of communication presents one of the strongest impacts in driving consumer intention to change to an EEHA. Furthermore, web media communication channels reflect the current importance of the internet and online sources of information as well as related mobile applications. This result is also aligned with the importance of engagement and social influence, more and more through web means. This finding is noteworthy as it has barely been included in earlier studies and it can be used to help agencies and policy-makers about the channels for addressing consumers in communication actions about energy-efficient transitions.

In addition to the results presented, a comparison between the sample countries was also performed. The results are summarized in Table 6. In all five countries, the strongest significant effects in the individual models per country were in most cases the ones that are also significant in the model with all sample observations. Co-benefits investment appears as statistically significant for all countries regarding behavior intention to change, and all except France for attitude on heating equipment use. This outcome reinforces the strong impact of this variable, already confirmed. Our findings also show engagement as an important driver of behavior intention to change in all countries except for Germany. Organization communication channels and operation and maintenance also have a significant effect on behavior intention to change in three of the five countries. The results reinforce the importance of these variables, whereby although differing in the effect magnitude, they are indeed explicative in almost all countries. Consumer engagement seems to be one key element toward the change to an EEHA, especially when emphasizing the possible benefits consumers may achieve in their own households. This finding suggests that, overall, people are willing to invest in appliances when there are clear benefits to both their house and personal health and wellbeing. Ultimately, changing an EEHA can be seen as an investment in their wellbeing, and this should not be ignored when formulating strategies or policies toward the increase of energy efficiency in the residential sector. Although this last conclusion proves to be transversal to all countries under study, it should be noted that the way consumers are approached may differ from country to country. For example, Germany is particularly interesting for its strong environmentalism value leveraged by the government regulations in sustainable energy matters [79], which may not be true for all countries. Moreover, considerable differences exist among European countries. For example, Mediterranean countries have significantly lower heating needs when compared to center or northern countries [80]. It is worth noting that in both Spain and Italy the energy efficiency construct reveals to have a strong effect, contrary to the others. This finding suggests then that in these countries (Mediterranean), the change to an EEHA is also much motivated by the intention to increase overall house's energetic efficiency, since the need to heat the house is not so prominent. This may imply a single fact: overall, consumers are willing to buy appliances for their "efficiency" characteristic, and if so, this can be true for any other energy efficient appliance. Increasing houses' energetic efficiency also has shown to be a relevant added value to houses, especially in the real-estate market. Several studies have proved that investments in energy performance really translate into economic value and higher prices for real estate [81,82]. Again, co-benefits prove their relevant role in the intention to change to efficient appliances. Also, media communication channels reveal to be significant to both attitude and intention in Spain but only for attitude in France. This finding suggests that media communication tends to vary from country to country in terms of the type of information and the way it is presented and spread. It is reasonable that the influence of these

channels differs between countries. This finding suggests the value of having a unified strategy or framework of communication in Europe, that then grows on its specifications according to the characteristics of each country.

Construct	Path	Total Effects				
		France	Germany	Italy	Portugal	Spain
Energy efficiency	EE -> Att	0.091	0.088	0.067	0.086	0.154***
	EE -> BIC	0.119	0.093	0.142**	0.094	0.144***
Savings	Sav -> Att	0.093	0.003	0.027	0.069	0.064
	Sav -> BIC	0.184***	-0.037	0.036	0.074	0.011
Label	Lab -> Att	0.161***	-0.007	0.013	0.073	0.041
	Lab -> BIC	0.099**	-0.014	0.059	0.073	0.040
Operation and maintenance	OM -> Att	-0.098*	-0.046	0.034	-0.146***	-0.089**
	OM -> BIC	-0.020	-0.102**	0.028	-0.182***	-0.150***
Engagement	EG -> Att	0.282***	0.145*	-0.011	0.090	0.190***
	EG -> BIC	0.206***	0.023	0.122**	0.110*	0.254***
Social influence	SI -> Att	0.032	0.126*	0.057	0.203***	0.227***
	SI -> BIC	0.035	0.125**	0.126*	0.077	0.196***
House age	HA -> Att	0.035	-0.13**	0.023	0.095*	0.014
	HA -> BIC	0.066*	-0.053	-0.008	0.127**	0.037
Houses' energy class	HEC -> Att	0.057	-0.138**	-0.008	0.070	0.009
	HEC-> BIC	0.020	-0.123**	-0.057	0.095	0.038
Co-benefits	CB -> Att	-0.019	0.227**	0.082	0.036	0.011
	CB -> BIC	0.070	0.350***	0.041	0.070	0.080
Co-benefits investment	CB inv -> Att	0.031	0.178**	0.342***	0.197***	0.222***
	CB inv -> BIC	0.100**	0.165***	0.226***	0.186***	0.131***
Media communication channels	MCC -> Att	-0.098**	0.006	-0.049	-0.020	0.133**
	MCC -> BIC	-0.022	0.027	0.007	0.056	0.110**
Organization communication channels	OCC -> Att	0.256***	0.131	0.078	0.063	-0.026
	OCC -> BIC	0.272***	0.211***	0.066	0.143*	0.012
Web media communication channels	WCC -> Att	0.116***	-0.048	0.025	0.084	0.041
	WCC -> BIC	0.010	0.078	0.058	0.045	0.046
Attitude on heating equipment use	Att -> BIC	0.419***	0.577***	0.415***	0.630***	0.564***
R-squared		78.1%	74.5%	43.1%	62.7%	62.8%

Table 6. Total effects of behavior change models tested individually in each country

This work presents the following theoretical implications. First, by developing a consumer behavior change model, this is one of the first models that joins several contexts in the decision to change to an EEHA. Other studies focused on only specific dimensions (e.g., psychological factors, house characteristics, sociodemographic characteristics). This consumer behavior change model can be a framework and sets the basis for further investigation in other types of appliances. Second, it uses the structural equation modeling technique, which is widely used in investigating consumer choice and adoption of several themes, for example, technology, but not so much in the energy sector. Third, this study uses a mixed-method approach, demonstrating the importance of both quantitative and qualitative studies, which we hope will encourage the application of this method in further investigation.

With respect to practical implications, the model developed supports decision-makers, especially regarding marketing campaigns and consumer communication. In fact, a campaign can be much more effective if people know exactly what to promote. As Wade [20] highlighted, another strategy for energy saving is to understand the users. Thus, our findings suggest what should be

promoted toward the change to EEHA, anticipating the factors that may influence consumers' intentions. For example, the presence of labeling showed to be relevant in driving people to change their heating appliances. As such, policies toward the promotion and diffusion of these labels, jointly with other campaigns, may lead to a consumer change regarding the heating appliance type, especially if these also include more information, for example, operating costs [52].

These results dovetail with the context of energy agencies and their necessity to build campaigns and policies that meet consumers' needs and characteristics. Indeed, our work provides a complete framework in which the most important variables predicting consumers' intention to change to an EEHA are identified, as well as the most important means to communicate, showing the importance of engaging people in the topic of efficient energy and EEHA.

As shown, engagement context is the main driver of intention to change to an EEHA, suggesting the important role of affective elements in consumers' decisions, specifically in energy appliances choices. The way the topic of EEHA involves consumers, the word-of-mouth about it and the perception of how EEHA is socially accepted and perceived as a good solution is significant to the consumer intention to change, contrary to other structural factors such as house characteristics. The consumer engagement in initiatives and with energy agencies and organizations is crucial. Some strategies can also include gamification [83] or mobile applications (web media communication channel) as a way to increase motivation and to engage consumers in energy-efficient behaviors, notably the choice of an EEHA. Gamification consists of the development of game characteristics in a non-game context [84].

The truth is that sometimes consumers do not know what efficient appliance to choose and what benefits they can achieve with that acquisition. Knowledge about energy use and energy saving options is positively related to the adoption of energy-efficient technologies [52]. As such, these strategies will not only increase the engagement but will also create consumers more informed about the change to an EEHA and its benefits. Consumers tend to ignore mass information and are more likely to respond to directed and targeted information [85]. Therefore, mobile applications and gamification strategies can provide each consumer with different types of information, depending on the consumer her/himself and the house characteristics, increasing consumers' interest.

One of the limitations of this study is that it addresses only heating appliances and excludes those that cool. For future research the scope of the study could be expanded to cooling appliances. To enhance generalization, the sample for future research could also consider region differences within countries, and additional studies could also extend the comparison between countries. Authors encourage the inclusion of cultural factors in future studies. Another limitation resides in the fact that the qualitative interviews were restricted to experts in the area of energy, and did not include usual consumers, who may have different opinions. However, we considered that the variables based on literature review strongly represent the consumer perspective. Finally, although the set of variables chosen in each context of the model was validated and extended in the exploratory study, this set is not restrictive, and other variables may be used in each context.

8. Conclusion

The adoption of renewable or clean energies, as well as energy savings, occupies a growing interest among researchers, not only for the necessity of mitigating climate problems, but also to understand consumer behavior within the topic of energy. Energy policies and campaigns should combine more insights from social science research in order to meet efficient energy goals [36]. The adoption of EEHA is one measure that if successfully implemented may help to solve environmental problems in several ways. This study contributes to a better understanding of consumer intention to change to an EEHA. The investigation considered six main contexts based on a literature review and a qualitative study, analyzing five European countries: France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, and Spain. Based on those contexts, the drivers to behavior change were tested. Our findings show that energy efficiency and the associated label have a positive effect in both attitude and intention to change to an EEHA. Engagement and social influence also play an important role, as do co-benefits. We also confirmed the negative impact of operation and maintenance, and the relevance of organizational and web media channels. Our results are of significant interest in the study of consumer behavior and for policy or campaign makers, supporting the design of effective communication strategies.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program [grant agreement N° 847049]. We would like to thank the HARP (Heating appliances retrofit planning) project consortium, consisting of *Agência para a Energia (ADENE)*, *R2M Solution Spain SL (R2M)*, *European Environmental Citizens Organization For Standardization (ECOS)*, *University of Minho (UMINHO)*, *ANIMA Federazione delle Associazioni Nazionali dell'Industria Meccanica Varia ed Affine (ASSOTERMICA)*, *European Solar Thermal Industry Federation (SHE/ESTIF)*, *Association of the European Heating Industry (EHI)*, *Accademia Europea di Bolzano (EURAC)*, *Agenzia Nazionale per le Nuove Tecnologie, L'energia e lo Sviluppo Economico Sostenibile (ENEA)*, *Deutsche Energie-Agentur GMBH (DENA)*, *Creara Consultores SL (CREARA)*, *Uwe Trenkner (TRENKNER)*, *Associação Portuguesa para a Defesa do Consumidor (DECO)*, *Syndicat des industries thermiques, aérauliques et frigorifiques (UNICLIMA)*, *Nova University of Lisbon (NOVA IMS)*, *Energies et Avenir -Association des professionnels pour le chauffage durable (EA)*, *Organisation of Consumers and Users (OCU)* and *Energies 2050 (ENERGIES2050)*, for their support in the data collection for the qualitative study and the validation and dissemination of the questionnaires in all five countries.

Appendix A – Details about qualitative study interviewees

ADENE – is a Portuguese energy agency whose mission is to develop activities of public interest in the topic of energy, with regard to the efficient consumption of water and energy. We interviewed two members responsible for the management of several projects in technical areas such as energy efficiency and energy labeling.

DECO – is a Portuguese association for consumer protection whose mission is to protect the rights and interests of consumers and contribute to consumers being more informed. We interviewed a member responsible for projects in the area of innovation.

ECOS – is a European environmental organization that promotes environmental interests in Europe and internationally. We interviewed an eco-design expert.

Energies 2050 – is an international non-governmental organization working toward sustainable development and climate protection. We interviewed the founder and president of the organization.

OCU – is a Spanish association for consumer protection of rights and interests. We interviewed a project officer in the area of renewable and efficient energy.

The University of Minho – is a center of the territory, environment, and construction from the University of Minho, Portugal. We interviewed the project manager and researcher in the area of energy efficiency and sustainability, focusing on buildings.

High-level protocol questions

1. Which of the following factors do you think drive or condition consumers' intention to change to an EEHA?
2. What do you think needs to be improved in energy-efficient campaigns?
3. What information would you like to know about consumers in this topic of changing to an EEHA?
4. From your experience, what are the triggers for consumers to change to an EEHA?
5. From your experience, what are the barriers that prevent consumers from changing to an EEHA?
6. From your experience, what is the impact of house characteristics on consumers' intention to change to an EEHA?
7. From your experience, what is the impact of engagement on consumers' intention to change to an EEHA?
8. Is there any other information that you think is relevant about consumers' intention to change to an EEHA?

Additional questions pertaining to the characteristics of the interviewees' organizations are not included.

Appendix B – Survey Items

Energy Efficiency (based on Venkatesh et al. (2012))

I would be more likely to change to an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance) if: (1 – Completely disagree; 7 – Completely agree)

EE. It will increase my house's energy efficiency.

Savings (based on Michelsen and Madlener (2012))

I would be more likely to change to an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance) if: (1 – Completely disagree; 7 – Completely agree)

Sav1. I receive a subsidy to finance the replacement.

Sav2. I am aware of total energy savings over the EEHA lifetime.

Sav3. I am aware of total monetary savings over the EEHA lifetime.

Label (based on Sammer and Wüstenhagen (2006))

Evaluate the following sentences about energy labels. (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

Lab1. The energy label is important in the decision of buying a heating appliance.

Lab2. When I buy a heating appliance, I pay attention to the energy label.

Lab3. I am more willing to buy a heating appliance with an efficient energy class (above C, i.e., A or B).

Operation and maintenance (based on Sopha and Klöckner (2011))

I will not purchase an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance) because: (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

OM1. I believe that the operation of an EEHA is more complicated than my current heating solution.

OM2. I believe that an EEHA needs the user to perform maintenance work by himself.

OM3. I believe that the maintenance of an EEHA requires too much work.

Engagement (based on Vivek et al. (2012))

Evaluate the following sentences about engagement. (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

EG1. I pay a lot of attention to anything about EEHA.

EG2. I keep up with things related to EEHA.

Social influence (based on Venkatesh et al. (2012))

Evaluate the following sentences about engagement. (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

SI1. People who are important to me think that I should adopt EEHA.

SI2. People who influence my behavior think that I should adopt EEHA.

SI3. People whose opinions that I value prefer that I adopt EEHA.

House Age (based on Michelsen and Madlener (2012))

HA. How old is your dwelling since your last renovation (in years)? If it was not renovated, answer with the years since its construction. < 1; [1, 5[; [5, 10[; [10, 15[; [15, 20[; [20, 25[; [25, 30[; >=30

House's energy class (based on Michelsen and Madlener (2012))

HEC. If known, what is the energy class of your house (based on the Energy Performance of Building Certificate)? A+; A; B; B-; C; D; E; F

Co-benefits (based on Ferreira et al. (2017))

I would be more likely to change to an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance) if: (1 – Completely disagree; 7 – Completely agree)

CB1. Condensation, humidity and mold related problems are avoided.

CB2. It will not reduce my house's useful floor area.

CB3. It values the dwelling in the real-estate market (I will sell the house for a higher price if it is equipped with an EEHA).

CB4. It allows me to be independent from energy price fluctuations.

CB5. It allows me to have a reduced environmental impact.

Co-benefits investment (based on Ferreira et al. (2017))

Are you willing to invest an extra value for your EEHA if it allows you to: (No; Up to 100€; Between 100 and 500€; More than 500€)

CBInv1. Achieve a comfortable indoor temperature during the heating season more easily.

CBInv2. Have better indoor air quality.

CBInv3. Lower indoor noise level.

CBInv4. Lower external noise level.

CBInv5. Operate the EEHA more easily.

CBInv6. Be more independent to energy prices.

CBInv7. Have a more aesthetically pleasing EEHA.

CBInv8. Have more useful living area.

CBInv9. Value the dwelling in the real-estate market.

CBInv10. Have a reduced environmental impact.

Media communication channels (based on Franceschinis et al. (2017))

Evaluate the importance of the following sources to search for information about EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance). (1 – Not important; 7 – Very important)

MCC1. Newspapers

MCC2. Radio

MCC3. Television

Organization communication channels (based on Franceschinis et al. (2017))

Evaluate the importance of the following sources to search for information about EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance). (1 – Not important; 7 – Very important)

OCC1. People I know who own an EEHA

OCC2. Organizations (local associations, energy agencies)

OCC3. Installers and/or related professionals

OCC4. EEHA shop

Web media organization communication channels (based on Franceschinis et al. (2017))

Evaluate the importance of the following sources to search for information about EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance). (1 – Not important; 7 – Very important)

WCC1. Internet Websites

WCC2. Mobile Application

Attitude on heating equipment use in general (based on March et al. (2015))

Evaluate the following sentences about changing to an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance). (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

Att1. I usually track my energy consumption based on my billing. (dropped)

Att2. I am willing to change my heating appliance(s).

Att3. I am planning to buy an EEHA.

Behavior intention to change to an EEHA (based on Venkatesh et al. (2012))

Evaluate the following sentences about changing to an EEHA (Energy Efficient Heating Appliance). (1 – Completely disagree – 7 – Completely agree)

BIC1. I intend to change to EEHA in the future.

BIC2. I will try to change to EEHA in my future.

BIC3. I am ready to change to EEHA.

Appendix C – Sample size and age distribution

Country	Age				Median equivalized household net income (in euros)	
	Classes	Sample	Population ¹	Chi-squared (p-value)	Confidence interval ³	Population ²
France	18 - 39	33%	33%	-0.2024	1,528 - 1,731	1,613
	≥ 40	67%	67%	-0.84		
Germany	18 - 39	32%	32%	0.14484	1,563 - 2,019	1,685
	≥ 40	68%	68%	-0.884		
Italy	18 - 39	29%	29%	0.4058	1,146 - 1,389	1,226
	≥ 40	71%	71%	-0.684		
Portugal	18 - 39	47%	30%	6.05101	804 - 1,161	716
	≥ 40	53%	70%	(<0.001)		
Spain	18 - 39	31%	31%	0.03767	1,071 - 1,346	1,073
	≥ 40	69%	69%	-0.97		

Note 1: ¹ Source: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/en/web/products-datasets/-/DEMO_PJAN (EUROSTAT: *Population on 1 January by age and sex*. The last update was 24.02.20 and extracted on 04.03.20).

Note 2: ² Source: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/bookmark/bc5e47e9-c116-4d2b-860f-293bb7a25927?lang=en> (EUROSTAT: *Mean and median income by household type - EU-SILC and ECHP surveys*. The last update was 24.02.20 and extracted on 04.03.20). Median equivalized household net income considers the impact of differences in household size and composition so, the total disposable household income is “equivalized”. The equivalized income attributed to each member of the household is calculated by dividing the total disposable income of the household by the equivalization factor. Equivalization factors can be determined in various ways. Eurostat applies an equivalization factor calculated according to the OECD-modified scale first proposed in 1994 - which gives a weight of 1.0 to the first person aged 14 or more, a weight of 0.5 to other persons aged 14 or more, and a weight of 0.3 to persons aged 0-13.

Note 3: ³ significance level of 0.001.

Table C.1. Age and income distribution of sample and population

Country	prevalence (p) ⁴	Minimum sample size ⁶	Sample size (n)
France	0.19	237	363
Germany	0.12	163	179
Italy	0.22	264	357
Portugal	0.18 ⁵	227	262
Spain	0.19	237	450

Note 4: ⁴ Source: Owen and Alloh [64].

Note 5: ⁵ Prevalence for Portugal was calculated based on the average of prevalences from the remaining four countries.

Note 6: ⁶ Calculated based on the sample size formula for an infinite population ($n=Z^2p*q/d^2$), where Z is the standard normal distribution for the $(1-\alpha/2)$ level, d is the precision, p is the prevalence, and $q=(1-p)$.

Table C.2. Sample size

Appendix D – Measurement model for reflective constructs

	EE	Sav	Lab	OM	EG	SI	HA	HEC	Att	BIC
EE	1.000	0.489	0.452	-0.247	0.233	0.195	0.094	0.016	0.314	0.430
Sav1	0.311	0.708	0.325	-0.050	0.057	0.114	0.047	-0.102	0.186	0.188
Sav2	0.491	0.936	0.482	-0.168	0.139	0.172	0.065	-0.048	0.265	0.340
Sav3	0.435	0.920	0.441	-0.128	0.100	0.102	0.056	-0.058	0.220	0.274
Lab1	0.385	0.433	0.887	-0.073	0.137	0.161	-0.038	-0.025	0.263	0.276
Lab2	0.385	0.420	0.927	-0.136	0.225	0.222	-0.013	0.027	0.262	0.320
Lab3	0.443	0.466	0.884	-0.201	0.219	0.195	-0.028	0.045	0.291	0.366
OM1	-0.221	-0.118	-0.140	0.891	-0.187	-0.089	-0.013	-0.094	-0.131	-0.237
OM2	-0.206	-0.134	-0.126	0.903	-0.116	-0.034	-0.087	-0.036	-0.133	-0.242
OM3	-0.246	-0.138	-0.161	0.946	-0.196	-0.112	-0.090	-0.083	-0.167	-0.300
EG1	0.252	0.161	0.266	-0.164	0.967	0.575	-0.027	0.270	0.329	0.465
EG2	0.192	0.063	0.145	-0.192	0.955	0.580	-0.021	0.322	0.270	0.409
SI1	0.179	0.136	0.199	-0.085	0.594	0.957	0.026	0.251	0.303	0.424
SI2	0.177	0.143	0.202	-0.065	0.566	0.969	0.031	0.227	0.290	0.408
SI3	0.205	0.163	0.220	-0.103	0.574	0.961	0.022	0.239	0.304	0.435
HA	0.094	0.066	-0.029	-0.072	-0.026	0.027	1.000	-0.239	0.056	0.084
HEC	0.016	-0.074	0.020	-0.078	0.306	0.249	-0.239	1.000	0.023	0.121
Att2	0.325	0.287	0.311	-0.164	0.282	0.255	0.060	0.009	0.894	0.640
Att3	0.233	0.180	0.229	-0.118	0.276	0.299	0.039	0.033	0.885	0.569
BIC1	0.413	0.299	0.342	-0.257	0.437	0.405	0.067	0.126	0.614	0.927
BIC2	0.449	0.358	0.368	-0.258	0.351	0.370	0.108	0.054	0.579	0.908
BIC3	0.294	0.205	0.258	-0.256	0.438	0.405	0.053	0.144	0.635	0.853

Table D.1. Loadings and cross-loadings

	EE	Sav	Lab	OM	EG	SI	HA	HEC	Att	BIC
EE										
Sav	0.530									
Lab	0.478	0.567								
OM	0.259	0.155	0.169							
EG	0.241	0.128	0.234	0.201						
SI	0.199	0.170	0.232	0.092	0.640					
HA	0.094	0.072	0.031	0.073	0.027	0.028				
HEC	0.016	0.089	0.038	0.082	0.322	0.254	0.239			
Att	0.365	0.334	0.374	0.192	0.379	0.370	0.065	0.027		
BIC	0.459	0.368	0.405	0.320	0.506	0.478	0.090	0.129	0.845	

Table D.2. Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT)

References

- [1] Beck AL, Chitalia S, Rai V. Not so gameful: A critical review of gamification in mobile energy applications. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2019;51:32–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.01.006>.
- [2] Niamir L, Ivanova O, Filatova T, Voinov A, Bressers H. Demand-side solutions for climate mitigation: Bottom-up drivers of household energy behavior change in the Netherlands and Spain. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2020;62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101356>.
- [3] Brounen D, Kok N, Quigley JM. Energy literacy, awareness, and conservation behavior of residential households. *Energy Econ* 2013;38:42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.02.008>.
- [4] Sangroya D, Nayak JK. Factors influencing buying behaviour of green energy consumer. *J Clean Prod* 2017;151:393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.010>.
- [5] Gaspar R, Antunes D. Energy efficiency and appliance purchases in Europe: Consumer profiles and choice determinants. *Energy Policy* 2011;39:7335–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.08.057>.
- [6] Bergman N, Foxon TJ. Reframing policy for the energy efficiency challenge: Insights from housing retrofits in the United Kingdom. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2020;63:101386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101386>.
- [7] Baldini M, Trivella A, Wentz JW. The impact of socioeconomic and behavioural factors for purchasing energy efficient household appliances: A case study for Denmark. *Energy Policy* 2018;120:503–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.05.048>.
- [8] Nie H, Vasseur V, Fan Y, Xu J. Exploring reasons behind careful-use, energy-saving behaviours in residential sector based on the theory of planned behaviour: Evidence from Changchun, China. *J Clean Prod* 2019;230:29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.101>.
- [9] Li D, Xu X, Chen C, Menassa C. Understanding energy-saving behaviors in the American workplace: A unified theory of motivation, opportunity, and ability. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2019;51:198–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.01.020>.
- [10] Chen MF. Extending the theory of planned behavior model to explain people's energy savings and carbon reduction behavioral intentions to mitigate climate change in Taiwan-moral obligation matters. *J Clean Prod* 2016;112:1746–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.07.043>.
- [11] Kelly S. Do homes that are more energy efficient consume less energy? A structural equation model of the English residential sector. *Energy* 2011;36:5610–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.07.009>.
- [12] Sunikka-Blank M, Galvin R. Irrational homeowners? How aesthetics and heritage values influence thermal retrofit decisions in the United Kingdom. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2016;11:97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.09.004>.
- [13] Braun FG. Determinants of households' space heating type: A discrete choice analysis for German households. *Energy Policy* 2010;38:5493–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.04.002>.
- [14] Lillemo SC, Alfnes F, Halvorsen B, Wik M. Households' heating investments: The effect of motives and attitudes on choice of equipment. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 2013;57:4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.01.027>.
- [15] Venkatesh V, Brown SA, Bala H. Bridging the qualitative-quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. *MIS Q*

- 2013;37:21–54. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.1.02>.
- [16] European Union. Directive 2012/27/EU of 25 October 2012 on energy efficiency. Off J Eur Union 2012:1–56.
- [17] Eurostat. Energy consumption in households Statistics Explained, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Energy_consumption_in_households#Energy_products_used_in_the_residential_sector; 2021 [accessed 6 April 2021]
- [18] Hanmer C, Abram S. Actors, networks, and translation hubs: Gas central heating as a rapid socio-technical transition in the United Kingdom. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2017;34:176–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.03.017>.
- [19] Haines V, Kyriakopoulou K, Lawton C. End user engagement with domestic hot water heating systems: Design implications for future thermal storage technologies. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2019;49:74–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.10.009>.
- [20] Wade F, Hitchings R, Shipworth M. Understanding the missing middlemen of domestic heating: Installers as a community of professional practice in the United Kingdom. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2016;19:39–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.05.007>.
- [21] Kavousian A, Rajagopal R, Fischer M. Ranking appliance energy efficiency in households: Utilizing smart meter data and energy efficiency frontiers to estimate and identify the determinants of appliance energy efficiency in residential buildings. *Energy Build* 2015;99:220–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.03.052>.
- [22] Adua L. Reviewing the complexity of energy behavior: Technologies, analytical traditions, and household energy consumption data in the United States. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2020;59:101289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101289>.
- [23] Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Handb. Theor. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 1, 2012, p. 438–59. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n22>.
- [24] Schwartz SH. Normative influences on altruism. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol* 1977;10:221–79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60358-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60358-5).
- [25] Stern PC, Dietz T, Abel T, Guagnano GA, Kalof L. Society for human ecology a value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: The case of environmentalism. *Hum Ecol Rev* 1999;6:81–97.
- [26] Heutel G. Prospect theory and energy efficiency. *J Environ Econ Manage* 2019;96:236–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.06.005>.
- [27] Yang S, Zhao D. Do subsidies work better in low-income than in high-income families? Survey on domestic energy-efficient and renewable energy equipment purchase in China. *J Clean Prod* 2015;108:841–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.07.022>.
- [28] Michelsen CC, Madlener R. Homeowners' preferences for adopting innovative residential heating systems: A discrete choice analysis for Germany. *Energy Econ* 2012;34:1271–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2012.06.009>.
- [29] Fornara F, Pattitoni P, Mura M, Strazzera E. Predicting intention to improve household energy efficiency: The role of value-belief-norm theory, normative and informational influence, and specific attitude. *J Environ Psychol* 2016;45:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.11.001>.
- [30] Timm SN, Deal BM. Effective or ephemeral? The role of energy information dashboards in changing occupant energy behaviors. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2016;19:11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.04.020>.
- [31] Yohanis YG, Mondol JD. Annual variations of temperature in a sample of UK dwellings. *Appl Energy* 2010;87:681–90.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2009.08.003>.
- [32] Howarth RB, Haddad BM, Paton B. The economics of energy efficiency: Insights from voluntary participation programs. *Energy Policy* 2000;28:477–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215\(00\)00026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(00)00026-4).
- [33] Sopha BM, Klöckner CA. Psychological factors in the diffusion of sustainable technology: A study of Norwegian households' adoption of wood pellet heating. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2011;15:2756–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.03.027>.
- [34] Tsoka S, Tsikaloudaki K, Theodosiou T, Dugue A. Rethinking user based innovation: Assessing public and professional perceptions of energy efficient building facades in Greece, Italy and Spain. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2018;38:165–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.02.009>.
- [35] Achtnicht M, Madlener R. Factors influencing German house owners' preferences on energy retrofits. *Energy Policy* 2014;68:254–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.01.006>.
- [36] Edling L, Danks C. To adopt or not to adopt? Insights on energy transitions from a study of advanced wood heating. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2018;45:331–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.06.019>.
- [37] Koirala BP, Araghi Y, Kroesen M, Ghorbani A, Hakvoort RA, Herder PM. Trust, awareness, and independence: Insights from a socio-psychological factor analysis of citizen knowledge and participation in community energy systems. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2018;38:33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.01.009>.
- [38] Surulivel ST, Selvabaskar S, Alamelu R, Rafic MM. Power savings and energy consumptions among households: A planned behaviour theory approach. 7th IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Power, Energy, Inf. Commun. ICCPEIC 2018, IEEE; 2018, p. 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCPEIC.2018.8525217>.
- [39] Noonan DS, Hsieh LHC, Matisoff D. Economic, sociological, and neighbor dimensions of energy efficiency adoption behaviors: Evidence from the U.S residential heating and air conditioning market. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2015;10:102–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.07.009>.
- [40] Mingers J. Combining IS research methods: Towards a pluralist methodology. *Inf Syst Res* 2001;254:1414–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-007-0569-9>.
- [41] Venkatesh V, Brown SA, Sullivan YW. Guidelines for conducting mixed-methods research: An extension and illustration. *J Assoc Inf Syst* 2016;17:435–95. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00433>.
- [42] Fusch PI, Ness LR. Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *Qual Rep* 2015;20:1408–16.
- [43] Brod M, Tesler LE, Christensen TL. Qualitative research and content validity: Developing best practices based on science and experience. *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:1263–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-009-9540-9>.
- [44] Ferreira M, Almeida M, Rodrigues A. Impact of co-benefits on the assessment of energy related building renovation with a nearly-zero energy target. *Energy Build* 2017;152:587–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.07.066>.
- [45] Ferreira M, Almeida M. Benefits from energy related building renovation beyond costs, energy and emissions. *Energy Procedia* 2015;78:2397–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2015.11.199>.
- [46] Franceschinis C, Thiene M, Scarpa R, Rose J, Moretto M, Cavalli R. Adoption of renewable heating systems: An empirical test of the diffusion of innovation theory. *Energy* 2017;125:313–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.02.060>.

- [47] Rogers EM. Diffusion of innovations. Simon and Schuster. 2010.
- [48] Franceschinis C, Thiene M, Scarpa R, Rose J, Moretto M, Cavalli R. Adoption of renewable heating systems: An empirical test of the diffusion of innovation theory. *Energy* 2017;125:313–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.02.060>.
- [49] Prete MI, Piper L, Rizzo C, Pino G, Capestro M, Mileti A, et al. Determinants of Southern Italian households' intention to adopt energy efficiency measures in residential buildings. *J Clean Prod* 2017;153:83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.157>.
- [50] Ek K, Söderholm Patrik P. The devil is in the details: Household electricity saving behavior and the role of information. *Energy Policy* 2010;38:1578–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.041>.
- [51] Sammer K, Wüstenhagen R. The influence of eco-labelling on consumer behaviour - results of a discrete choice analysis for washing machines. *Bus Strateg Environ* 2006;15:185–99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.522>.
- [52] Mills B, Schleich J. Residential energy-efficient technology adoption, energy conservation, knowledge, and attitudes: An analysis of European countries. *Energy Policy* 2012;49:616–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.07.008>.
- [53] Steg L. Promoting household energy conservation. *Energy Policy* 2008;36:4449–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.09.027>.
- [54] Banfi S, Farsi M, Filippini M, Jakob M. Willingness to pay for energy-saving measures in residential buildings. *Energy Econ* 2008;30:503–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2006.06.001>.
- [55] Wolff A, Weber I, Gill B, Schubert J, Schneider M. Tackling the interplay of occupants' heating practices and building physics: Insights from a German mixed methods study. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2017;32:65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.07.003>.
- [56] March H, Hernández M, Saurí D. Assessing domestic water use habits for more effective water awareness campaigns during drought periods: A case study in Alicante, eastern Spain. *Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci* 2015;15:963–72. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-15-963-2015>.
- [57] Erell E, Portnov BA, Assif M. Modifying behaviour to save energy at home is harder than we think.... *Energy Build* 2018;179:384–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.09.010>.
- [58] Davis LW. Evaluating the slow adoption of energy efficient investments: Are renters less likely to have energy efficient appliances? *Des Implement US Clim Policy* 2011;54:301–16. [https://doi.org/presented at "The Design & Implementation of US Climate Policy"](https://doi.org/presented%20at%20The%20Design%20&%20Implementation%20of%20US%20Climate%20Policy), May 13-14, 2010.
- [59] Mills BF, Schleich J. Profits or preferences? Assessing the adoption of residential solar thermal technologies. *Energy Policy* 2009;37:4145–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.05.014>.
- [60] Cha ES, Kim KH, Erlen JA. Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: Issues and techniques. *J Adv Nurs* 2007;58:386–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04242.x>.
- [61] Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J Appl Psychol* 2003;88:879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.
- [62] Lindell MK, Whitney DJ. Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *J Appl Psychol* 2001;86:114–21. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.114>.
- [63] Johnson RE, Rosen CC, Djurdjevic E. Assessing the impact of common method variance

- on higher order multidimensional constructs. *J Appl Psychol* 2011;96:744–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021504>.
- [64] Owen K, Alloh F. Eurogas: Energy survey. https://eurogas.org/website/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Eurogas_Energy-Report_ComRes.pdf 2019 [accessed 29 March 2020].
- [65] Naing L, Winn T, Rusli BN. Practical issues in calculating the sample size for prevalence studies. *Arch Orofac Sci* 2006;1:9–14.
- [66] Wilson C, Crane L, Chryssochoidis G. Why do homeowners renovate energy efficiently? Contrasting perspectives and implications for policy. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 2015;7:12–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.03.002>.
- [67] Musti S, Kortum K, Kockelman KM. Household energy use and travel: Opportunities for behavioral change. *Transp Res Part D Transp Environ* 2011;16:49–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2010.07.005>.
- [68] Ke W, Liu H, Wei KK, Gu J, Chen H. How do mediated and non-mediated power affect electronic supply chain management system adoption? The mediating effects of trust and institutional pressures. *Decis Support Syst* 2009;46:839–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2008.11.008>.
- [69] Goo J, Kishore R, Rao HR, Nam K. The role of service level agreements in relational management of information technology outsourcing: An empirical study. *MIS Q* 2009;33:119–46. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20650281>.
- [70] Fornell C, Bookstein FL. Two structural equation models: LISREL and PLS applied to consumer exit-voice theory. *J Mark Res* 1982;19:440. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151718>.
- [71] Ringle, Christian M., Wende S, Becker J-M. SmartPLS 3. Bönningstedt: SmartPLS. 2015; Retrieved from: <http://www.smartpls.com>.
- [72] Hair JF, Ringle CM, Sarstedt M. PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *J Mark Theory Pract* 2011;19:139–52. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202>.
- [73] Fornell C, Larcker DF. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *J Mark Res* 1981;18:39.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>.
- [74] Chin WW. Issues and opinion on structural equation modeling. *MIS Q Manag Inf Syst* 1998;22:vii–xvi.
- [75] Lee G, Xia W. Toward agile: An integrated analysis of quantitative and qualitative field data on software development agility. *MIS Q* 2010;34:87–114.
- [76] Henseler J, Ringle CM, Sinkovics RR. The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. *Adv Int Mark* 2009;20:277–319. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979\(2009\)0000020014](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014).
- [77] Balta-Ozkan N, Amerighi O, Boteler B. A comparison of consumer perceptions towards smart homes in the UK, Germany and Italy: Reflections for policy and future research. *Technol Anal Strateg Manag* 2014;26:1176–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2014.975788>.
- [78] Vogiatzi C, Gemenetzi G, Massou L, Pouloupoulos S, Papaefthimiou S, Zervas E. Energy use and saving in residential sector and occupant behavior: A case study in Athens. *Energy Build* 2018;181:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.09.039>.
- [79] Wunderlich P, Veit DJ, Sarker S. Adoption of sustainable technologies: A mixed-methods study of German households. *MIS Q Manag Inf Syst* 2019;43:673–91.
<https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2019/12112>.
- [80] Martinopoulos G, Papakostas KT, Papadopoulos AM. A comparative review of heating systems in EU countries, based on efficiency and fuel cost. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev*

- 2018;90:687–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.060>.
- [81] Popescu D, Bienert S, Schützenhofer C, Boazu R. Impact of energy efficiency measures on the economic value of buildings. *Appl Energy* 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2011.08.015>.
- [82] Encinas F, Marmolejo-Duarte C, Sánchez de la Flor F, Aguirre C. Does energy efficiency matter to real estate-consumers? Survey evidence on willingness to pay from a cost-optimal analysis in the context of a developing country. *Energy Sustain Dev* 2018;45:110–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2018.05.008>.
- [83] Wee SC, Choong WW. Gamification: Predicting the effectiveness of variety game design elements to intrinsically motivate users' energy conservation behaviour. *J Environ Manage* 2019;233:97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.11.127>.
- [84] Deterding S, Khaled R, Nacke LE, Dixon D. Gamification: Toward a definition. *CHI 2011 Gamification Work Proc* 2011;12.
- [85] Lutzenhiser L. Social and Behavioral Aspects of Energy use. *Annu Rev Energy Environ* 1993;18.
- [86] Venkatesh V, Thong JYL, Xu X. Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Q* 2012;36:157–78. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41410412>.
- [87] Vivek SD, Beatty SE, Morgan RM. Customer engagement: Exploring customer relationships beyond purchase. *J Mark Theory Pract* 2012;20:122–46. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679200201>.