MODS207 Applied Project: Rebound Effects

Laychiva Chhout

Telecom Paris, 91120 Palaiseau, France
laychiva.chhout@telecom-paris.fr
laychiva.chhout@polytechnique.edu

May 31, 2024

Contents

Overview

In recent years, sustainable development has aimed to mitigate climate change, primarily through initiatives focused on reducing carbon emissions and daily energy consumption. However, these advancements can inadvertently lead to negative consequences for consumers, a phenomenon known as the 'rebound effect.' This effect occurs when the overuse of green products by consumers undermines the intended environmental benefits. In this research project, we will explore the historical context of the rebound effect to gain a deeper understanding of its implications. Additionally, we will examine case studies to analyze potential solutions to this challenge.

1 Introduction

1.1 Historical origins: Jevon's Paradox

The concept of the rebound effect is deeply rooted in what is known as *Jevons' Paradox*, named after the 19th-century British economist **William Stanley Jevons**. In his seminal work *"The Coal Question" (1865)*, Jevons observed that technological advancements increasing the efficiency of coal use during the Industrial Revolution in England did not reduce the total coal consumption. Instead, these improvements led to its increased consumption across various industries. Jevons argued that more efficient machinery made coal use more cost-effective, which extended its use to new markets and increased overall consumption. This counterintuitive outcome implies that efficiency improvements might not always reduce resource usage but can lead to greater consumption, a principle that has implications for modern energy policy (Polimeni et al. 2008).

1.2 From Khazzoom to Sorrell

The term 'rebound effect' was later associated with the works of economists like *Daniel Khazzoom* and *Steve Sorrell*. *Khazzoom* criticized mandated efficiency standards for household appliances, arguing that improvements in technical efficiency did not reduce overall energy consumption as much as expected. His work suggested that as appliances become more energy-efficient, their increased affordability and performance can lead to more extensive and frequent use, thereby offsetting some of the energy savings (Khazzoom 1980). Expanding on this, *Steve Sorrell* provided a comprehensive review of the rebound effect across different sectors, highlighting the varied impact of efficiency improvements on energy use. *Sorrell*'s research further substantiated the complexity of the rebound effect, showing that it can vary significantly across different contexts and technologies (Sorrell 2009).

1.3 Economic Theories and Concepts

To thoroughly understand the rebound effect within the frameworks of neoclassical and behavioral economics, a variety of scholarly works provide critical insight. The rebound effect is analyzed within neoclassical economics primarily through the lens that improvements in efficiency reduce the effective cost of using a resource, thereby potentially increasing demand. *Harry D. Saunders* elaborates on this dynamic, emphasizing how economic growth can exacerbate this effect, leading to greater resource consumption even as efficiency improves (Saunders 1992).

Behavioral economics offers additional perspectives by examining how deviations from rational decision-making processes can influence energy consumption. (Sorrell and Dimitropoulos 2008) provide a comprehensive review of these behavioral factors in , which discusses the complex ways in which individuals' responses to increased efficiency can paradoxically lead to increased energy use . Furthermore, (Gillingham, Rapson, and Wagner 2016) explore the implications of these behavioral changes for energy policy, highlighting how perceived savings can lead consumers to make choices that counteract the intended benefits of efficiency improvements .

1.4 Historical Instances of Rebound Effect

- **Automobile Efficiency Improvements**: The history of automobile efficiency provides a clear example of the rebound effect. As vehicles became more fuel-efficient, the cost per mile of driving decreased, which led to an increase in driving distances (Sorrell 2007). This is a practical illustration of the rebound effect where initial energy savings were offset by increased consumption behaviors.

- **Lighting Technology**: The transition from incandescent bulbs to more energy-efficient lighting technologies such as LEDs is another instance. While these technologies significantly reduce energy consumption per unit of light, the overall energy consumption for lighting did not decrease proportionally due to increased usage, such as more lighting fixtures and longer usage hours (Sorrell 2007).

2 Theoretical Perspectives

2.1 General Perspective

2.1.1 Direct Rebound Effects

Direct rebound effects refer to the increase in consumption of a service due to increased efficiency in its use. For instance, a more fuel-efficient car might encourage longer or more frequent trips, thereby reducing the anticipated energy savings. This direct effect is most evident in personal consumption behaviors where immediate feedback on efficiency gains is observed (Sorrell 2007).

2.1.2 Indirect Rebound Effects

Indirect rebound effects occur when savings from energy efficiency are spent on other goods and services that require energy to produce or consume. For example, money saved on energy bills might be used to buy a new electronic device, leading to additional energy consumption in the production and use of this new product. This type of effect extends beyond the initial scope of energy savings and can be observed across various sectors and income levels (Sorrell 2007).

2.2 Perspective of Tilman Santarius

Based on (Santarius, Walnum, and Aall 2018), the rebound effects are categorized into several types:

2.2.1 Microeconomic Rebound Effects

These effects occur on the consumer side, impacting households and end-use consumers. Microeconomic rebound effects explore how individual consumption patterns may adjust in response to changes in energy efficiency. For example, research has shown that while energy-efficient appliances may reduce energy per use, some households end up using these appliances more frequently, thereby reducing the overall energy savings. This "rebound" can vary significantly, with studies citing increases in energy usage from 5% to 40% (Santarius, Walnum, and Aall 2018). These effects are critical to understand as they highlight the complexity of consumer behavior in the face of technological advancements in energy efficiency.

2.2.2 Mesoeconomic Rebound Effects

These are grounded in the historical analysis by William Stanley Jevons in 1865 and arise during the production process. This perspective suggests that improvements in energy efficiency by producers can lead to reduced operational costs and increased production output, potentially offsetting gains from the initial efficiency improvements. The article discusses examples where increased efficiency in industrial processes leads to lower production costs and thus more intensive use of the efficient technology, ultimately reducing the expected energy savings (Santarius, Walnum, and Aall 2018).

2.2.3 Macroeconomic Rebound Effects

At the aggregate level, these effects assess how improvements in energy efficiency might stimulate overall economic growth, which in turn influences total energy demand across the economy. The discussed study illustrates that energy efficiency improvements can lead to a decrease in energy prices, which stimulates increased energy demand across various sectors. This increased demand can then negate some of the energy savings achieved through efficiency improvements (Santarius, Walnum, and Aall 2018).

2.2.4 Economy-wide Rebound Effects

This category integrates microeconomic, mesoeconomic, and macroeconomic rebound effects, resulting in what is known as the "economy-wide rebound effect." These effects encompass the cumulative impact of energy efficiency improvements across an entire economy, often leading to increased energy consumption that offsets the expected savings. This broader perspective is essential for understanding the full implications of energy efficiency policies and for developing more comprehensive approaches that address the interconnectedness of different economic sectors (Santarius, Walnum, and Aall 2018).

2.3 Psychological and Sociological Perspectives

2.3.1 Psychological Perspectives

The psychological approach to studying rebound effects focuses on understanding individual behavioral responses to increased energy efficiency. Key psychological theories such as cognitive dissonance, self-perception theory, and the theory of planned behavior provide insights into how and why individuals might increase their consumption when they perceive that they are using resources more efficiently.

- Cognitive Dissonance and Moral Licensing: People may feel justified in using more of a resource if they believe they are doing so more efficiently. This concept, known as moral licensing, suggests that doing something "good" (like saving energy) can psychologically license a person to indulge in behavior that might negate the initial benefit. This is supported by research from (Tiefenbeck et al. 2013), which demonstrates how users of energy-efficient technology might initially reduce consumption, but gradually return to or exceed previous usage levels due to reduced guilt.

- Self-Perception Theory: This theory suggests that people infer their attitudes from their behavior. If they adopt energy-efficient technologies, they might perceive themselves as environmentally conscious, which could paradoxically lead to increased energy use, assuming they've 'earned' the right to consume more (Bem 1972).

- The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB): formulated by (Ajzen 1991), helps explain how decisions related to energy usage and efficiency might lead to the rebound effect. According to TPB, an individual's behavior is driven by their intentions, which are influenced by their attitudes toward a behavior, subjective norms, and their perceived behavioral control over the behavior. In the context of energy efficiency, even if people have positive attitudes towards saving energy and perceive social pressure to reduce consumption, their perceived control over energy usage (such as through more efficient technologies) can increase their actual usage. This phenomenon aligns with the rebound effect, where increased efficiency in resource use leads to greater consumption due to reduced usage costs or the perception that one has already contributed positively by using efficient technologies.

2.3.2 Sociological Perspectives

Sociological analysis of rebound effects examines the role of consumer culture, social norms, and economic structures in shaping collective responses to energy efficiency.

- Consumer Culture and Social Status: As explained by (Kempen 2009), the desire to attain or maintain social status can drive increased consumption, even when faced with efficiency gains that typically encourage reduced usage. This phenomenon is particularly evident in the context of rebound effects where energy-efficient technologies, upon becoming more accessible, often transform into symbols of status themselves. Paradoxically, acquiring an energy-efficient vehicle, while seen as an environmentally friendly choice, may also serve as a status symbol. This dual perception can lead owners to use their vehicles more frequently or indulge in other high-consumption behaviors, thereby offsetting the environmental benefits originally gained by the vehicle's efficiency.

- Structural and Institutional Factors: Sociologists also consider how institutions and infrastructures shape consumption patterns (Wallenborn 2018). The way societal infrastructure—such as urban planning and housing development—is designed can lock in high-energy consumption patterns, which can dilute the impact of individual actions aimed at reducing energy use.

3 Methodologies for Measuring Rebound Effects

3.1 Quantitative Approaches

Quantitative methods are essential for empirically estimating the magnitude of rebound effects. These approaches typically involve econometric models, statistical analysis.

3.1.1 Econometric Analysis

Econometric models are widely used to quantify rebound effects by analyzing the relationship between energy efficiency improvements and changes in energy consumption (Belaïd, Youssef, and Lazaric 2020; Andersson, Linscott, and Nässén 2019).

A typical econometric model can be described using a linear regression model, which is one of the most common forms. The general linear regression model can be represented as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_k X_k + \epsilon$$

Where:

- Y is the dependent variable (the outcome being studied).
- $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ are independent variables (factors thought to influence Y).
- β_0 is the intercept term (the value of Y when all X are 0).
- $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_k$ are the coefficients of the model, which represent the change in the dependent variable Y associated with a one-unit change in the respective independent variables.
- ϵ is the error term, accounting for the variation in Y not explained by the independent variables.

Econometric models work by estimating the parameters (coefficients) of the model from empirical data, using statistical methods like Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). The goal is to find the line (in the case of a linear model) that best fits the data, minimizing the sum of the squared differences (errors) between the observed values and the values predicted by the model. For instance, the econometric model focuses on the relationship between energy efficiency in automobiles and the total miles driven can be describe as:

$$\textit{Miles Driven} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \textit{Fuel Efficiency} + \beta_2 \times \textit{Income} + \epsilon$$

Where:

1. Model's explanation
   (a) Dependent Variable *Miles Driven*: This is the outcome variable that the model seeks to explain. It quantifies the total miles that are driven, which is influenced by various factors including fuel efficiency and income.
   (b) Independent Variables:
      - *Fuel Efficiency*: This variable measures how efficient a vehicle is in terms of fuel consumption. The associated coefficient, β_1, captures the effect of fuel efficiency on miles driven. A key hypothesis in the context of the rebound effect is that improvements in fuel efficiency might lead to more driving because each mile driven costs less in terms of fuel.
      - *Income*: This variable helps control for the socioeconomic status of the driver. β_2 measures how income levels affect driving behavior, independent of the vehicle's fuel efficiency. Higher income might lead to more driving because of greater travel needs or preferences.
   (c) Coefficients $(\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2)$:
      i. β_0 : This is the intercept term, representing the expected miles driven when fuel efficiency and income are both zero (theoretically, as this is not practically observable).
      ii. β_1 : This coefficient is critical for studying the rebound effect. If β_1 is positive, it suggests that an increase in fuel efficiency leads to an increase in miles driven, indicative of a rebound effect. This is because the lower operating costs per mile encourage more driving.
      iii. β_2 : Indicates how variations in income levels affect miles driven, controlling for fuel efficiency.
   (d) Error Term (ϵ): Captures all other factors that affect miles driven that are not explicitly included in the model. This includes variables like individual preferences, geographic factors, and other unobserved influences.

2. Econometric analysis and interpretation:

   Using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) to estimate this model, the goal is to find values for $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ that best fit the observed data. OLS minimizes the sum of the squared differences between the observed and predicted values of *Fuel Efficiency*, providing the most unbiased and efficient estimates of the coefficients under standard conditions (like no perfect multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, etc.).

3. Relevance of β_1 to the Rebound Effect:

   β_1 directly measures the potential rebound effect, indicating how much additional driving is associated with each unit increase in fuel efficiency. If β_1 is positive and significant, it suggests a rebound effect where the increased efficiency in fuel use indeed leads to more driving, thus potentially offsetting some of the environmental benefits of more fuel-efficient vehicles.

   To isolate whether β_1 truly reflects the rebound effect or is confounded by other variables, the model should include comprehensive controls (like income, as included here) and consider additional factors that could influence driving habits. Further, checking for the robustness of β_1 's estimation through various diagnostic tests in econometrics (like checking for multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and autocorrelation) is essential to confirm the reliability of the findings.

3.1.2 Input-Output Analysis

The study by (Thomas and Azevedo 2013) employs an input-output (I-O) analysis framework to estimate the direct and indirect rebound effects resulting from energy efficiency improvements for U.S. households. This methodology integrates consumer demand theory with environmentally extended input-output analysis (EEIO) to track the environmental impacts of household spending across different economic sectors. Data sources include the 2002 U.S. economic input-output life-cycle assessment (EIO-LCA) model, the 2004 Consumer Expenditure Survey, and energy and emissions data from the EPA and EIA.

The analysis begins by defining annual household expenditures (Y), which include spending on energy services and other goods. The energy or emissions implications of these expenditures are calculated using the EEIO framework, where the total supply chain energy or environmental emissions (E) are represented as $E = ZY$. Here, Z is the total supply chain emissions intensity matrix, which is further detailed as $Z = V(I - A)^{-1} + VC$. In this equation, V is a vector of direct energy or emissions intensity per dollar of expenditure, I is the identity matrix, A is the matrix of input-output coefficients representing production functions for all sectors, $(I - A)^{-1}$ is the Leontief inverse, and VC accounts for combustion emissions from fuels like natural gas and gasoline.

The study distinguishes between direct rebound effects (changes in energy service demand due to efficiency) and indirect rebound effects (changes in demand for other goods).

The total rebound effect (R) is modeled as $R[\%] = 1 - \frac{AES}{PES}$, where AES (Actual Energy Savings) is calculated as $EB - ER$ and PES (Potential Energy Savings) is calculated as $EB - EE$. Here, EB represents baseline emissions, EE represents emissions after efficiency improvements, and ER represents emissions considering rebound effects.

To further decompose the rebound effect, the study uses price and cross-price elasticities. The direct rebound effect (RD) is given by $RD = -\eta_{S,PS}$, while the indirect rebound effect (RI) is expressed as $RI = -\sum_{O \neq S} \frac{z_O w_O \eta_{O,PS}}{z_S w_S}$. In these formulas, $\eta_{S,PS}$ is the own-price elasticity of demand for the energy service, $\eta_{O,PS}$ is the cross-price elasticity of demand for other goods (O) with respect to the price of the energy service, z_O and z_S are the direct energy intensities of other goods (O) and the energy service (S), respectively, and w_O and w_S are the expenditure shares of other goods (O) and the energy service (S), respectively.

The study also considers three expenditure cases: the Base Case (Y_B), which represents the household's original expenditures; the Efficiency Case (Y_E), which assumes an efficiency investment without changes in demand for energy services or other goods; and the Rebound Case (Y_R), which reflects changes in demand for energy services and other goods due to rebound effects. These are mathematically represented as follows:

$$Y_B = Y_S + \sum_{o \neq S} Y_O = P_S S + \sum_{o \neq S} P_O O = I w_S + \sum_{o \neq S} w_O$$

$$Y_E = Y_B - P_S S \frac{\Delta P_S}{P_S} = I w_S (1 - \tau) + \sum_{o \neq S} w_O$$

$$Y_R = Y_B - Y_S \frac{\Delta P_S}{P_S} + Y_S \frac{\Delta S}{S} + \sum_{o \neq S} Y_O \frac{\Delta O}{O}$$

$$Y_R = Y_B - Y_S \frac{\Delta P_S}{P_S} - Y_S \eta_{S,PS} \frac{\Delta P_S}{P_S} - \sum_{o \neq S} Y_O \eta_{O,PS} \frac{\Delta P_S}{P_S}$$

While the model effectively quantifies the percentage of rebound effects, it has limitations in capturing the nuanced behavioral changes that drive these effects, such as leaving lights on due to perceived energy savings. Additionally, the static nature of the model assumes constant prices and linear production functions, which may overlook dynamic changes in energy use patterns and technology over time. By assuming zero incremental capital costs and the same embodied energy for efficient appliances, the model provides an upper bound for the indirect rebound effect. This comprehensive approach enables the study to estimate the broader economic impacts and indirect rebound effects of energy efficiency improvements, offering critical insights into how monetary savings are re-spent across different sectors and their subsequent effects on overall energy consumption and emissions. For further understanding of each component, please refer to the original paper.

3.2 Qualitative Approaches

Qualitative methods provide insights into the behavioral, cultural, and contextual factors influencing rebound effects, which are often overlooked by quantitative approaches.

3.2.1 Case Studies

Detailed case studies provide context-specific insights and a deep understanding of rebound phenomena under various settings. For instance, a case study: **District Cooling Systems and Rebound Effects in Urban Residential Areas in China** (Guo et al. 2016) investigates the rebound effect in the use of district cooling systems in urban residential areas in China. Despite the higher energy efficiency of these systems, their actual energy usage often exceeds that of decentralized systems, largely due to changes in occupant behavior. This case study helps to deepen the understanding of how technological improvements in energy efficiency can paradoxically lead to increased energy usage, due to changes in human behavior. They used the following methodology:

- Data Collection:
  - Quantitative data: energy consumption data were collected from five different district cooling systems, analyzed for usage patterns and compared with decentralized systems.
  - Qualitative data: interviews were conducted with residents to understand their perceptions and behavior changes post-implementation of district cooling systems.
- Analysis:
  - Analyze the collected data to identify patterns that indicate increased energy usage despite the higher efficiency of the cooling systems.
  - Explore how the adjustability of systems, pricing schemes, and improvement of indoor thermal comfort contribute to increased usage.

3.2.2 Ethnographic Studies

Ethnographic studies engage deeply with user behavior and attitudes towards energy consumption through detailed observations and interviews. These studies are adept at revealing micro-level behaviors that could lead to rebound effects when adopting energy-efficient technologies. For example, researchers might embed themselves within a community to observe how families interact with new energy-efficient appliances daily. Such immersive research helps elucidate the nuanced behaviors that might counteract the anticipated energy savings of efficient appliances. For instance, (Ehrhardt-Martinez and Laitner 2010) demonstrate a people-centric approach to study these effects, highlighting the importance of considering human behavior in energy efficiency initiatives.

3.3 Other Approaches

3.3.1 Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs)

Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) are sophisticated tools used to evaluate the comprehensive impacts of energy policies, encompassing environmental, economic, and technological interactions. These models integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines such as economics, environmental science, and engineering, allowing for the simulation of complex systems where energy, economy, and environment intersect (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 2023).

IAMs typically consist of several sub-models, each focusing on different aspects of the systems being studied:

- **Economic Models:** These simulate the macroeconomic responses to policy interventions, including changes in GDP, employment, and sectoral shifts. They often use computable general equilibrium (CGE) or partial equilibrium models to assess economic interactions.

- **Climate Models:** These are used to project the physical responses of the climate system to greenhouse gas emissions, including temperature changes and frequency of extreme weather events.
- **Energy Models:** These detail the production, conversion, and consumption of energy across different sectors and technologies, assessing the effects of technological change and policy measures on energy demand and supply.
- **Land-Use Models:** These analyze the impacts of energy and climate policies on land use, including agriculture, forestry, and urban development, crucial for evaluating changes in land-based carbon sequestration or emissions.

The strength of IAMs lies in their ability to provide a holistic view of the interactions between these components, enabling policymakers to understand potential trade-offs and synergies among various policy options. For instance, IAMs can evaluate how a policy aimed at reducing energy consumption might affect economic output, carbon emissions, and land use. They employ a variety of mathematical formulations to model these interactions dynamically over time, often under scenarios that reflect different policy pathways or external assumptions about future economic and demographic trends.

Example of CGE Model: The CGE model used by (Turner 2009) explores the rebound effects in the UK economy by systematically analyzing the sensitivity of rebound effects to changes in the price elasticity of energy demand and substitution elasticities in production. The CGE model encapsulates the various direct and indirect interactions across the economy, such as changes in production costs, household incomes, and price levels, which all influence energy demand. The model's structure allows for detailed simulation of how energy efficiency improvements might lead to unintended increases in energy demand – the rebound effect. This is represented by the equations:

$$\Delta E = (\eta - 1) \cdot \rho$$
$$R = (1 + \frac{\Delta E}{\rho}) \times 100$$

Here, ΔE is the change in energy use, η represents the general equilibrium price elasticity of demand for energy, and ρ indicates the rate of energy efficiency improvement. R calculates the rebound effect as a percentage, where values greater than 100% indicate backfire scenarios.

This model provides a nuanced understanding of the rebound effect by incorporating complex economic and environmental relationships, showing how initial energy savings from efficiency improvements can be offset by behavioral and other systemic responses within the economy.

3.3.2 System Dynamics Models

System dynamics is a modeling methodology used to understand the behavior of complex systems over time. It involves the use of stocks, flows, feedback loops, and time delays to simulate the interactions within a system, providing a framework for policy analysis and decision support. Simulation models allow researchers to explore potential future scenarios and their impacts by adjusting variables and observing the outcomes. Based on the work of (Ahmadi Achachlouei and Hilty 2016), a notable example is the IPTS study on passenger transport, which applied system dynamics to evaluate the environmental effects of ICT on transport modalities. The model, known as "Model 1," quantitatively simulated the demand for passenger transport under various scenarios. It incorporated multiple feedback loops—such as cost efficiency, resource scarcity, and mode shift-to depict how changes in technology, policy, and consumer behavior could influence transport demand.

3.3.3 Agent-Based Models (ABMs)

Agent-Based Models (ABMs) are a type of computational simulation. Computational simulations are methods that use computers to simulate the behaviors of complex systems numerically, allowing researchers to conduct experiments and analyze outcomes in a virtual environment. These simulations are particularly useful in systems where direct experimentation is costly, risky, or impractical. ABMs specifically model the interactions between autonomous agents within a given system to observe complex phenomena that emerge from these interactions. Each agent in an ABM is programmed with specific behaviors and decision-making rules that drive their actions within the simulated environment. ABMs are valuable in studying systems where human behavior plays a critical role in determining outcomes, making them ideal for analyzing socio-economic and ecological dynamics.

For instance, in the paper by Andrea (Hicks 2022), ABMs are coupled with Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) to assess the environmental impacts of products in a more nuanced way that incorporates human behavior. A detailed example provided in the paper involves the transition from incandescent to more energy-efficient lighting technologies like compact fluorescent and LED bulbs. The ABM simulates individual household decisions to adopt these new technologies, factoring in personal preferences, economic considerations, and the perceived benefits of energy efficiency.

The model examines the collective impact of these individual decisions on overall energy consumption by aggregating the outcomes of each agent's actions. It calculates the potential increase in usage due to lower operating costs of more energy-efficient bulbs. This aspect of the simulation is critical as it reveals potential rebound effects, where the decreased cost per unit of lighting could lead to longer lighting durations and more frequent use, as households adjust their behavior based on the perceived cost-efficiency of the new technology. Thus, even though the lighting devices are more energy-efficient, the overall energy consumption might not decrease as expected or could even increase. This counter-intuitive result—increased energy usage despite the adoption of more efficient technologies—is what the ABM helps to uncover, demonstrating the complex interplay between technological advances and human behavioral patterns.

4 Case Studies

4.1 Residential Energy Use: Smart Home Technologies

In the (Chen et al. 2018) case study, the authors explore the rebound effect in smart homes, using qualitative case study approaches, highlighting an increase in energy consumption due to improved energy efficiency and lower costs. In smart homes, even as devices become more efficient, the tendency for people to use more energy than the savings achieved is observed. This phenomenon, termed the "rebound effect," reflects a psychological response where the perceived savings in energy costs lead to greater energy use. For instance, residents may extend the use of heating or air conditioning due to lower operational costs, inadvertently increasing overall consumption.

The study measured the rebound effect through experiments where participants were provided with energy-saving advice and cost feedback. Findings revealed that when residents received reduced electricity bills and tips for reducing consumption, their energy use actually increased by an average of 13.5%. The experiments suggested that providing real-time feedback on electricity costs and consumption can help mitigate the rebound effect. It also showed that the most significant increase was in lighting settings (20.24% rebound effect), whereas appliance settings had the smallest rebound effect at 6.42%.

The 20.24% increase in electricity consumption for lighting in smart homes can be attributed to several psychological and behavioral responses to perceived cost savings from more efficient technologies. Residents may leave lights on longer because they believe the cost impact is minimal due to the efficiency of LED lighting. This effect, known as moral licensing as explained in the previous section, occurs when individuals feel they've earned the right to use more energy because they've invested in energy-efficient technology. Additionally, the real-time feedback on reduced electricity costs can unintentionally encourage higher usage if residents perceive it as confirmation that it's more affordable to keep lights on. Such behaviors highlight the complexity of human interactions with energy-saving technologies, where the anticipated savings can inadvertently lead to increased energy consumption.

4.2 Transportation: Autonomous Electric Vehicles (AEVs)

In the case study of (Onat et al. 2023), the authors explore the potential rebound effects associated with the deployment of autonomous electric vehicles (AEVs). While AEVs promise significant environmental benefits due to improved fuel efficiency, the study highlights significant rebound effects that could offset these advantages. These effects arise from increased vehicle manufacturing emissions and changes in user behavior that lead to more frequent and longer trips.

The key findings indicate that the lifecycle emissions of AEVs could be higher than initially anticipated, partially due to a substantial increase in manufacturing emissions. The emissions from manufacturing AEVs are estimated to rise by up to 40% compared to non-autonomous electric vehicles. This significant increase is attributed to the complexity of AEVs, which require advanced components like sensors, radar, and sophisticated computing systems not present in conventional vehicles. These high-tech components are resource-intensive, involving rare materials whose extraction and processing are energy-demanding and environmentally detrimental. Additionally, the dispersed global supply chain for these specialized components also adds to the carbon footprint, as parts are often transported over long distances before assembly.

Another critical aspect covered in the study is the source of electricity for AEVs and their charging infrastructure. It is assumed that the environmental impact of these vehicles heavily depends on whether the electricity is generated from renewable sources (green electricity) or fossil fuels. The use of green electricity would mitigate some of the rebound effects by reducing the carbon footprint associated with charging the vehicles.

In terms of the lifecycle assessment (LCA), the efficiency and production of charging stations are also considered. The LCA approach adopted in the study includes not only the direct emissions from vehicle operation and manufacturing but also the indirect emissions from the entire supply chain, including the infrastructure needed to support AEVs such as maintenance, repair, battery replacement, etc. The study assumes that as the network of charging stations expands, there will be a significant increase in demand for electricity, which if not managed through sustainable sources, could further exacerbate the environmental impact.

The methodology used in the study incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data, utilizing econometric models to predict emissions based on different deployment scenarios and technological advancements. Simulation techniques are also employed to model the behavioral changes in consumers' driving patterns due to the perceived convenience and efficiency of AEVs.

4.3 Digital Development Setting: China Case

In a detailed study of digital development in 285 Chinese cities (Peng, Zhang, and Liu 2023), the focus was on a variety of technologies including high-speed internet, data centers, 5G networks, smart grid technologies, and Internet of Things (IoT) applications within smart cities. These technologies, fundamental to digital transformation, significantly increase electricity consumption initially by 7% to 20% obtaining from employing a panel quantile regression model, which is similar to the econometric approach that is described in the previous section. This surge is especially pronounced in cities with higher incomes and a robust presence of tertiary industries, where digital technologies are more prevalent and intensively used.

The increase in energy consumption arises when the anticipated energy savings from digital efficiency improvements such as reduced travel from telecommuting or better energy management from smart grids are overshadowed by the energy demands of maintaining and expanding digital services. This effect is particularly severe in the early stages of digital infrastructure deployment, where substantial energy is consumed in setting up and operating new technologies.

Over time, however, this rebound effect begins to diminish, stabilizing at a minimum of 22%. This reduction is driven by several factors. Technological advancements lead to more energy efficient hardware and software, reducing per unit energy consumption. Regulatory measures, including stricter energy efficiency standards and incentives for using renewable energy sources, further help mitigate the impact. Additionally, as digital technologies become more widespread, economies of scale reduce the energy cost associated with their deployment and maintenance.

4.4 Smartphones and Consumer Electronics

In their comprehensive study of the global carbon footprint of the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) sector, (Belkhir and Elmeligi 2018) employ a lifecycle analysis (LCA) methodology to track the environmental impact from production to disposal of ICT devices, such as smartphones, tablets, and other consumer electronics. This approach involves collecting extensive data on the manufacturing processes, operational energy use, and end-of-life disposal of devices. The researchers estimate emissions at each stage, incorporating scenarios that project future technological changes, usage patterns, and energy efficiencies. They also explore the rebound effect, analyzing how increases in ICT efficiency might paradoxically lead to greater overall energy consumption due to increased device turnover rates and growing demand for more powerful technology.

A key aspect of their methodology involves using quantile regression techniques to estimate the carbon footprint across different quantiles of the data distribution. The quantile regression model is represented by the equation:

$$Q_y(\tau \mid x) = x'\beta(\tau)$$

where $Q_y(\tau \mid x)$ is the conditional quantile of the response variable y (e.g., carbon emissions) given the predictor variable x (e.g., ICT efficiency measures) at quantile τ, and $\beta(\tau)$ represents the quantile-specific coefficients. These coefficients, $\beta(\tau)$, vary across different quantiles τ (e.g., the 10th, 50th, 90th percentiles), providing a detailed understanding of how different levels of ICT efficiency impact carbon emissions across the entire distribution, rather than just the mean.

To measure the rebound effect, the study examines changes in $\beta(\tau)$ across different quantiles. If $\beta(\tau)$ indicates higher coefficients at higher quantiles, it suggests that increased ICT efficiency is associated with disproportionately higher carbon emissions at those levels, highlighting the rebound effect.

The study's data collection involves gathering extensive data from various sources, including industry reports and peer-reviewed articles, covering energy consumption during both the operational phase and production, including raw material extraction and manufacturing. Future projections are based on current and emerging trends in technology use, energy efficiency improvements, and changes in consumer behavior, employing scenario analysis to explore different pathways of ICT impact on carbon emissions up to 2040. Additionally, the examination of the rebound effect highlights how initial energy savings from ICT efficiencies might be offset by increased usage and demand. This comprehensive methodology provides a robust forecast, highlighting a significant rise in the ICT sector's greenhouse gas emissions from approximately 11.6% of global emissions in 2007 to over 14% by 2040 , driven largely by the energy demands of consumer electronics production and operation.

4.5 Impact of Teleworking on Energy Demand

The study on teleworking by (Hook et al. 2020) employs a systematic review methodology to thoroughly analyze the energy impacts of teleworking across 39 studies, integrating data extracted from a broad array of 9000 published articles. This approach begins with a comprehensive literature search across multiple databases to collect relevant studies, followed by a meticulous screening process to refine the selection based on specific criteria related to energy consumption. Key metrics such as energy savings from reduced commuting, changes in home energy consumption, and increased non-work travel are extracted and synthesized to identify patterns and discrepancies.

The methodology includes both qualitative and quantitative analyses to measure the rebound effects—increased energy consumption that offsets initial savings from teleworking. These effects are assessed by comparing energy usage data before and after the adoption of teleworking, focusing on changes in home energy use and non-work related travel. The variability in data from different studies presents methodological challenges, particularly in measuring indirect impacts like non-work travel, which are influenced by a variety of factors including individual behaviors, household characteristics, and local energy policies.

Moreover, the study considers how the impacts of teleworking may evolve over time as technological and behavioral adaptations occur, making teleworking more integrated and optimized within daily routines. This longitudinal analysis helps in understanding the shifting dynamics of teleworking's energy impacts, providing insights into how energy efficiency improvements and changes in teleworker behavior can potentially diminish the magnitude of rebound effects.

5 How to deal with Rebound Effects?

Type of policy pathway	**Rebound mitigation strategy**		
	Increased environmental efficiency – "consuming more efficiently"	**Consumption shifting – "consuming differently"**	**Downsize consumption – "consuming less"**
Policy design	Recognition in policy design Broader definitions and toolkit Benchmarking tools		
Sustainable consumption and behaviour		Consumption information Identity signalling Standardisation	Autonomous frugal behaviour
Innovation	Targeted eco-innovation		
Environmental economic policy	Energy/carbon tax Bonus-malus schemes Cap and trade schemes Rebates and subsidies		
New business models	Product service systems		

Figure 1: Policy pathways for rebound mitigation according to the type of instrument and general strategy.

In figure 1 extracted from (Font Vivanco, Kemp, and van der Voet 2016), numerous mitigation strategies have been studied and provided. In this study, the author has proposed three different mitigation strategies, namely

(1). Increased environmental efficiency - ”consuming more efficiently”, (2). Consumption shifting - ”Consuming differently” and (3). Downsize consumption - ”consuming less”. Each of them span over different policy pathway.

5.1 Increased environmental efficiency - ”consuming more efficiently”

- **Policy design** includes policies like *Recognition in Policy Design*, where rebound effects are explicitly considered during the policy-making process to ensure that policies are robust enough to handle unintended consequences. *Broader Definitions and Toolkit* enhance the understanding of rebound effects by incorporating comprehensive definitions and creating tools that help quantify and manage these effects more effectively. *Benchmarking Tools* are developed to compare and measure the efficiency of various technologies or practices, helping identify where rebound effects might be significant and require focused interventions.

- **Innovation**: Focused on *Targeted Eco-Innovation*, this pathway encourages the development of new technologies and solutions that not only improve efficiency but are also designed to minimize rebound effects. This involves promoting technologies that offer environmental benefits without significantly reducing the cost of consumption, which can lead to increased use.

- **Environmental Economic Policy**: This includes instruments like *Energy/Carbon Tax*, which impose a cost on energy consumption or carbon emissions, discouraging excessive use and encouraging investment in cleaner alternatives. *Bonus-Malus Schemes* adjust taxes or fees based on environmental performance, rewarding low emitters and penalizing high emitters. *Cap and Trade Schemes* set a maximum allowed level of emissions and let companies trade emission permits, creating a financial incentive to reduce emissions. *Rebates and Subsidies* are offered to support the adoption of energy-efficient technologies by reducing their upfront cost to consumers.

- **New Business Models:** *Product Service Systems (PSS)*, which shift the business model from product ownership to service delivery, aim to reduce material consumption while meeting consumer needs. This can lead to reduced resource use as the focus shifts from selling more products to providing better service quality and maintaining customer relationships over time.

5.2 Consumption shifting - ”Consuming differently”

- **Sustainable consumption and behaviour:** strategies under this category aim to modify consumer behavior towards more sustainable practices. Consumption Information involves educating consumers about their energy use and the environmental impact of their actions, encouraging more conscious decision-making. Identity Signaling taps into the cultural and social aspects of consumption, promoting products or behaviors that align with eco-friendly identities and making green choices more visible and desirable. Standardisation involves setting and enforcing industry standards that ensure products meet certain environmental criteria, reducing the variability in product impacts and guiding consumers towards better choices.

5.3 Downsize consumption - ”Consuming less”

- **Sustainable consumption and behaviour:** This strategy promotes Autonomous Frugal Behavior, encouraging individuals to voluntarily reduce their consumption through personal choice and lifestyle changes. This might include reducing energy use, opting for products with longer lifespans, or choosing services over products to minimize resource use.

6 Discussion

The exploration of the rebound effect highlights a paradox in sustainable development: technological advancements intended to decrease energy consumption often inadvertently lead to increased overall use. This effect is illustrated through practical examples, such as smart home technologies and autonomous electric vehicles, where initial energy efficiencies are overshadowed by subsequent behavioral changes and increased usage. These real-world instances validate theoretical perspectives like Jevons' Paradox, which suggests that efficiency improvements can lead to greater consumption by lowering costs and increasing demand. Conversely, from an innovation perspective, one could argue that because higher demand is anticipated for technologies like electric vehicles (EVs) and digital infrastructure, there is a pressing need to lower costs to meet this demand sustainably.

This paper also criticizes the methodologies used to measure rebound effects. While quantitative approaches such as econometric models and simulation models are adept at tracking direct relationships between energy efficiency improvements and consumption changes, they often overlook complex behavioral, cultural, and contextual influences. These models typically rely on simplified assumptions that fail to capture the nuanced ways consumers adjust their energy use in response to perceived efficiencies. For instance, econometric models may not fully account for the diversity in consumer behavior across different socio-economic contexts, leading to potential biases in their findings. Similarly, simulation models might oversimplify real-world dynamics by focusing on isolated variables without considering the interconnectedness of consumer habits and energy policies.

One significant difficulty with these quantitative approaches is that while they can measure the percentage of rebound effects, they often do not evaluate individual behaviors that contribute to these effects. For example, in the case of energy-efficient lighting, models may capture an overall increase in energy consumption but fail to explain specific behaviors such as leaving lights on unnecessarily because the cost of doing so is perceived to be lower. This gap highlights the limitations of current methodologies in fully understanding the behavioral drivers behind the rebound effect.

To address these limitations, the discussion recommends an integrated approach that leverages both quantitative data and qualitative insights from ethnographic studies, allowing for a deeper understanding of the rebound effect. By combining economic analysis with insights from behavioral sciences and sociology, researchers can develop more effective strategies to mitigate the rebound effect. This multidisciplinary approach can provide a more holistic view, capturing the complexity of human behavior and its impact on energy consumption. It also underscores the importance of context-specific studies that can inform more nuanced and effective policy-making and sustainable practices. Additionally, acknowledging the assumptions and potential biases within each methodology can help refine these approaches and improve the accuracy and relevance of their outcomes in assessing and addressing the rebound effect.

7 Conclusion and Personal Insights

This research into the rebound effect reveals the complex challenge of achieving genuine energy savings in the face of technological advancements and consumer behavior. The phenomenon demonstrates that while technological strides can reduce per-unit energy consumption, they can also lead to an overall increase in energy use due to behavioral adaptations. This underscores the importance of a nuanced approach to policy-making that considers not just the direct impacts of energy efficiency but also the indirect effects driven by human behavior.

From a personal perspective, this study highlights the critical need for policies that integrate technological advancements with behavioral interventions. Future research should prioritize cross-disciplinary studies that go into the psychological and sociological aspects of energy use to formulate more comprehensive energy policies. Additionally, educational programs that increase awareness about the rebound effect and promote sustainable consumption practices are essential.

Ultimately, addressing the rebound effect is not just about advancing technology but also about understanding and influencing consumer behavior as demonstrated in section 5. Furthermore, by adopting a more holistic approach that includes cross-disciplinary research and diverse policy strategies, we can align technological progress with environmental sustainability goals more effectively.

References

Polimeni, John M. et al. (2008). *The Jevons Paradox and the Myth of Resource Efficiency Improvements.* London: Earthscan. URL: `http://uberty.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/John_M._Polimeni_Kozo_Mayumi_Mario_Giampietro.pdf`.

Khazzoom, J. Daniel (1980). "Economic Implications of Mandated Efficiency in Standards for Household Appliances". In: *The Energy Journal* Volume 1.Number 4, pp. 21–40. URL: `https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:aen:journl:1980v01-04-a02`.

Sorrell, Steve (2009). "Jevons' Paradox revisited: The evidence for backfire from improved energy efficiency". In: *Energy Policy* 37.4, pp. 1456–1469. URL: `https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:enepol:v:37:y:2009:i:4:p:1456-1469`.

Saunders, Harry D. (1992). "The Khazzoom-Brookes Postulate and Neoclassical Growth". In: *The Energy Journal* 13.4, pp. 131–148. ISSN: 01956574, 19449089. URL: `http://www.jstor.org/stable/41322471` (visited on 05/13/2024).

Sorrell, Steve and John Dimitropoulos (2008). "The rebound effect: Microeconomic definitions, limitations and extensions". In: *Ecological Economics* 65.3, pp. 636–649. URL: `https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:ecolec:v:65:y:2008:i:3:p:636-649`.

Gillingham, Kenneth, David Rapson, and Gernot Wagner (2016). "The Rebound Effect and Energy Efficiency Policy". In: *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 10.1, pp. 68–88. URL: https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:oup:renvpo:v:10:y:2016:i:1:p:68-88..

Sorrell, Steve (2007). *The Rebound Effect: An Assessment of the Evidence for Economy-Wide Energy Savings from Improved Energy Efficiency*. Tech. rep. UK Energy Research Centre. URL: https://ukerc.ac.uk/publications/the-rebound-effect-an-assessment-of-the-evidence-for-economy-wide-energy-savings-from-improved-energy-efficiency/.

Santarius, Tilman, Hans Jakob Walnum, and Carlo Aall (Nov. 2018). "From Unidisciplinary to Multidisciplinary Rebound Research: Lessons Learned for Comprehensive Climate and Energy Policies". In: *Frontiers in Energy Research* 6. DOI: 10.3389/fenrg.2018.00104.

Tiefenbeck, Verena et al. (2013). "For better or for worse? Empirical evidence of moral licensing in a behavioral energy conservation campaign". In: *Energy Policy* 57, pp. 160–171. ISSN: 0301-4215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.01.021. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421513000281.

Bem, Daryl J. (1972). "Self-Perception Theory". In: *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 6, pp. 1–62.

Ajzen, Icek (1991). "The theory of planned behavior". In: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50 (2), pp. 179–211.

Kempen, Luuk van (Jan. 2009). "Status Consumption and Poverty in Developing Countries. Evidence and Welfare Effects". In: *Language and Cognitive Processes - LANG COGNITIVE PROCESS*.

Wallenborn, Grégoire (Oct. 2018). *Rebounds Are Structural Effects of Infrastructures and Markets*. ULB Institutional Repository 2013/277828. ULB – Universite Libre de Bruxelles. URL: https://ideas.repec.org/p/ulb/ulbeco/2013-277828.html.

Belaïd, Fateh, Adel Ben Youssef, and Nathalie Lazaric (2020). "Scrutinizing the direct rebound effect for French households using quantile regression and data from an original survey". In: *Ecological Economics* 176, p. 106755. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106755. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800920306698.

Andersson, David, Ross Linscott, and Jonas Nässén (Dec. 2019). "Estimating car use rebound effects from Swedish microdata". In: *Energy Efficiency* 12. DOI: 10.1007/s12053-019-09823-w.

Thomas, Brinda A. and Inês L. Azevedo (2013). "Estimating direct and indirect rebound effects for U.S. households with input–output analysis Part 1: Theoretical framework". In: *Ecological Economics* 86. Sustainable Urbanisation: A resilient future, pp. 199–210. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.12.003. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800912004764.

Guo, Siyue et al. (Aug. 2016). "The Rebound Effect in District Cooling Systems: Analysis Based on Case Studies and Surveys in China". In.

Ehrhardt-Martinez, Karen and John Laitner (Jan. 2010). "Rebound, Technology and People: Mitigating the Rebound Effect with Energy-Resource Management and People-Centered Initiatives". In: *American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, Summer Study Proceedings*, pp. 76–91.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2023). *Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) and Energy Environment Economy (E3) Models*. https://unfccc.int/topics/mitigation/workstreams/response-measures/modelling-tools-to-assess-the-impact-of-the-implementation-of-response-measures/integrated-assessment-models-iams-and-energy-environment-economy-e3-models. Accessed: 2023-05-12.

Turner, Karen (2009). "Negative rebound and disinvestment effects in response to an improvement in energy efficiency in the UK economy". In: *Energy Economics* 31.5, pp. 648–666. ISSN: 0140-9883. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2009.01.008. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140988309000127.

Ahmadi Achachlouei, Mohammad and Lorenz M. Hilty (2016). "Using Systems Thinking and System Dynamics Modeling to Understand Rebound Effects". In: *Advances and New Trends in Environmental and Energy Informatics*. Ed. by Jorge Marx Gomez et al. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, pp. 237–255. URL: https://files.ifi.uzh.ch/hilty/t/Literature_by_RQs/RQ%20226/2016_Ahmadi%20Achachlouei_Hilty_Using_Systems_Thinking_and_System_Dynamics_Modeling_to_Understand_Rebound_Effects.pdf.

Hicks, Andrea (2022). "Seeing the people in LCA: Agent based models as one possibility". In: *Resources, Conservation Recycling Advances* 15, p. 200091. ISSN: 2667-3789. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcradv.2022.200091. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667378922000293.

Chen, Ko-jung et al. (2018). "Influence of Rebound Effect on Energy Saving in Smart Homes". In: *Cross-Cultural Design. Applications in Cultural Heritage, Creativity and Social Development*. Ed. by Pei-Luen Patrick Rau. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 266–274. ISBN: 978-3-319-92252-2.

Onat, Nuri et al. (Oct. 2023). “Rebound effects undermine carbon footprint reduction potential of autonomous electric vehicles”. In: *Nature Communications* 14. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-023-41992-2.

Peng, Hua-Rong, Yue-Jun Zhang, and Jing-Yue Liu (2023). “The energy rebound effect of digital development: Evidence from 285 cities in China”. In: *Energy* 270, p. 126837. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.126837. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544223002311.

Belkhir, Lotfi and Ahmed Elmeligi (2018). “Assessing ICT global emissions footprint: Trends to 2040 recommendations”. In: *Journal of Cleaner Production* 177, pp. 448–463. ISSN: 0959-6526. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.239. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095965261733233X.

Hook, Andrew et al. (Aug. 2020). “A systematic review of the energy and climate impacts of teleworking”. In: *Environmental Research Letters* 15.9, p. 093003. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab8a84. URL: https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab8a84.

Font Vivanco, David, René Kemp, and Ester van der Voet (2016). “How to deal with the rebound effect? A policy-oriented approach”. In: *Energy Policy* 94, pp. 114–125. ISSN: 0301-4215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.03.054. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421516301586.