

## **Barriers to the Adoption of Energy Efficiency Measures in Mostaganem, Algeria**

\*Mohammed Seddiki<sup>1</sup>, Amar Bennadji<sup>2</sup> and Mohamed Tehami<sup>3</sup>

---

**First submission:** 23 April 2019; **Accepted:** 20 November 2019; **Published:** 15 December 2020

**To cite this article:** Mohammed Seddiki, Amar Bennadji and Mohamed Tehami (2020). Barriers to the adoption of energy efficiency measures in Mostaganem, Algeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 25(2): 39–61. <https://doi.org/10.21315/jcdc2020.25.2.2>.

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.21315/jcdc2020.25.2.2>

---

**Abstract:** The residential sector of Algeria consumes 29% of the total energy consumption. In order to reduce and address this consumption along with the challenges of climate change, the Algerian public policy considers energy efficiency investment measures (EEIMs) in the residential sector as a key factor. However, despite the recommendations and incitement measures from the government, the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian homeowners is too low. In 2018, EEIMs have been implemented in 4,000 houses. This number represents only 4% of the government's target which is the implementation of EEIMs in 100,000 houses per year. The present article, accordingly, attempts to explore the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs. To this effect, a questionnaire survey with 150 randomly selected Algerian single-family homeowners in Mostaganem area was used for the study. It was found that the five greatest barriers to the adoption of EEIMs were: (1) the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment, (2) the high initial prices of energy efficient equipment, (3) the lack of techniques and tools for the estimation of saved energy, (4) the unwillingness to borrow money and (5) the difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures. The principal component analysis categorised 16 barriers around four components: (1) "Financial" barriers, (2) "Technological" barriers, (3) "Lack of time and knowledge" barriers and (4) "Attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers. Finally, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) analysis has shown that the perception of barriers to the adoption of EEIMs also differs in accordance with certain personal characteristics of the homeowner.

**Keywords:** Barriers, Energy efficiency investment measures, Homeowners, Questionnaire survey, Algeria

### **INTRODUCTION**

The residential sector of Algeria consumes a lot of energy and is responsible for a high level of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions (Denker, El Hassar and Baradiy, 2014). An effective way to reduce household energy consumption is the implementation of energy efficiency investment measures (EEIMs) which use less energy while offering the same level of service (Prete et al., 2017). In 2016, the Algerian government has launched a programme to foster the adoption of EEIMs. This programme aims at insulating 100,000 houses per year and installing 100,000 solar water heaters per

---

<sup>1</sup>Faculté des Sciences et de la Technologie, Université Abdelhamid Ibn Badis-Mostaganem (UMAB), BP 188/227 Mostaganem 27000, ALGERIA

<sup>2</sup>Scott Sutherland School of Architecture and Built Environment, The Robert Gordon University, Garthdee Rd, Aberdeen AB10, Scotland, UNITED KINGDOM

<sup>3</sup>Université des Sciences et de la Technologie d'Oran Mohamed Boudiaf, USTO-MB, BP 1505, El M'nouer, 31000 Oran, ALGERIA

\*Corresponding author: [mohammed.seddiki@univ-mosta.dz](mailto:mohammed.seddiki@univ-mosta.dz)

year (APRUE [National Agency for the Promotion and the Rationalization of the Energy Use], 2016). Nevertheless, with the low prices of energy due to various subsidies, Algerian households were not conscious of their energy consumption and the government could not meet this objective yet. Currently, due to the economic crisis, the Algerian government is no longer able to maintain its financial support to the energy sector. Consequently, the price of energy has increased by 20% and Algerian households are now more conscious of their energy consumption (Seddiki, 2016). By adopting EEIMs, Algerian households can significantly reduce their energy consumption. Several municipalities in Algeria provide various incentives in the form of zero-interest loans, tax exemption or tax reduction to stimulate the implementation of EEIMs. The climate in different parts of Algeria varies greatly due to its vast geographical expanse. Therefore, for more consistency, this article focuses on Mostaganem area, which is located in Northern Algeria (as shown in Figure 1). Mostaganem area has been granted funds by the Algerian government and is considered as a pilot area for the adoption of EEIMs (Denker, El Hassar and Baradiy, 2014).



Figure 1. Location of Mostaganem Area in Northern Algeria  
Source: *d-maps.com* (n.d.)

However, despite the high prices of energy and a favourable policy context, the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian homeowners is too low. Indeed, for 2018, APRUE has announced that EEIMs have been implemented in 4,000 houses. This number represents only 4% of the government target which is the implementation of EEIMs in 100,000 houses per year (Mokhtar, 2018). This indicates that the main drivers and barriers to the adoption of EEIMs are not well understood and not correctly handled by current policymakers. To the best knowledge of the authors, no empirical studies

on homeowners' adoption of EEIMs have been conducted in Algeria. To help close this gap, the objectives of the study outlined in this article are: (1) to identify and rank the critical barriers that hinder the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family homeowners, (2) to investigate the underlying relationships between these barriers and (3) to investigate the differences in the perception of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of the different groups segmented according to personal and contextual variables. For the conduction of this research study, we rely on data from a questionnaire survey with 150 randomly selected Algerian single-family house owners in Mostaganem area to analyse the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will review studies of drivers, barriers and factors influencing the adoption of EEIMs of homeowners within the broader context. Several researchers have investigated the adoption of EEIMs of homeowners focusing on different streams of research (Prete et al., 2017). A stream of research has analysed factors that influence the adoption of EEIMs of homeowners. According to Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra (2010), these factors can be categorised within two groups: contextual factors (e.g., homeownership, the age of the house) and personal factors (e.g., education, age, income). An early study by Cameron (1985) using individual household data from the United States of America indicated that the adoption of EEIMs is strongly influenced by retrofit costs, relative energy prices and income. The researcher focused on discrete energy conservation retrofits such as insulation and storm windows. Achtnicht and Madlener (2014) studied the key drivers and barriers to the adoption of energy retrofit actions in Germany. A survey of more than 400 owner-occupiers of single-family detached, semi-detached and row houses was conducted through computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI). The respondents also faced a choice experiment involving different energy retrofit measures. The results indicate that the income, energy cost savings, payback period and favourable opportunities (e.g., heating system that needs replacement) strongly influence the adoption of energy retrofit actions in Germany. Prete et al. (2017) examined the determinants of Southern Italian households' intention to adopt energy efficiency measures in residential buildings. Open-ended questionnaires were administered to 128 Apulian households. The particularity of the research carried out by Prete et al. (2017) is to demonstrate that attitude is the main determinant of households' intention and willingness to adopt energy efficiency measures.

Another stream of research has examined households' willingness to pay (WTP) for EEIMs of different types of technologies. Scarpa and Willis (2010) applied a choice experiment approach to investigate households' WTP for renewable energy technologies in the United Kingdom (UK). The results indicate that households considered the capital cost of renewable energy technologies as too high. Štreimikienė and Baležentis (2015) studied the main drivers of WTP for renewable electricity of Lithuanian households. The researchers used the focus group approach with 100 participants. The results indicate that the lack of information and environmental awareness play a crucial role in the WTP for renewables in Lithuanian households. Tampakis et al. (2017) studied citizens' views on electricity savings and production from renewable energy sources (RES) on a Greek island. A survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire and face-to-face interviews

with 385 respondents. The results show that insufficient information regarding RES systems that can be used in households are considered by the citizens as being a major barrier.

Another stream of research has focused only on the barriers that influence the adoption of EEIMs of homeowners. Different types of barriers have been identified in the literature such as low energy prices, priority to comfort and other non-energy aspects, lack of attractive products and services (Risholt and Berker, 2013), incentives and regulations (Palm and Tengvard, 2011), the helpless (Reddy, 1991), technical parameters and general housing activities (Jakob, 2007), limited knowledge about new technologies (Häkkinen and Belloni, 2011), lack of expertise of the executive board (Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra, 2011), high initial prices of energy efficient equipment (Diashu, Sovacool and Vu, 2010), lack of personal involvement (Stieß and Dunkelberg, 2013). Jakob (2007) investigated drivers and barriers to energy efficiency in renovation decisions of single-family homeowners using survey data. The findings indicate that energy-efficient renovations are affected by technical parameters (e.g., lifetime of a roof) and general housing activities (e.g., building extensions). Ravetz (2008) affirms that energy efficiency refurbishments are not considered as a high priority for UK homeowners when updating their homes. The findings indicate that the perceived hassle of installation, upfront costs, uncertainties over lower fuel bills and a lack of knowledge over payback periods are considered as major barriers. Mortensen, Heiselberg and Knudstrup (2011) presented a literature review of the barriers for energy renovations in private households found in Denmark. The findings indicate that the lack of knowledge and interest in the topic, the uncertainty about both investment size and savings, lack of examples and unbiased information represent the main barriers.

Häkkinen and Belloni (2011) studied barriers and drivers for sustainable building in Finland using literature review, inquiries and interviews. The results show that the main barriers for households' to adopt EEIMs are limited knowledge about new technologies and their prices. Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra (2011) investigated the barriers to the implementation of EEIMs in Swedish co-operative apartment buildings. The researchers sent a questionnaire to chairmen of 3,000 co-operative housing association across Sweden. The findings indicate that the lack of expertise of the executive board was considered as a strong barrier to energy efficiency investments. Diashu, Sovacool and Vu (2010) investigated the barriers to energy efficiency in the residential sector within one province in China. A survey questionnaire of more than 600 households was conducted. The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment, the low prices of energy in China, the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment represent the main barriers to energy efficiency. Stieß and Dunkelberg (2013) investigated the objectives and barriers of German homeowners to energy-efficient refurbishment. The practicality of this study compare to the previous ones is to consider two groups an energy group who informed themselves comprehensively and a standard group. The main barriers for both groups were the lack of personal involvement, satisfaction with the existing thermal performance, the lack of financial resources and unwillingness to borrow money.

The research presented in this article is related to this specific stream of research where only the barriers that influence the adoption of EEIMs of homeowners are considered by the authors. To the best knowledge of the authors, no empirical studies on homeowners' adoption of EEIMs have been conducted in Algeria. This study tries to fill this gap, the main objective of our empirical study are: (1) to identify

and rank the critical barriers that hinder the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family homeowners, (2) to investigate the underlying relationships between these barriers and (3) to investigate the differences in the perception of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of the different groups segmented according to personal and contextual variables.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Questionnaire Development and Implementation**

In order to collect data on the barriers hindering the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family homeowners in Mostaganem area, an empirical survey was carried out on a random sample of 180 owners of single-family houses in Mostaganem (Algeria). As a result of inappropriate completion and non-recovery of about 30 questionnaires, a total of 150 owners of single-family houses were used for the study. The sample size in this survey was considered as appropriate since each dependent variable (16 dependent variables have been considered in the survey) had practically 10 participants as indicated in Hair et al. (2010). Furthermore, the sample size was considered acceptable compared with the sample size of 128 respondents for the survey on factors influencing Southern Italian households' intention to adopt energy efficiency measures conducted by Prete et al. (2017). Respondents who had the responsibility to decide the adoption of EEMs were considered as the target population of the study. The survey was carried out using a self-administered questionnaire in the winter of 2018.

The questionnaire (in French) was divided into two parts. The first part included the overarching aims of the research study and covered questions to identify contextual factors (e.g., homeownership, the age of the house) and personal factors (e.g., education, age, income). The second part detailed 16 possible barriers for the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family homeowners in Mostaganem area. The barriers in our questionnaire were all identified after a comprehensive review of the literature (Häkkinen and Belloni, 2011; Ravetz, 2008; Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra, 2011; Mortensen, Heiselberg and Knudstrup, 2011; Risholt and Berker, 2013; Friedman, Becker and Erell, 2018). The respondents were asked to evaluate every single barrier using a five-point Likert scale, where "1" meant that the barrier was not important while "5" meant that the barrier was very important. In order to identify potential practical problems as well as problems with the survey design, a pilot study with 20 questionnaires preceded the main survey. The results of the pilot survey helped to improve the questionnaire.

### **Analytical Procedure**

The analysis of the collected data was conducted through reliability analysis, ranking analysis, principal component analysis and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) as follows.

### **Reliability analysis**

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to examine the internal consistency among the barriers in order to test the reliability of the five-point scale (Kim, Lee and Nguyen, 2016; Chileshe, Hosseini and Jepson, 2016).

### **Ranking analysis**

In order to identify and rank the critical barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family homeowners, the ranking analysis as indicated in Chileshe et al. (2015) was implemented. The relative importance of the critical barriers was defined through the examination of descriptive statistics (mean score values and standard deviation). The relative importance of each barrier is represented by the mean score while the degree of compromise between participants is characterised by the standard deviation (Kim, Lee and Nguyen, 2016). The selection of the variable with the lowest standard deviation was performed for the rank differentiation where two or more barriers had the same mean values (Doloi et al., 2012).

### **Principal component analysis**

The principal component analysis was conducted mainly to examine the multivariate interrelationships within the barriers and derive a reduced set of hindrance factors that can be readily used in practice as indicated in Michelsen and Madlener (2013).

### **MANOVA**

The personal and contextual variables were used for separating the participants into groups. In order to investigate the differences in the perception of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of the different groups segmented according to personal and contextual variables, MANOVA was conducted as indicated in Chileshe, Hosseini and Jepson (2016). When an overall difference was found between any groups of homeowners as a result of MANOVA, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were applied to find the source of differences as indicated in Yuksel, Kanik and Baykara (2000).

## **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

This section presents the outcomes of the analysis of the collected data and discusses the results, including characteristics of the sample, the reliability analysis, the ranking of hindrance factors, the principal component analysis of hindrance factors and the MANOVA.

### **Characteristics of the Sample**

A summary of personal and contextual characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. The respondents were mainly men (62.7%) and 89% of the respondents ranged from 30 to more than 60 years old. For educational background, 90% of the respondents possessed a Bachelor's degree or higher. The majority

of the respondents' (60%) have a household's monthly net income more than USD300 (which represents the average salary in Algeria). Most of the sampled houses (69.3%) were constructed between 1991 and 2018. The area of the sampled houses ranged from less than 100 m<sup>2</sup> to more than 250 m<sup>2</sup>.

Table 1. Personal and Contextual Characteristics of the Respondents

Variable	Classification	N	Frequency (%)
Gender	Male	94	62.7
	Female	56	37.3
Age	20 to 30 years old	16	10.6
	31 to 40 years old	36	24
	41 to 50 years old	42	28
	51 to 60 years old	32	21.3
	More than 60 years old	24	16
Education	No secondary school qualification	3	2
	Lower secondary school qualification	2	1.3
	Intermediate secondary school qualification	2	1.3
	Higher secondary school qualification	7	4.7
	Bachelor's degree	15	10
	Master's degree	62	41.3
	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree	59	39.3
Job	Farmer	3	2
	Artisan	1	0.7
	Merchant	12	8
	Industrial	3	2
	Employee	32	21.3
	Student	11	7.3
	Middle-management	19	12.7
	Senior executive	15	10
	Professional	28	18.7
	Retired	10	6.7
	Jobless	3	2
	Other	13	8.6
Household's monthly net income (converted to US dollar)	Less than USD150	10	6.7
	USD150 to USD300	13	8.7
	USD300 to USD455	27	18
	USD455 to USD605	29	19.3
	USD605 to USD760	15	10
	USD760 and more	28	18.7
	Not stated	28	18.7

(Continued on next page)

Table 1. Continued

Variable	Classification	N	Frequency (%)
Year of construction	Before 1945	6	4
	1945 to 1962	7	4.7
	1963 to 1990	16	10.7
	1991 to 2000	47	31.3
	2001 to 2010	33	22
	2011 to 2018	24	16
	No stated	17	11.3
Size of the home	Less than 100 m <sup>2</sup>	27	18
	100 m <sup>2</sup> to 150 m <sup>2</sup>	37	24.7
	150 m <sup>2</sup> to 200 m <sup>2</sup>	22	14.7
	200 m <sup>2</sup> to 250 m <sup>2</sup>	15	10
	More than 250 m <sup>2</sup>	38	25.3
	Not stated	11	7.3

### Reliability Analysis

In order to test the reliability of the five-point scale, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to examine the internal consistency among the barriers as indicated in Kim, Lee and Nguyen (2016) and Chileshe, Hosseini and Jepson (2016). The five-point scale has been found reliable as the 16 barriers presented a Cronbach's alpha of 0.821, which was greater than the acceptable lower limit for the Cronbach's alpha (0.7).

### Ranking Analysis

This analysis ranked the hindrance factors based on the value of their means and standard deviations. Table 2 presents the statistical means, standard deviations and ranks of these factors.

The respondents ranked the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment as the primary hindrance to the adoption of EEIMs. Similarly, Dianshu, Sovacool and Vu (2010) have indicated that the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment represents a major barrier for the implementation of energy efficiency measure in China. Although there is an Algerian public policy that provides financial incentives in the form of tax credits, loans and rebates (Bouamama, 2013), the results indicate that this policy is not sufficient and need to be improved in order to encourage homeowners to invest in energy efficient measures.

Table 2. Ranking of the Barriers to the Adoption of Energy Efficiency Investment Measures

Barriers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
The lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment	4.21	1.02	1
The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment	4.09	1.17	2
The lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy	3.97	1.21	3
The unwillingness to borrow money	3.97	1.32	4
The difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures	3.92	1.14	5
The lack of financial resources	3.87	1.19	6
The lack of attractive products	3.73	1.18	7
The lack of time to collect necessary information	3.65	1.24	8
The lack of knowledge of architects and installers	3.60	1.42	9
The limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits	3.51	1.33	10
The perceived hassle of installation does not motivate them to implement the efficiency improvement	3.40	1.33	11
The uncertainty about economic future	3.35	1.42	12
The lack of examples	3.32	1.53	13
The lack of knowledge over the payback periods	3.20	1.35	14
The investments in energy efficiency measures are low priority compared to other measures	3.07	1.36	15
The low energy prices do not motivate to implement the efficiency improvement	2.84	1.38	16

The respondents ranked the high initial prices of energy efficient equipment as the second hindrance. This result is in agreement with the findings of Yang and Zhao (2015). The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment are mainly due to the lack of local production in Algeria. Algerian suppliers import energy efficient equipment from abroad which generates high initial prices for homeowners. Therefore, it is crucial to develop local production capacity in order to reduce the prices of energy efficient equipment.

It is surprising to note that the respondents ranked the lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy as the third hindrance. This is in agreement with Du et al. (2014) findings that the lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy is one of the major barriers to the adoption of energy-saving technologies in the building sector in China. It is crucial that the potential saved energy could be accurately estimated by installers and architects to reassure homeowners about their investment.

The unwillingness to borrow money was ranked as the fourth hindrance by the respondents. This could be because existing financing instruments in Algeria are not sufficient or are inappropriate for homeowners. In order to finance the adoption of energy efficient measures, it is very important for homeowners to access attractive and long-term financing that is adapted to their needs, investment capacity and ability to pay off a debt. The unwillingness to borrow money was also identified as important barriers in Stieß and Dunkelberg (2013) and Zundel and Stieß (2011).

The difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures was ranked as the fifth most important hindrance. In fact, some homeowners know energy efficiency measures and their benefits and could pay for the energy efficiency measures. However, they are completely helpless in the face of all the problems that must be tackled in identifying, procuring, installing, operating and, maintaining energy efficiency measures (Reddy, 1991).

The low energy price of energy was not evaluated as a barrier that considerably affects the adoption of EEIMs and therefore was ranked last. This is because the energy bills become an increasingly heavy burden for Algerian households. In fact, due to the economic crisis, the Algerian government is no longer able to maintain its financial support to the energy sector, which use to assure in the past decade very low energy prices. Consequently, the price of energy has increased by 20% and Algerian households are now more attentive about energy consumption (Seddiki, 2016).

**Principal Component Analysis: Categorising the Barriers**

In order to define the underlying structure of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of single-family homeowners, a principal component analysis with varimax rotation was used (as shown in Table 3). A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, as well as Bartlett tests, were performed in order to evaluate the factorability of the data. The KMO statistic is at 0.882 and the p-value of the Bartlett test was (< 0.001). Both of them showed that the items in the scale were suitable for factor analysis. The principal component analysis groups the 16 variables around four components: (1) "financial" barriers, (2) "technological" barriers, (3) "lack of time and knowledge" barriers and (4) "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers.

Table 3. Component Matrix after Varimax Rotation

	Component				Variance Explained (%)
	1	2	3	4	
The limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits			0.806		12.6
The lack of knowledge over the payback periods			0.583		
The lack of time to collect necessary information			0.574		
The lack of examples			0.597		

(Continued on next page)

Table 3. Continued

	Component				Variance Explained (%)
	1	2	3	4	
The lack of attractive products		0.689			
The lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy		0.742			
The lack of knowledge of architects and installers		0.755			15.2
The difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures		0.689			
The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment	0.781				
The lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment	0.556				16.9
The lack of financial resources	0.825				
Uncertainty about economic future	0.788				
The unwillingness to borrow money	0.425				
The investments in energy efficiency measures are low priority compared to other measures				0.629	
The perceived hassle of installation does not motivate them to implement the efficiency improvement				0.553	10
The low energy prices do not motivate to implement the efficiency improvement				0.709	

Note: Varimax rotation was used

### Component 1: "Financial" barriers

The first of the four components include five barriers to the adoption of EEIMs, namely, the lack of financial resources, the uncertainty about economic future, the high initial prices of energy efficient equipment, the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment, the unwillingness to borrow money. This component accounts for the highest variance (16.9%) of all the components and represents the major "financial" barriers hampering the adoption of EEIMs.

### Component 2: "Technological" barriers

The second component accounts for 15.2% of the total variance and includes four important barriers that hinder the adoption of EEIMs, namely: (1) the lack of knowledge of architects and installers, (2) the lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy, (3) the difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing,

operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures and (4) the lack of attractive products. Component 2 represents the major "technological" barriers hampering the adoption of energy efficiency measures.

### **Component 3: "Lack of time and knowledge" barriers**

This component explains 12.6% of the total variance of the data. The component includes four barriers, namely, the limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits, the lack of knowledge over the payback periods, the lack of time to collect necessary information, the lack of examples. This component could be described as "lack of time and knowledge" barriers. The barriers included in Component 3 were considered by homeowners as less important as the barriers of Component 1 and Component 2.

The limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits leads homeowners to not invest in EEIMs or to invest in unsuitable products. Therefore, it is of crucial importance to effectively disseminate information about EEIMs and their benefits (Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra, 2011).

Uncertain economic benefits may also lead homeowners to avoid EEIMs. However, the result indicates that the respondents ranked this hindrance 14th. This disagrees with Zundel and Stieß (2011) findings that uncertain economic benefits represent a major barrier.

The respondents ranked the lack of time to collect necessary information as the eighth hindrance. This could be explained by the fact that the different sources of information in Algeria are not well organised. Consequently, it is extremely time-consuming for a homeowner to find the right information. As stated before, it very important to provide for homeowners easy access to information about EEIMs. The lack of time to collect necessary information was also identified as important barriers in Golove and Eto (1996).

The lack of examples of homeowners that have invested in energy efficiency measures was not perceived by the respondents as a strong barrier and was ranked thirteenth. This indicates that the decision of homeowners to invest in energy efficiency measures is not influenced by neighbours, friends, colleagues, or anyone who has invested in such measures. This disagrees with Mortensen, Heiselberg and Knudstrup (2011) findings that indicate the lack of example represents a strong barrier for energy renovation of Danish single-family houses.

### **Component 4: "Attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers**

The last component includes the flowing barriers – the low energy prices, the investments in energy efficiency measures are a low priority compared to other measures and the perceived hassle of installation. These barriers were ranked 16, 15 and 11, respectively. This final factor accounts for 10% of the total variance. This component could be described as "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers. The barriers included in this component were considered by homeowners among the least important hindrances for the adoption of EEIMs. These results are in agreement with the findings of Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra (2011) who also indicate that "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers such as "investments in energy efficiency measures are a low priority

compared to other measures" are not a serious hindrance. However, the results are in disagreement with the findings of Friedman, Becker and Erell (2018) and Stieß and Dunkelberg (2013) that "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers such as "lack of interested in energy efficiency" are fairly important. The fact that homeowners have considered "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers as not significant hindrances might be because, for these homeowners, their energy costs are high enough to motivate them to invest in energy efficiency measure.

## MANOVA

In order to investigate the differences in the perception of the components of the different groups segmented according to personal and contextual variables, we have implemented a one-way MANOVA. According to Chileshe, Hosseini and Jepson (2016), the most common multivariate test is Wilks' lambda. Table 4 displays significant MANOVA (i.e.,  $p$ -value under 0.05). Then, if an overall difference is found between any groups of homeowners as a result of MANOVA, univariate tests ANOVA are applied to find the source of difference as indicated in Yuksel, Kanik and Baykara (2000).

Table 4. Wilks' Lambda Result (MANOVA Tests)

Variable	Component 1: "Financial" Barriers	Component 2: "Technological" Barriers	Component 3: "Lack of Time and Knowledge" Barriers	Component 4: "Attitude Towards Energy Efficiency Improvements" Barriers
Gender	$p = 0.01$ Lambda = 0.904	No significant differences	$p = 0.01$ Lambda = 0.915	No significant differences
Age	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences
Education	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences
Household's monthly net income	$p = 0.002$ Lambda = 0.666	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences
Year of construction	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences
Size of the home	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences	No significant differences

### Component 1: "Financial" barriers

Table 4 indicates significant effects of the gender ( $p = 0.01$ ) as well as the household's monthly net income ( $p = 0.002$ ) on the respondents' perceptions of the financial barriers hindering the adoption of EEIMs.

In order to find the source of difference, univariate tests ANOVA are applied. The results of the univariate tests indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the barrier "lack of financial resources" ( $p = 0.001$ ) between groups of homeowners segmented according to gender (as shown in Table 5).

Table 5. Univariate Tests with Gender as an Independent Variable and the Five Financial Barriers as the Dependent Variables

	<b>Dependent Variable</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>Degrees of Freedom (df)</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Gender	The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment	3.541	1	3.541	2.616	0.108
	The lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment	0.596	1	0.596	0.573	0.450
	The lack of financial resources	14.383	1	14.383	10.919	0.001
	The uncertainty about economic future	5.757	1	5.757	2.893	0.091
	The unwillingness to borrow money	2.240	1	2.240	1.292	0.257

Table 6 indicates that female respondents were more likely to consider the lack of financial resources as a very important barrier to the adoption of energy efficiency measures than male respondents. This is in disagreement with Nair, Gustavsson and Mahapatra (2010) findings that homeowners' gender does not influence their preference for energy efficiency.

Table 6. Characteristics of Respondents' Gender and Relationships with the Lack of Financial Resources

	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Standard Error (SE)</b>
The lack of financial resources	Female	56	4.27	1.05	0.141
	Male	94	3.63	1.20	0.124

The disparities in financial resources between women and men could be explained by the facts that in Algeria, men generally earn more money than women do and that majority of women do not benefit from employment stability (Missous-Kadry, 2014).

Furthermore, the results of the univariate tests indicate that there are statistically significant differences in the perception of the barriers "the lack of financial resources" ( $p < 0.001$ ) and "the uncertainty about economic future" ( $p < 0.001$ ) between groups of homeowners segmented according to household's monthly net income (as shown in Table 7).

Table 7. Univariate Tests with Household's Monthly Net Income as an Independent Variable and the Five Financial Barriers as Dependent Variables

	<b>Dependent Variable</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p-Value</b>
Household's monthly net income	The high initial prices of energy efficient equipment	15.57	6	2.595	1.971	0.074
	The lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment	9.62	6	1.604	1.582	0.157
	The lack of financial resources	30.54	6	5.090	4.071	< 0.001
	The uncertainty about economic future	44.79	6	7.465	4.178	< 0.001
	The unwillingness to borrow money	2.77	6	0.461	0.258	0.956

Table 8 indicates that homeowners in the income group (USD605 to USD760) and the income group (USD760 and more) were more likely to find the financial resources in order to invest in energy efficiency compared to other income groups while homeowners who had an annual income less than 150 were the least likely to find the financial resources in order to invest in energy efficiency. This is agreement with Herring, Caird and Roy (2007) findings that homeowners' income affects the investment in energy efficiency. Furthermore, homeowners in the income group (less than USD150) were more likely to consider the uncertainty of the economic future as a very important barrier compared to other income groups. Due to the precarious financial situation of the income group (less than USD150), energy efficiency loans would not be the right option. Therefore, funding in the form of subsidies and tax reduction would be more appropriate.

Table 8. Characteristics of Respondents' Monthly Net Income and Relationships with the Lack of Financial Resources as Well as the Uncertainty about Economic Future

	<b>Household's Monthly Net Income</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>SE</b>
The lack of financial resources	USD150 to USD300	13	4.08	1.320	0.366
	USD300 to USD455	27	4.37	0.967	0.186
	USD455 to USD605	29	4.07	1.033	0.192
	USD605 to USD760	15	3.93	0.799	0.206
	Not stated	28	3.71	1.243	0.235
	Less than USD150	10	4.30	0.949	0.300
	USD760 and more	28	3.04	1.290	0.244

(Continued on next page)

Table 8. Continued

	Household's Monthly Net Income	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	SE
The uncertainty about economic future	USD150 to USD300	13	3.46	1.561	0.433
	USD300 to USD455	27	3.96	1.160	0.223
	USD455 to USD605	29	3.07	1.462	0.272
	USD605 to USD760	15	3.60	1.298	0.335
	Not stated	28	3.36	1.224	0.231
	Less than USD150	10	4.40	0.966	0.306
	USD760 and more	28	2.50	1.478	0.279

**Component 2: "Technological" barriers**

For the "technological" barriers, we find no statistically significant differences between any groups of homeowners. Therefore, the perception of the "technological" barriers hindering the adoption of energy efficiency measures seems to be similar for all groups of homeowners in our sample.

**Component 3: "Lack of time and knowledge" barriers**

The results of the MANOVA analysis indicate that the gender has a significant effect ( $p = 0.01$ ) on the respondents' perceptions of the "lack of time and knowledge" barriers hindering the adoption of energy efficiency measures (as shown in Table 4).

More precisely, the results of the univariate tests (as shown in Table 9) indicate that there are statistically significant differences in the perception of the barriers "limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits" ( $p = 0.014$ ) and "lack of time to collect necessary information" ( $p = 0.008$ ) between groups of homeowners segmented according to gender.

Table 9. Univariate Tests with Gender as an Independent Variable and the Four Lack of Time and Knowledge Barriers as Dependent Variables

	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-Value
Gender	Limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits	10.563	1	10.563	6.181	0.014
	Lack of knowledge over the payback periods	0.223	1	0.223	0.123	0.727
	Lack of time to collect necessary information	10.739	1	10.739	7.317	0.008
	Lack of examples	1.82e-4	1	1.82e-4	7.79e-5	0.993

Table 10 indicates that respondents who were women were more likely to consider the "limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits" as an important barrier to the adoption of energy efficiency measures than respondents who were men. This could be explained by the fact that women do not access equally with men to the information about energy efficiency measures (Clancy, Oparaocha and Roehr, 2004). However, this is in disagreement with other studies that have reported no statistical relationship between respondents' gender and their perception of energy efficiency (Sardianou, 2007).

Furthermore, respondents who were women were more likely to consider the "lack of time to collect necessary information" as an important barrier to the adoption of energy efficiency measures than respondents who were men (as shown in Table 10). This could be explained by the fact that many Algerian women juggle family obligations, domestic tasks and paid work and do not find time to collect necessary information about energy efficiency measures (Clancy, Oparaocha and Roehr, 2004).

Table 10. Characteristics of Respondents' Gender and Relationships with the Barriers the Limited Knowledge about Energy Efficiency Measures and Their Benefits as Well as the Lack of Time to Collect Necessary Information

	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	SE
Limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits	Female	56	3.86	1.26	0.168
	Male	94	3.31	1.34	0.138
Lack of time to collect necessary information	Female	56	4.00	1.04	0.140
	Male	94	3.45	1.30	0.134

#### Component 4: "Attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers

For the "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers, we find no statistically significant differences between any groups of homeowners. Therefore, the perception of the "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers hindering the adoption of energy efficiency seems to be similar for all groups of homeowners in our sample.

## CONCLUSIONS, POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

This article extends current knowledge by conducting an empirical study on homeowners' adoption of EEIMs in Algeria. The main purposes of this article are: (1) to identify and rank the critical barriers that hinder the adoption of EEIMs of Algerian single-family house owners, (2) to investigate the underlying relationships between these factors and (3) to investigate the differences in the perception of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs of the different groups segmented according to personal and contextual variables.

Authors have identified 16 barriers in this article. Through the ranking analysis, it was found that the five greatest barriers to the adoption of EEIMs were: (1) the lack of subsidies and rebates on energy efficient equipment, (2) the high initial prices of energy efficient equipment, (3) the lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy, (4) the unwillingness to borrow money and (5) the difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining energy efficiency measures.

The principal component analysis was implemented to explore the relationships among the 16 barriers. The principal component analysis categorised the 16 barriers around four components: (1) "Financial" barriers, (2) "Technological" barriers, (3) "Lack of time and knowledge" barriers and (4) "Attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers.

The MANOVA and ANOVA analysis have indicated that there are differences in our sample regarding the perception of the barriers to the adoption of EEIMs. Especially, evidence for differences between groups that were segmented according to gender as well as the household's monthly net income have been found. The results indicate that genders as well as the household's monthly net income significantly affect the respondents' perceptions of the component "financial" barriers. It was also found that gender has a significant impact on the respondents' perceptions of the component "the lack of time and knowledge" barriers. It should be noted that for the components "technological" barriers and the "attitude towards energy efficiency improvements" barriers, no statistically significant differences between any groups of homeowners have been found.

### **Policy Implications and Recommendations**

The reduction of energy consumption in the residential sector is among the top priorities of the Algerian government. By adopting EEIMs, Algerian households can significantly contribute to reducing residential energy demand. Despite the many barriers hindering Algerian homeowners from implementing EEIMs the trend to promote the adoption of EEIMs is the only way forward. In light of the above analysis, we suggest the following policy recommendations to improve the efficiency of government interventions and diminish these barriers.

Firstly, different financial incentives and subsidy policies should be correctly targeted and be made adequate to encourage Algerian homeowners to adopt EEIMs. In our survey, financial barriers have been considered by homeowners as the major barriers hampering the adoption of energy efficiency measures.

The government could reduce the expense of purchasing energy efficiency systems by offering a tax credit. For instance, the government could implement tax incentives for home insulation, heat systems, energy-efficient equipment such as A+ refrigerator and air conditioning systems. Also, rebate programmes could be implemented by the government. It would give consumers price reduction to purchase new energy efficient appliances when they replaced used appliances. Although subsidised low or zero interest loans seems a good strategy for motivating energy efficient investment, our survey has indicated that homeowners are unwilling to borrow money; therefore, incentives in the form of rebate and tax reduction would be more appropriate. Furthermore, the Algerian government should propose tax incentives in order to attract investors and boost the development of local production of energy efficiency equipment. A local production, as well

as a competition among local producers, would induce lower initial prices and encourage the adoption of energy efficiency measures.

Secondly, our empirical study showed that technological barriers were considered by homeowners as very important. Therefore, different strategies should be adopted by the government in order to overcome these barriers. The lack of techniques and tools for estimation of saved energy and the lack of knowledge of architects and installers can be addressed together through the development of specialised training programmes in the field of energy efficiency, which would be adapted for each category of trainees (students, architects, engineers, installers and so on). The programme should train participants on reliable energy simulation tools in buildings and facilitate access to such tools. In order to address the barrier of the difficulty of identifying, procuring, installing, operating and maintaining EEIMs, an organisation dedicated specifically to the adoption of EEIMs could be set up for homeowners. The organisation would be composed of partners from the public, private and research spheres. It would provide support and advice during all the phases of the energy project, followed by proper monitoring of the results in terms of savings after project implementation ends.

Thirdly, the government should implement information instruments to motivate homeowners to adopt EEIMs. Energy performance certificates and labels seem to be good solutions. Such instruments have not been implemented in the residential sector of Algeria yet. They provide homeowners with reliable information about the real energy performance of their home and they classify that level of performance. Energy performance certificates are also practical to inform and educate homeowners about energy efficiency measures and their benefits. Another solution to provide homeowners with real-time information on how energy is being used in their homes is to require the energy suppliers to install smart meters or home electrical monitoring systems for their customers. Such devices would help homeowners to manage and reduce their energy use. In addition, the distribution of energy efficiency guides by homeowner associations or energy suppliers companies could be an effective way to disseminate information. Traditional media, social media and information-sharing portals also represent good opportunities to facilitate access to the latest policy, technical and energy related developments in the sector.

Fourthly, our empirical study showed that respondents who were female were more likely to consider the barriers "limited knowledge about energy efficiency measures and their benefits" as well as "the lack of financial resources" as a very important barrier to the adoption of energy efficiency measures than respondents who were men. Therefore, it is of crucial importance that the government implements financial incentives and information instruments that adequately address women's requirements. For instance, the creation of energy efficiency groups and mentor programmes that focussed on women could support the provision of awareness-raising and the training of women about the energy efficiency measures and their benefits (Clancy, Oparaocha and Roehr, 2004). Besides, the government could boost women's direct access to financial incentives through technical innovation and changes in financial services' design to better tailor products to women's preferences and constraints (Fletschner and Kenney, 2014). Furthermore, in order to improve women's access to financial resources in general, it is essential to guarantee women an equal pay with men as well as job stability through measures such as paid maternity leave, paid childcare and childcare subsidies.

Finally, some limitations are worth mentioning. Since the study was conducted in the area of Mostaganem in Algeria, the findings may not be generalised to other geographical locations. Other studies in countries with similar context such as Tunisia and Morocco could put our findings into a broader perspective. Also, the survey focused mainly on the barriers to adoption to the adoption of EEIMs. Similar studies that focus on other dimensions such as motivations of Algerian homeowners for the adoption of EEIMs and their perceptions on different incentives could be an interesting direction in future research.

## REFERENCES

- Achtnicht, M. and Madlener, R. (2014). Factors influencing German house owners' preferences on energy retrofits. *Energy Policy*, 68: 254–263.
- APRUE (National Agency for the Promotion and the Rationalization of the Energy Use) (2016). Programme d'efficacité énergétique. Available at: <http://www.aprue.org.dz/PROGRAMME%20EFFICACITE%20ENERG.html> [Accessed on 3 June 2016].
- Bouamama, W. (2013). Au sujet de la politique d'efficacité énergétique en Algérie: Approche systémique pour un développement durable. Magister's diploma diss. University of Abou Bakr Belkaid.
- Cameron, T.A. (1985). A nested logit model of energy conservation activity by owners of existing single family dwellings. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(2): 205–211.
- Chileshe, N., Hosseini, M.R. and Jepson, J. (2016). Critical barriers to implementing risk assessment and management practices (RAMP) in the Iranian construction sector. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 21(2): 81–110. <https://doi.org/10.21315/jcdc2016.21.2.5>.
- Chileshe, N., Rameezdeen, R., Hosseini, M.R. and Lehmann, S. (2015). Barriers to implementing reverse logistics in South Australian construction organisations. *Supply Chain Management*, 20(2): 179–204. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-10-2014-0325>.
- Clancy, J., Oparaocha, S. and Roehr, U. (2004). *Gender Equity and Renewable Energies*. Bonn, Germany: Secretariat of the International Conference for Renewable Energies.
- Denker, A., El Hassar, S.M.K. and Baradiy, S. (2014). *Pour une Construction Eco-Energetique en Algérie*. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit.
- Dianshu, F., Sovacool, B.K. and Vu, K.M. (2010). The barriers to energy efficiency in China: Assessing household electricity savings and consumer behavior in Liaoning Province. *Energy Policy*, 38(2): 1202–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.012>.
- d-maps.com (n.d.). Map of Algeria. Available at: [https://d-maps.com/carte.php?num\\_car=34295&lang=en](https://d-maps.com/carte.php?num_car=34295&lang=en) [Accessed on 8 January 2019].
- Doloi, H., Sawhney, A., Iyer, K. and Rentala, S. (2012). Analysing factors affecting delays in Indian construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(4): 479–489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2011.10.004>.

- Du, P., Zheng, L.-Q., Xie, B.-C. and Mahalingam, A. (2014). Barriers to the adoption of energy-saving technologies in the building sector: A survey study of Jing-jin-tang, China. *Energy Policy*, 75: 206–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.025>.
- Fletschner, D. and Kenney, L. (2014). Rural women's access to financial services: Credit, savings and insurance. In A. Quisumbing, R. Meinzen-Dick, T. Raney, A. Croppenstedt, J. Behrman and A. Peterman (eds.), *Gender in Agriculture*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 187–208. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8616-4\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8616-4_8).
- Friedman, C., Becker, N. and Erell, E. (2018). Retrofitting residential building envelopes for energy efficiency: Motivations of individual homeowners in Israel. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 61(10): 1805–1827. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2017.1372278>.
- Golove, W.H. and Eto, J.H. (1996). *Market Barriers to Energy Efficiency: A Critical Reappraisal of the Rationale for Public Policies to Promote Energy Efficiency*. Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley Lab.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Tatham, R.L. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th Ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Häkkinen, T. and Belloni, K. (2011). Barriers and drivers for sustainable building. *Building Research and Information*, 39(3): 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2011.561948>.
- Herring, H., Caird, S. and Roy, R. (2007). Can consumers save energy? Results from surveys of consumer adoption and use of low and zero carbon technologies. *Proceedings European Council for an Energy Efficient Economy Summer Study*, 4: 188595.
- Jakob, M. (2007). *The Drivers of and Barriers to Energy Efficiency in Renovation Decisions of Single-Family Home-Owners*. Zurich: Center for Energy Policy and Economics (CEPE), Department of Management, Technology and Economics, ETH Zurich.
- Kim, S.-Y., Lee, Y.-S. and Nguyen, V.T. (2016). Barriers to applying value management in the Vietnamese construction industry. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 21(2): 55–80. <https://doi.org/10.21315/jcdc2016.21.2.4>.
- Michelsen, C.C. and Madlener, R. (2013). Motivational factors influencing the homeowners' decisions between residential heating systems: An empirical analysis for Germany. *Energy Policy*, 57: 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.01.045>.
- Missous-Kadry, N. (2014). Women do not enjoy employment stability as Algerian men do. *Your Middle East*, 10 September. Available at: <https://yourmiddleeast.com/2014/09/10/women-do-not-enjoy-employment-stability-as-algerian-men-do/> [Accessed on 20 March 2019].
- Mokhtar, Z. (2018). Alors que le programme national d'efficacité énergétique devrait toucher 100 000 logements/an: L'APRUE annonce l'isolation thermique de 4 000 unités en 2018. Available at: <http://magazineogb.com/index.php/le-magazine/a/311-alors-que-le-programme-national-d-efficacite-energetique-devrait-toucher-100-000-logements-an-l-aprue-annonce-l-isolation-thermique-de-4-000-unites-en-2018> [Accessed on 24 February 2019].

- Mortensen, A., Heiselberg, P. and Knudstrup, M.-A. (2011). Barriers for energy renovation of Danish single-family houses and suggested solutions to overcome these. *PHN 11 Helsinki 4th Nordic Passive House Conference Proceedings*. Helsinki, Finland: Finnish Association of Civil Engineers RIL and VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, 84–85.
- Nair, G., Gustavsson, L. and Mahapatra, K. (2011). Barriers to implement energy efficiency investment measures in Swedish co-operative apartment buildings. In *World Renewable Energy Congress-Sweden; 8–13 May; 2011*. Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University Electronic Press, 1110–1117. <https://doi.org/10.3384/ecp110571110>.
- Nair, G., Gustavsson, L. and Mahapatra, K. (2010). Factors influencing energy efficiency investments in existing Swedish residential buildings. *Energy Policy*, 38(6): 2956–2963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.01.033>.
- Palm, J. and Tengvard, M. (2011). Motives for and barriers to household adoption of small-scale production of electricity: Examples from Sweden. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 7(1): 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2011.11908061>.
- Prete, M.I., Piper, L., Rizzo, C., Pino, G., Capestro, M., Mileti, A., Pichierri, M., Amatulli, C., Peluso, A.M. and Guido, G. (2017). Determinants of Southern Italian households' intention to adopt energy efficiency measures in residential buildings. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 153: 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.157>.
- Ravetz, J. (2008). State of the stock: What do we know about existing buildings and their future prospects? *Energy Policy*, 36(12): 4462–4470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.09.026>.
- Reddy, A.K. (1991). Barriers to improvements in energy efficiency. *Energy Policy*, 19(10): 953–961. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-4215\(91\)90115-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-4215(91)90115-5).
- Risholt, B. and Berker, T. (2013). Success for energy efficient renovation of dwellings: Learning from private homeowners. *Energy Policy*, 61: 1022–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.06.011>.
- Sardianou, E. (2007). Estimating energy conservation patterns of Greek households. *Energy Policy*, 35(7): 3778–3791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.01.020>.
- Scarpa, R. and Willis, K. (2010.) Willingness-to-pay for renewable energy: Primary and discretionary choice of British households' for micro-generation technologies. *Energy Economics*, 32(1): 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2009.06.004>.
- Seddiki, M. (2016). L'aide à la décision multicritère pour la rénovation thermique des bâtiments en maçonnerie: Cas de l'Algérie. PhD diss. Université des Sciences et de la Technologie USTO MB.
- Stieß, I. and Dunkelberg, E. (2013). Objectives, barriers and occasions for energy efficient refurbishment by private homeowners. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 48: 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.09.041>.
- Štreimikienė, D. and Baležentis, A. (2015). Assessment of willingness to pay for renewables in Lithuanian households. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 17: 515–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-014-0810-z>.
- Tampakis, S., Arabatzis, G., Tsantopoulos, G. and Rerras, I. (2017). Citizens' views on electricity use, savings and production from renewable energy sources: A case study from a Greek island. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 79: 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.036>.

- Yang, S. and Zhao, D. (2015). Do subsidies work better in low-income than in high-income families? Survey on domestic energy-efficient and renewable energy equipment purchase in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 108: 841–851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.07.022>.
- Yuksel, N., Kanik, A.E. and Baykara, T. (2000). Comparison of in vitro dissolution profiles by ANOVA-based, model-dependent and-independent methods. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, 209(1/2): 57–67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173\(00\)00554-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173(00)00554-8).
- Zundel, S. and StieB, I. (2011). Beyond profitability of energy-saving measures: Attitudes towards energy saving. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 34: 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-011-9156-7>.