



Time and Money Matters for Sustainability: Insights on User Preferences on Renewable Energy for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

Delong Du
Delong.Du@uni-siegen.de
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany

Apostolos K. Vavouris
apostolos.vavouris@strath.ac.uk
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, United Kingdom

Omid Veisi
omid.veisi@student.uni-siegen.de
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany

Lu Jin
lu.jin@fit.fraunhofer.de
Fraunhofer FIT
Sankt Augustin, Germany

Gunnar Stevens
gunnar.stevens@uni-siegen.de
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany

Lina Stankovic
lina.stankovic@strath.ac.uk
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, United Kingdom

Vladimir Stankovic
vladimir.stankovic@strath.ac.uk
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, United Kingdom

Alexander Boden
alexander.boden@fit.fraunhofer.de
Fraunhofer FIT
Sankt Augustin, Germany

ABSTRACT

Charging electric vehicles (EVs) with renewable energy can lessen their environmental impact. However, the fluctuating availability of renewable energy affects the sustainability of public EV charging stations. Nearby public charging stations may utilize differing energy sources due to their microgrid connections - ranging from exclusively renewable to non-renewable or a combination of both - highlighting the substantial variability in energy supply types within short distances. This study investigates the near-future scenario of integrating dynamic renewable energy availability in charging station navigation to impact the choices of EV users towards renewable sources. We conducted a within-subjects design survey with 50 car users and semi-structured interviews with 10 EV users from rural, suburban, and urban areas. The results show that when choosing EV charging stations, drivers often prioritize either time savings or money savings based on the driving scenarios that influence drivers' consumer value. Notably, EV users tend to select renewable-powered stations when they align with their main priority, be it saving money or time. This study offers end-user insights into the front-end graphic user interface and the development of the back-end ranking algorithm for navigation recommender systems that integrate dynamic renewable energy availability for the sustainable use of electric vehicles.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → User centered design.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution International 4.0 License.

MuC '24, September 01–04, 2024, Karlsruhe, Germany
© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0998-2/24/09
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3670653.3670677>

KEYWORDS

Electric Vehicles, Renewable Energy, Charging Station, Sustainability, EV User, Navigation

ACM Reference Format:

Delong Du, Apostolos K. Vavouris, Omid Veisi, Lu Jin, Gunnar Stevens, Lina Stankovic, Vladimir Stankovic, and Alexander Boden. 2024. Time and Money Matters for Sustainability: Insights on User Preferences on Renewable Energy for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations. In *Proceedings of Mensch und Computer 2024 (MuC '24)*, September 01–04, 2024, Karlsruhe, Germany. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3670653.3670677>

1 INTRODUCTION

In Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) research, supporting eco-friendly decision-making exhibit as a common topic, including adapting sustainable mobility [35, 58, 61], reducing food waste [34, 36, 37, 75], promoting sustainable tourism [71], saving energy at home [9, 10, 66–69, 72, 72], and planning photovoltaic systems [83, 84]. While the importance of eco-friendly charging for domestic electric vehicles (EVs) is growing [23, 44, 80], it is still largely unknown how to support EV users in making eco-friendly choices in public charging scenarios.

Electric vehicles (EVs) have been proposed as a cleaner alternative to internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs), primarily due to their potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through charging with renewable energy sources [31]. Countries worldwide are transitioning from ICEVs to EVs, reflecting a global shift toward sustainable transportation. In the European Union and the United Kingdom, this transition is evidenced by the ban on selling new petrol and diesel cars from 2035 as part of a broader strategy to achieve climate neutrality by 2050 [59]. In China and the United States, policies have been established aiming to promote electric vehicle development and adoption [57, 100]. Central to this transition is the development of EV charging stations and infrastructures, which presents an opportunity to integrate renewable energy. Different energy sources exhibit significant variations in

carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, with fossil fuels having the worst carbon footprint, while renewables demonstrate a footprint close to zero [63] excluding battery production emission. By optimizing the carbon footprint in long-distance travel planning, EV users can choose charging stations powered by renewable energy to align with their environmental values [56, 77].

However, renewable energy, despite its clean nature, is subject to fluctuation due to variation, thus making it challenging to guarantee the availability of energy and power on demand [7, 48]. To maintain a steady renewable energy supply, solutions such as sustainable hydropower storage [74], diversifying energy sources [29], and enabling grid stability for increasing photovoltaics through grid management [8] are employed to mitigate the fluctuating nature of renewable energy sources. However, the availability of renewable energy for use differs across electricity grids in various areas and regions, influenced by the diversity of their regional electricity generation mixes [89] and the varying levels of renewable energy penetration and infrastructure [49]. As microgrids increasingly adopt distributed renewable energy generation [27, 73], regional variations significantly influence the type of renewable facilities implemented, such as solar PV and wind energy systems. These differences play a critical role in shaping the energy source distribution within the grid. With the growing differences in microgrid configurations, the phenomenon of regional variations in renewable energy availability is expected to escalate, leading to high variability even between neighboring areas. Some charging stations are off-grid, powered by distributed energy sources instead of the conventional utility grid [47].

Thus, addressing regional and local variations in renewable energy availability requires further research into integrating sustainability considerations into vehicle navigation systems. This could involve empirical studies about EV users' public charging experience to negotiate navigation choices toward renewable-powered charging stations. However, how to integrate and meaningfully present environmentally friendly options to users and contract sustainable practices is still an open question that this paper tries to address. In summary, this study adopts a Research Through Design Approach [103], using graphic user interfaces (GUI) of navigation recommender prototypes to explore user experience in choosing green charging stations. This approach aims to gain insights into EV user decision-making processes and preferences on their consumption value of renewables, seeking to understand the rationale behind their public charging station choices. The investigation is structured around the following research questions:

RQ1: How to influence EV users to choose renewable-powered charging stations by integrating renewable energy availability into the GUI of navigation recommenders?

RQ2: What impact does integrating renewable energy availability into the GUI of the navigation recommender have on EV users' decision-making preference in selecting charging stations?

We analyzed the screen designs of Tesla models' in-car navigation systems and then simplified these designs for our investigation (refer to Fig. 1: Design Context). Subsequently, we created three different versions (refer to Fig. 1: Design Focus) to investigate how time, money, and eco-information influence EV user consumer value.




Figure 1: Three within-Subjects Survey GUI Variants: Top figure: Variant 1, middle figure: Variant 2; Bottom figure: Variant 3.

- **Variant 1 (Time vs Money):** Participants were asked to choose between a faster and more expensive charging option and a cheaper and more time-consuming option.
- **Variant 2 (Time vs Eco-Friendly):** Both charging stations were priced equally, with the most time-consuming one offering the added benefit of renewable energy.
- **Variant 3 (Time vs Money + Eco-Friendly):** Participants were asked to choose between a more expensive and faster charging station and a less expensive but more time-consuming option equipped with renewable energy.

Our main contribution is a consumer behavioral study supported with both quantitative Chi-Square test statistics results and qualitative interview analysis on electric vehicle (EV) drivers' rationals for choosing charging stations, highlighting the influence of factors including time, money, and renewable energy availability. The results indicate that EV users often prioritize either time savings or money savings, depending on the driving scenario, which influences their consumer value. Importantly, EV users are inclined to choose renewable-powered charging stations when it aligns with their main priority - whether their consumer value prefers saving time or money.

2 RELATED WORK

This section discusses current research on regional variations of renewable energy availability, followed by prior work on navigation systems for EV charging stations and EV users' experience with charging stations.

2.1 Regional Variation of Renewable Energy Availability

Renewable energy sources are being promoted worldwide, with the International Energy Agency predicting a stabilization in electricity generation emissions from 2023 to 2025 with 42 countries from Asia, Africa, North and South America, Europe, and Australia [29]. In the United States, the share of renewable energy in the electric power sector increased from 9% in 2008 to 17% in 2018 [33]. In 2022, Sweden led the EU with 66.0% of its energy from renewables, primarily hydro, wind, biofuels, and heat pumps; Finland followed at 47.9%, using hydro, wind, and biofuels; Denmark (41.6%) used wind and biofuels [16].

To reduce carbon emissions, EVs can ideally be charged with renewable sources rather than non-renewable energy [31, 89]. The carbon footprint of an EV is correlated with varying patterns of charging of renewable energy availability, as well as with the country and the area within a country where the charger is located [89]. However, varying levels of renewable energy availability are observed, notably experiencing spatial and temporal heterogeneity. Various factors, such as investment efforts, consumption intensity, and generation efficiency, influence the mechanisms for renewable generation and infrastructure penetration [98]. These can be influenced by the diversity of weather and geographical conditions and the renewable energy availability in different areas and regions [97]. Although electricity networks are generally interconnected on a regional, national, and international level, the energy produced is first consumed locally and then exported to other regions, as transportation of energy over long distances carries high costs due to the inherent complexity of constructing and maintaining the required high power lines, and due to losses in the transportation and distribution network. These losses (circa 8% of the total electricity produced) are responsible for approximately 1Gt of CO₂ emissions per year [28]. In the USA, in 2022, more than 0.8 quadrillion British thermal units were lost due to the transmission and distribution of electricity [87]. In China, smart grids experience a regional imbalance between power resources that requires long transmission distances from 1000–3000 km [99]. The renewable energy availability of each microgrid can vary greatly between microgrids of different areas. In the United Kingdom, across the 14 different areas of the Distribution System Operators grids, the difference in penetration of renewables (especially between North and South) leads to a significant discrepancy between the availability of renewable energy [49].

With the ever-increasing pace of penetration of small-scale distributed renewables, distribution and transmission losses are expected to decrease, as electricity will need to travel less distance between the production and consumption point [81]. Introducing distributed sources will result in a highly complex system with different generation mixtures (and carbon footprints) even at the subregional/neighborhood level, with research focusing on optimal ways to distribute this generation sources [81]. This will lead to different availability of energy, power, and pricing, even within close proximity, based on the specific characteristics of the generation mixture in each area connecting to its microgrids.

Different approaches have been proposed to harness energy from distributed sources or to recover wasted energy for EV charging. In [43], energy otherwise lost from overhead lines due to design properties and the deceleration of light rail rolling stock is used to charge EVs in parking lots located near Edinburgh Tram electricity substations. Furthermore, approaches using distributed renewables for EV charging have been proposed in the literature [65], with the authors proposing using local energy storage systems for peak saving and reducing the dependency on the utility grid. Although distributed renewables can help provide locally produced energy, these sources are characterized by high variability due to the stochastic nature of the physical phenomena responsible for renewable generation. Renewable sources generally exhibit diurnal and seasonal variations due to different solar insolation levels, wind speed, water flow, force, etc. Therefore, renewable energy's temporal and

spatial availability and cost should be communicated to end users through information and communication technologies (ICT), such as the navigation system of EV charging stations, to make sustainable decisions.

2.2 Navigation Systems of EV Charging Stations

Traveling long distances with EVs requires recharging, making travel time optimization planning essential for practical purposes [64]. The existing state-of-the-art EV charging systems focus on integrating renewable energy availability into eco-friendly recharging navigation systems [56, 77, 96]. Two classes of EV charging navigation applications differ mainly in terms of their workflows; one is function-based, and the other is context-based, each catering to different user needs and preferences, shown in Figure 1. Function-based navigations [3] focus on presenting a straightforward and function-centric interface. Upon launching the app, users are greeted with a menu or a ranking list of functions such as finding the nearest charging station, checking station availability, filtering stations by charger type, or viewing charging prices. The usage is linear and task-orientated; users select a function and are then taken to a new screen that delves into the details of that particular function. This approach suits users who prefer direct interaction with specific features without additional contextual information. On the other hand, context-based navigations [62] take a more holistic and immersive approach. It typically opens with a map view, displaying the user's current location and nearby EV charging stations. Such navigation systems contain essential information, such as the availability of charging ports and connector types, pricing, and even user reviews. Users can interact with the map to find stations, plan routes, or get recommendations based on their current battery level and destination. The context-based approach is ideal for users who appreciate a comprehensive overview and prefer to make decisions based on a wide range of information presented within their current context.

EV Supply Equipment (EVSE) is the infrastructure facility designed to charge EVs. These stations provide electrical power to EVs to recharge their batteries. The proliferation of EV charging stations is a critical factor in the adoption and convenience of using EVs. Public charging stations can be found in various public locations, such as shopping centers, parking lots, and dedicated charging stations. The overall EV charging system includes vehicles, EV customers, and the charging station center [5]. Most navigation applications for EV charging stations include maps, navigation, and recommender systems for charging stations. The map function enables finding nearby EV charging stations and provides detailed information. The navigation function enables guiding to the nearest EV charging station; the recommender of charging stations provides a list of optimal choices and routes that connect the battery remaining with the available charging station. In addition to the main function, several other factors, such as weather and traffic conditions provided in navigation, can also influence the results of the selection route [5]. Navigation strategies can arguably be very important for EV users, even more so than for drivers of cars with combustion engines. By using these strategies, drivers can not only choose less congested routes but also charge their vehicles at less busy charging stations. This can result in a number of benefits for

both the driver and the community as a whole, including better resource management, reduced range anxiety for EV users, and optimized overall costs. Without navigation, EV users may face traffic congestion, high energy consumption, long waiting times at charging stations, and ultimately higher costs [25].

2.3 EV Users' Experience on Charging Stations

According to ISO 9241-210:2019, User experience is defined as "a consequence of the presentation, functionality, system performance, interactive behavior, and assistive capabilities of an interactive system, both hardware and software; it is also a consequence of the user's prior experiences, attitudes, skills, habits and personality" [1]. When specifically examining EV users' experience, EV users' interactive behaviors with such navigation systems focus on their rationale for choosing charging stations powered by renewable energy. Many considerations are known to influence the decisions of EV users regarding charging stations. Factors such as budgets of time and money have been discussed to be important for selecting charging stations [11, 78, 91]. Time and money budgets are intertwined with several other factors that influence EV traveling decisions for selecting charging stations, such as EV characteristics (e.g., the type of battery) [101] or maximum AC / DC charging ratings [39], user travel time and plans [76, 94], environmental and situational context such as weather, road and traffic conditions [6, 38], as well as charging infrastructure attributes like availability of charging spots [24, 60] and surroundings [60].

With the transition towards renewable energy use for EV charging, linking electrical power systems and ICT navigation systems aims to engage EV users in providing demand response [19]. Real-time monitoring and updates on renewable energy availability require municipal administration to collect data from infrastructure, sensors, and energy sources for energy management [42]. Recent studies have demonstrated the significant potential of ICT-embedded recommender systems in optimizing the integration of EVs with renewable energy sources for changing purposes. Das et al. proposed a multi-objective techno-economic-environmental optimization approach for EV charging, which reduces energy costs and grid utilization [14]. Chen et al. introduced a blockchain-based EV incentive system to maximize renewable energy utilization by scheduling EV charging consumption [13]. Tang et al. proposed distributed routing and charging scheduling optimization problems for an Internet of Electric Vehicle (IoEV) network to minimize the money and time cost for EV users while accommodating changes in renewable energy availability [82].

3 METHODOLOGY

The ongoing research on the integration of sustainability considerations into navigation systems for EV charging stations discussed in the related work section has demonstrated the importance of investigating end-user experiences to enhance the development of navigation recommender systems with sustainability metrics. Building on this foundation, our approach aims to develop a nuanced understanding of end-user experiences with navigation interfaces that integrate time, money, and sustainability considerations. This exploration is guided by a Research Through Design approach [103]. To explore this impact, our approach employed a mix of qualitative

and quantitative methods, with a focus on the impact of integrating renewable energy availability on end-user GUI. This approach combined qualitative insights from 10 EV users' interviews with quantitative data from 50 driver/passenger surveys, providing a comprehensive understanding of the EV charging experience. This mixed-method approach facilitated an in-depth exploration of end users' decision-making processes from the qualitative data, as well as a validation of those interview insights through the Chi-Square test of independence on the survey data.

3.1 Gather User Preferences: A Within-Subjects Design Survey Approach

The study initially involved a total of 50 participants (drivers and passengers) for the quantitative methodology: a within-subjects survey approach [12, 55]. The within-subjects design of the survey enabled us to gather data on user preferences for EV charging stations by comparing different GUI variants. In Human-Computer Interaction research, a within-subjects design involves simultaneously presenting users with comparable variants, enabling researchers to compare responses across each interface. The survey presented to the participants three GUI variants of a charging station navigation recommender system [55]. This setup was designed to determine how user preferences are affected by the display of renewable energy availability. The eco-feedback has to be positioned as the second alternative option to avoid first-option bias where users are affected by the ranking of the option [21], as shown in Figure 1. Gathering user preferences, we compared survey responses as the GUI variables were presented together and explained to 50 participants. We analyze how their responses varied across the three variants. Additionally, we tracked how each of the 50 participant's responses changed between each of the two conditions and combined these shifts statistically to gather the impact of displaying renewable energy availability on user preferences.

3.2 Understand Decision-Making Processes: An Interview Approach

After the quantitative survey, we conducted in-person field interviews while driving with 10 EV users who were specifically recruited for this study from a combination of 3 rural area participants, 3 suburban area participants, and 4 urban area participants. Participants reported their demographic and driving information (see Table 1), as well as their usual daily driving duration and the percentage of battery used. Notably, two participants were EV taxi drivers, requiring more than one battery cycle per day, labeled as 100% + 80% daily battery usage, indicating significantly higher daily usage compared to others who primarily used their EVs for commuting or personal travel. Participants typically charged their EVs once every two days at home. However, participants P7 and P8 often charged more than once per day, either at home or at public stations.

The interviews adopted a hybrid approach, combining retrospective and speculative methods. Participants were first asked to recount their experiences with navigating to charging stations. Subsequently, they were invited to speculate based on the survey GUI conditions. They reported their choices and then explained why they made their decision to choose certain charging stations. This

Table 1: Participant Demographics, Driving Profiles, Region, and Occupation

Participant	Gender	Age	Region	Occupation	Driving Time	Daily Battery Usage
P1	M	28	Rural	Commuter	50 min/day	25%
P2	M	29	Rural	Commuter	50 min/day	25%
P3	M	62	Urban	Retired Older Adult	30 min/day	10%
P4	W	61	Urban	Retired Older Adult	15 min/day	5%
P5	M	26	Suburban	Commuter	120 min/day	40%
P6	W	27	Suburban	Commuter	120 min/day	30%
P7	W	46	Suburban	E-taxi Driver	600 min/day	100% + 80%
P8	M	53	Suburban	E-taxi Driver	600 min/day	100% + 80%
P9	W	42	Urban	Commuter	180 min/day	60%
P10	W	25	Rural	Commuter	70 min/day	30%

interview process focused on understanding how the visibility of renewable energy availability influences the decision-making processes of EV users when choosing charging stations. Interview data were analyzed to identify factors influencing participants' decision-making processes, with a focus on the contextual elements that influenced their choice of charging stations.

Participants vary in age from 25 to 62 years old. They reside in different areas: rural, urban, and suburban. Most participants are commuters, with commute times ranging from 15 to 180 minutes per day, while two are e-taxi drivers with 600 minutes per day. P7 and P8 are taxi drivers who drive about 10 hours per day on average. This includes approximately 8 hours of work-related driving and 2 hours of personal driving (such as grocery shopping, commuting, and picking up children). Therefore, they use more than one full battery charge cycle daily, which is why their usage of 180% exceeds 100%, as they charge their EV during the day 1-2 times.

3.3 Converge Mix-Method Results


After the data analysis based on the gathered user preference data from the survey and understanding the decision-making process from the interview, we explained the meanings of our results in the format of a user consumer journey [18] as a visual representation. A consumer journey map visually represents a user's interactions with a service, from when they first become aware of it to when they make a purchase. By mapping out the steps in the user journey, researchers can identify the factors that influence users' choices when choosing a charging station, thus developing strategies for improving front-end user interface design and back-end ranking algorithm development for EV charging navigation recommender systems.

4 RESULTS

4.1 User Preference: Survey Result

This section presents the results of our within-subject design survey. In Figure 2, we present a comprehensive statistical comparison of user preferences among 50 participants under three GUI variants. This statistic provides a clear overview of how preferences are distributed and vary in each scenario, with the answers given for the different variants being:

Figure 2 presents a comprehensive statistical comparison of user preferences among 50 participants under three GUI variants.

**Figure 2: Overall Statistical Comparison of User Preference**

This statistic provides a clear overview of how preferences are distributed and vary in each scenario, with the answers given for the different variants being:

- **Variant 1 (Time vs Money):** 31 chose the faster, more expensive charging option, and 19 chose the more time-consuming, cheaper option.
- **Variant 2 (Time vs Eco-Friendly):** 29 participants opted for the faster charging option, priced equally to the other option, while 21 chose the more time-consuming option powered by renewable energy.
- **Variant 3 (Time vs Money + Eco-Friendly):** 17 participants selected the more expensive and quicker option, and 33 opted for the less expensive, more time-consuming option powered by renewables.

The results for Variant 1 show that despite the higher price, Charger X is preferred due to its shorter charging time. The results for Variant 2 and Variant 3 indicate that the preference for Charger X is influenced not only by charging time but also by price and the option to use green energy. A Chi-Square test of independence was conducted to examine the differences between the categories (V1, V2, V3) for Charger X. The results were significant, $\chi^2((2, N = 3) = 9.18, p = .01$. This indicates that the different conditions impact the choice behavior. In the second step, we examined how choice behavior changes between the three variants (V1 vs V2, V2 vs V3, V1 vs V3).

- **V1 vs V2** The difference between V1 and V2 is that V2 offers the option to use green energy, which is more expensive compared to V1. We analyze whether this affects the choice preference. The Chi-Square test shows no significant difference, $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 0.042, p = 0.838$, indicating that price plays a more important role than sustainability aspects.
- **V2 vs V3** The difference between V2 and V3 is the opposite of the previous comparison. In the variant V3, the green energy at Charger Y is cheaper than in V2. The test was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 4.871, p = 0.027$. This supports the analysis that price has a significant influence on charger preference.
- **V1 vs V3** The comparison between V1 and V3 allows us to analyze the effect of green energy when the price remains constant between the variants. The Chi-Square test was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 6.771, p = 0.009$. This indicates that green energy can be an additional motivation, even if it is not the dominant factor in user behavior. The price factor

is a motivational element for users to consider compromising time for the green energy station.

In Figure 2, we present the changes in individual choices in response to different variants. Specifically, we show the impact of displaying renewable energy availability on users' preference for charging stations, with participants responding:

- **21 participants disregard sustainability intel:** 12 for more time-efficient and more costly (Pattern: XXX) + 9 for cheaper but more time-consuming charging stations (Pattern: YXY).
- **24 participants shifted preferences due to awareness of renewable energy availability:** 10 switched from time-efficient and expensive stations to slower ones powered by renewable energy, regardless of cost (Pattern: XYY) + 8 chose time-consuming charging stations for the environmental benefits, even if it did not save them money (Pattern YYY) + 6 switched to renewable-powered ones when cost savings were available despite the extra time spent (Pattern: XXY).
- **5 participants' data appeared differently:** 3 initially chose renewable energy stations with no price or time benefits but later switched to faster and more expensive options (Pattern: XYX) + 2 initially chose time-consuming stations but later prioritized factors over renewable energy and opted for costlier and less time spent (Pattern: YXX).

4.2 Decision Making: Interview Results

To understand the decision-making processes of choosing charging stations, we interviewed 10 EV drivers who completed the survey and asked about the reasons and their thoughts on why they chose to use specific charging stations. The most common theme emerged among the participants, highlighting a general phenomenon of disregarding sustainability in favor of either saving time or money. Participants P1, P2, P8, and P10 favored time-saving options.

"My time is more valuable than the money that I save." (P1)

"Depending on how much time it takes to move there (to a renewable-powered station), my answer would differ. 2 minutes are fine; 10 mins are too much." (P2)

P8, working as a taxi driver, emphasized the economic aspect of time value:

"I am likely to make more money for the 10 minutes I waste, so I would definitely not drive extra because it just doesn't make sense to me." (P8)

Similarly, P10 prioritized efficiency, stating,

"I don't care. I have to go to work. I don't want to be stuck in traffic, and also, it's early in the morning when I am really sleepy, or when I am off work, I just head home ASAP." (P10)

Moreover, participants P3, P5, P7, and P9 showed a preference for money-saving, even if it required extra time.

"Definitely the cheaper one even though it's further. It's likely to be on my way already." (P3)

"If it's on my way, I would go to the cheaper one even if it's further. It's just obvious to do that." (P5)

"It's actually almost the same; we are talking about whether I should save a certain amount for this much time. I think it's worth it as I calculate." (P7)

"If I am not in a rush, most likely I want to save some money unless I am in a rush. We are talking about if we have some extra time or not." (P9)

While cost and time were predominant, P4 and P6 also included sustainability in their decision-making but still leaned towards economic benefits.

"If it can save some money and also protect the environment, I am willing to do so." (P4) *"It's rewarding me some money for choosing the green earth one. I like doing that because it makes me feel happy."* (P6)

In addition, participants frequently highlighted that their choices were influenced by a variety of contextual factors. They mentioned considering aspects such as weather, parking availability, local amenities, surroundings, and traffic conditions. These factors, as explained, were crucial in determining both the time spent and the money invested in their travels. Interestingly, several participants also shared that, over time, they began relying more on their memory for station locations than the navigation recommender app. This shift often led them to overlook real-time updates on renewable energy availability that were neglected due to drivers' growing reliance on spatial memory. Participants also reported that a potentially frustrating experience could jeopardize drivers' trust in an eco-friendly recommender, such as encountering traffic congestion on the way to a further renewable-powered charging station or the available charging spots getting occupied before they arrive.

5 DISCUSSION

In this section, we first discuss the end user insights on their charging station selection experience with different GUIs that integrated renewable energy availability in a format of the consumer journey [18], shown in Figure 3. Furthermore, we provide heuristic design implications for motivating EV drivers to choose more sustainable charging stations.

5.1 Consumer Journey of Choosing Renewable Powered Charging Station

Our consumer journey [18], Figure 3, illustrates how EV drivers select renewable power charging stations and what considerations they make while doing so. Our results show that EV drivers often prioritize money or time budgets when selecting charging stations. By demonstrating the benefits of time or cost savings, we should hence be able to motivate drivers to choose charging stations powered by renewable energy. This phenomenon extends the concept of consumer surplus in consumer theory [15, 85], representing a trade-off between the amount a consumer is willing to pay or the time they are willing to spend versus what they actually do. Here, the consumer surplus arises from the notification of sustainable energy, perceived as offering time-saving benefits for time-focused drivers and cost-saving advantages for cost-conscious ones.




Figure 3: Consumer Journey of Choosing Renewable Powered Charging Station

Our study discovered that sustainability considerations are often secondary unless linked to time or cost savings. Moreover, our interview participants reported various factors aligned with recent research. Those influencing factors for making EV charging station choices include weather conditions [38], traffic [6, 38], surrounding amenities [60], availability of charging spots [24, 60], price [91], convenience [91], and charging speed [91]. Our findings on time and money budgets as significant considerations also align with research on programming management algorithms and models [11, 78]. Interestingly, our findings imply that people alter their practices toward sustainability, which are mostly related to their budgets, and that they prioritize either money or time-saving. To some extent, this finding is also consistent with a recent mixed-methods study in a Norwegian positive energy neighborhood, where participants were motivated to change some energy-intensive practices, such as EV charging, due to the considerable impact this would have on their energy bills [23, 88]. Hence, providing sustainability information alone does not significantly influence drivers unless coupled with time or cost benefits that align with their preferences. This observation opens up possibilities for personalized, content-based, and scenario-based recommendation systems [20, 40, 46, 50–54]. Such systems need to understand users' general preferences for time or money and special scenarios of their time and money budgets, whether they are in a rush, have limited funds, or find the pricing too high based on their perceived value. The trade-off between drivers' time and cost benefits interacts with the EV grid load agenda, where sustainability is primarily a governmental environmental concern. This interplay also fits within the framework of game theory [92], suggesting that a negotiation between driver preferences and sustainability agenda and policy can lead to a cooperative and mutually beneficial outcome.

On top of that, our interview data also indicated that long-term practice of charging might not rely solely on recommender systems but also on drivers' spatial memory. This means they might choose charging stations based on familiarity rather than recommendations, regardless of whether they are in rural or urban areas, where the density and surroundings of charging stations differ. This aspect challenges the effectiveness of sustainable recommender systems in influencing drivers' mobility practices. Moreover, the lack of timely updates on the availability of charging stations can lead to frustration among drivers, such as when they arrive at a station only to find it occupied or encounter traffic delays. These experiences could deter EV drivers from relying on recommender systems in the future, making it even more important to consider how to embed recommendations into the information infrastructures so that consumers can be nudged towards changing their behaviors in

effective ways without requiring active investigation and planning. In the longer term, time aspects might be mitigated with the greater availability of renewable charging options, while cost savings might be affected by increased CO2 taxes and further development of sustainable energy sources. But until we are there, it seems paramount to consider the design of interfaces and how we can support EV drivers in making more sustainable decisions now based on their expressed preferences and decision-making strategies.

5.2 Design Implications

In the discussion of the consumer journey section, we have identified the pain points of EV drivers towards making sustainable charging decisions. What we learned from our GUI design experiment is that displaying such a sustainable indication of renewable energy availability is not users' major concern and will likely be discarded. Users would prefer to recommend the best option to them as the default first option. Based on the concept of nudge theory [86] and its relationship with cognitive load [79], to mitigate the trade-off between drivers' priorities (time and money budgets) and sustainability concerns, it would be highly impactful to set the most sustainable option as default selection based on their preference profile. This design can nudge drivers to choose renewable energy-powered stations without overwhelming them with cognitive load decision-making or comprising their priorities. To address the spatial memory problem, drivers may tend to reduce reliance on navigation through GUIs, but their memory around the area should be integrated. Voice-assistant features and real-time geolocation GPS updates can allow drivers to receive spoken direction recommendations. This design can embody the notions of ubiquitous computing [41] and pervasive technology [17] by seamlessly blending the voice interface into the background of people's everyday practices. Lastly, we can also use gamification [93, 102] to motivate drivers, for instance, by collecting points to charge their EVs with renewable energy sources, and after reaching certain times or points for charging their EVs with green energy, we reward drivers with a one-time charge coupon to persuade drivers as players to perform sustainable practices. However, further design investigations on nudging, voice assistant interface, pervasive system, and gamification design implications deserve research attention due to the complexity of user experience in real practice. Understanding those cybernetics connections between end-users and the smart electricity grid by presenting eco-feedback for sustainable mobility practice can be a potential path to a more sustainable future [45].

5.3 Limitations and Future Works

This study presents findings on EV users' preference changes and interactive behavior in response to a navigation recommender system's graphic user interfaces, which integrate renewable energy availability at public charging stations for long-distance travel. Several limitations exist and warrant further research. Future studies should investigate factors such as weather conditions [38], traffic [6, 38], surrounding amenities [60], availability of charging spots [24, 60], price [91], convenience [91], and charging speed [91], urban data [90], and spatial memory [90]. This research is essential to improve the integration of renewable energy availability into public

charging station navigation systems, thereby promoting sustainability. Potential traffic congestion is a concern when navigation systems direct multiple EV users to the same station. A negative experience may occur if two drivers are directed to a single available renewable energy-powered charging station, causing one to wait for an extended period and resulting in distrust of the system. Users' trust in such navigation recommenders, once broken, is difficult to repair. Driving speed and weather conditions across different seasons also influence the battery life and driving range of EVs. The infrastructure of charging stations, amenities, and information about surrounding urban and community areas also affect EV users' choices. Additionally, exploring interfaces that enable EV users to rely on their spatial memory instead of graphic interfaces requires rigorous investigation. Research into screen-gazing behavior in the driving context, especially regarding traffic situations and road segments to avoid car accidents [95], as well as participants' reliance on their spatial memory of charging stations, is crucial. Further research on the usability of user interface engagement and voice assistant interfaces for such recommender systems would help prevent information overload [4, 30, 90]. Additionally, augmented reality applications should be designed carefully to avoid over-immersion and distraction from driving reality [32]. While EV owners are usually affluent, they still care about privacy and data security. Additionally, emissions from battery production must be considered when evaluating the environmental impact of EVs. Long-term studies with working products are essential to discovering and solving emergent problems faced by EV users. The social practice theory perspective [26, 70] and the conjoint analysis method in consumer research [22] could benefit future research studies.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This study provides insights into the consumer value preferences and decision-making process of electric vehicle (EV) users regarding the choice of public charging stations powered by renewable energy. Primary findings discovered that EV users' decision-making process is influenced by a complex interplay of factors, with particular emphasis on the trade-off between time and money spent. The results indicate that EV users typically prioritize either time savings or cost savings based on the driving scenario, affecting their consumer value. Notably, they tend to opt for renewable-powered charging stations when it aligns with their primary priority, whether that is saving time or money. However, it is also evident that sustainability considerations alone are insufficient to alter charging station preferences. This highlights the need for a more nuanced approach to designing EV charging navigation systems and interfaces. Such systems should not only provide real-time updates on renewable energy availability but also integrate contextual factors such as traffic conditions, parking availability, and driving speed recommendations to promote sustainable practices of the user experience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 955422.

We extend our appreciation to the following individuals for their feedback and support: Daniel Korus, Danielle Geng, Dennis

Lawo, Lihua Kong, Lukas Böhm, Guoqing Wang, Jingjing Xu, Kai Mannwald, MD Shajalal, Sidra Naveed, and Yinping Du; we also want to thank all the study participants and fellow researchers and supervisors of the Gecko project [2].

REFERENCES

- [1] 2019. ISO 9241-210:2019 Ergonomics of human-system interaction - Part 210: Human-centred design for interactive systems. ISO 9241-210:2019 (2019). <https://www.iso.org/standard/77520.html>
- [2] 2020. EU Marie Curie Doctoral Networks - Gecko Project. <https://gecko-project.eu/>. (2020). Last Accessed: June 20, 2024.
- [3] Gonalo Alface, Joo C Ferreira, and Rben Pereira. 2019. Electric vehicle charging process and parking guidance app. *Energies* 12, 11 (2019), 2123.
- [4] Fatemeh Alizadeh, Sima Amirkhani, and Elias Schmitt. 2019. School Field Trips and Children's Safety: A Teacher Assistant System for School Field Trips. (2019).
- [5] Amro Alsabbagh, Zhikang Li, and Chengbin Ma. 2021. Electric vehicle charging navigation strategy considering multiple customer concerns. In *2021 4th IEEE International Conference on Industrial Cyber-Physical Systems (ICPS)*. IEEE, 879–884.
- [6] Natascia Andrenacci and Maria Pia Valentini. 2023. A Literature Review on the Charging Behaviour of Private Electric Vehicles. *Applied Sciences* 13, 23 (2023), 12877.
- [7] Mehrnaz Anvari, Gerald Lohmann, Matthias Wchter, Patrick Milan, Elke Lorenz, Detlev Heinemann, M Reza Rahimi Tabar, and Joachim Peinke. 2016. Short term fluctuations of wind and solar power systems. *New Journal of Physics* 18, 6 (2016), 063027.
- [8] Gustavo Aragn, Vinoth Pandian, Veronika Krau, Otilia Werner-Kytl, Gitte Thybo, and Elisa Pautasso. 2022. Feasibility and economical analysis of energy storage systems as enabler of higher renewable energy sources penetration in an existing grid. *Energy* 251 (2022), 123889.
- [9] Sotirios Athanasoulas, Fernanda Guasselli, Nikolaos Doulamis, Anastasios Doulamis, Nikolaos Ipiotis, Athina Katsari, Lina Stankovic, and Vladimir Stankovic. 2024. the Plegma dataset: Domestic appliance-level and aggregate electricity demand with metadata from Greece. *Scientific Data* 11, 1 (2024), 376.
- [10] Sotirios Athanasoulas, Stavros Sykiotis, Maria Kaselimi, Anastasios Doulamis, Nikolaos Doulamis, and Nikolaos Ipiotis. 2023. OPT-NILM: An Iterative Prior-to-Full-Training Pruning Approach for Cost-Effective User Side Energy Disaggregation. *IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics* (2023).
- [11] Yue Cao, Tong Wang, Omprakash Kaiwartya, Geyong Min, Naveed Ahmad, and Abdul Hanan Abdullah. 2016. An EV charging management system concerning drivers' trip duration and mobility uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 48, 4 (2016), 596–607.
- [12] Gary Charness, Uri Gneezy, and Michael A Kuhn. 2012. Experimental methods: Between-subject and within-subject design. *Journal of economic behavior & organization* 81, 1 (2012), 1–8.
- [13] Xi Chen, Tianyang Zhang, Wenxing Ye, Zhiwei Wang, and Herbert Ho-Ching Lu. 2020. Blockchain-based electric vehicle incentive system for renewable energy consumption. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs* 68, 1 (2020), 396–400.
- [14] Ridoy Das, Yue Wang, Ghanim Putrus, Richard Kotter, Mousa Marzband, Bert Herteleer, and Jos Warmerdam. 2020. Multi-objective techno-economic-environmental optimisation of electric vehicle for energy services. *Applied Energy* 257 (2020), 113965.
- [15] Robert B Ekelund Jr and Robert F Hbert. 2013. *A history of economic theory and method*. Waveland Press.
- [16] Eurostat. 2023. 23% of Energy Consumed in 2022 Came from Renewables. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20231222-2> Accessed: 2024-06-23.
- [17] Brian J Fogg. 1998. Persuasive computers: perspectives and research directions. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 225–232.
- [18] Asbjrn Flstad and Knut Kvale. 2018. Customer journeys: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice* 28, 2 (2018), 196–227.
- [19] Dieter Gantenbein, Carl Binding, Bernhard Jansen, Aditya Mishra, and Olle Sundstrm. 2012. EcoGrid EU: An efficient ICT approach for a sustainable power system. In *2012 Sustainable Internet and ICT for Sustainability (SustainIT)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [20] Min Gao, Kecheng Liu, and Zhongfu Wu. 2010. Personalisation in web computing and informatics: Theories, techniques, applications, and future research. *Information Systems Frontiers* 12, 5 (2010), 607–629.
- [21] Klaus Goffart, Michael Schermann, Christopher Kohl, Jrg Preibinger, and Helmut Kremer. 2016. Using the default option Bias to influence decision making while driving. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 32, 1 (2016), 39–50.

- [22] Paul E Green and Venkatachary Srinivasan. 1978. Conjoint analysis in consumer research: issues and outlook. *Journal of consumer research* 5, 2 (1978), 103–123.
- [23] Fernanda Caroline Guasselli, Apostolos Vavouris, Lina Stankovic, Vladimir Stankovic, Sébastien Didierjean, and Kirsten Gram-Hanssen. 2024. Smart energy technologies for the collective: Time-shifting, demand reduction and household practices in a Positive Energy Neighbourhood in Norway. *Energy Research & Social Science* (2024), 01–24.
- [24] Qinglai Guo, Shujun Xin, Hongbin Sun, Zhengshuo Li, and Boming Zhang. 2014. Rapid-charging navigation of electric vehicles based on real-time power systems and traffic data. *IEEE Transactions on smart grid* 5, 4 (2014), 1969–1979.
- [25] Pawan Kumar Gurjar, Chandra Prakash Barala, Parul Mathuria, and Rohit Bhakar. 2022. Electric Vehicles Navigation Planning and Operation for Smart City: A Review. In *2022 1st International Conference on Sustainable Technology for Power and Energy Systems*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [26] Tom Hargreaves. 2011. Practice-ing behaviour change: Applying social practice theory to pro-environmental behaviour change. *Journal of consumer culture* 11, 1 (2011), 79–99.
- [27] N Himabindu, Santoshkumar Hampannavar, B Deepa, and M Swapna. 2021. Analysis of microgrid integrated Photovoltaic (PV) Powered Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (EVCS) under different solar irradiation conditions in India: A way towards sustainable development and growth. *Energy reports* 7 (2021), 8534–8547.
- [28] IEA. 2020. Sustainable Recovery. Retrieved January 10, 2023 from <https://www.iea.org/reports/sustainable-recovery/electricity>
- [29] IEA. 2023. Electricity Market Report 2023. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.iea.org/reports/electricity-market-report-2023>
- [30] Dietmar Jannach, Sidra Naveed, and Michael Jugovac. 2017. User control in recommender systems: Overview and interaction challenges. In *E-Commerce and Web Technologies: 17th International Conference, EC-Web 2016, Porto, Portugal, September 5–8, 2016, Revised Selected Papers* 17. Springer, 21–33.
- [31] Florian Knobloch, Steef V Hanssen, Aileen Lam, Hector Pollitt, Pablo Salas, Unnada Chewprecha, Mark AJ Huijbregts, and Jean-Francois Mercure. 2020. Net emission reductions from electric cars and heat pumps in 59 world regions over time. *Nature sustainability* 3, 6 (2020), 437–447.
- [32] Veronika Krauß and Yücel Uzun. 2020. Supporting medical auxiliary work: The central sterile services department as a challenging environment for augmented reality applications. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)*. IEEE, 665–671.
- [33] Sarah Ladislav and Stephen Naimoli. 2019. U.S. and EU Power Sector Market Structure: Historic Evolution and Impact on Renewables Deployment. https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/190925_LadislavNaimoli_U.S.EUPowerSector_wEU.pdf Last Accessed: 2024-06-23.
- [34] Marvin Landwehr, Philip Engelbutzeder, and Volker Wulf. 2021. Community supported agriculture: the concept of solidarity in mitigating between harvests and needs. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–13.
- [35] Dennis Lawo, Lukas Böhm, Anna-Katharina Flügge, Christina Pakusch, and Gunnar Stevens. 2021. Going car-free: investigating mobility practice transformations and the role of ICT. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Computer-Human Interaction Research and Applications (CHIRA 2021)*, October 28–29, 2021. SciTePress, Science and Technology Publications, 36–47.
- [36] Dennis Lawo, Margarita Esau, Philip Engelbutzeder, and Gunnar Stevens. 2020. Going vegan: The role (s) of ICT in vegan practice transformation. *Sustainability* 12, 12 (2020), 5184.
- [37] Dennis Lawo, Thomas Neifer, Margarita Esau, and Gunnar Stevens. 2021. Buying the ‘right’ thing: Designing food recommender systems with critical consumers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–13.
- [38] Haoming Liu, Wenqian Yin, Xiaoling Yuan, and Man Niu. 2018. Reserving charging decision-making model and route plan for electric vehicles considering information of traffic and charging station. *Sustainability* 10, 5 (2018), 1324.
- [39] Francesco Lo Franco, Mattia Ricco, Riccardo Mandrioli, and Gabriele Grandi. 2020. Electric vehicle aggregate power flow prediction and smart charging system for distributed renewable energy self-consumption optimization. *Energies* 13, 19 (2020), 5003.
- [40] Juergen Luetttin, Susanne Rothermel, and Mark Andrew. 2019. Future of in-vehicle recommendation systems@ Bosch. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 524–524.
- [41] Kalle Lyytinen and Youngjin Yoo. 2002. Ubiquitous computing. *Commun. ACM* 45, 12 (2002), 63–96.
- [42] Vangelis Marinakis, Alexandra G Papadopoulou, George Anastasopoulos, Haris Doukas, and John Psarras. 2015. Advanced ICT platform for real-time monitoring and infrastructure efficiency at the city level. In *2015 6th International Conference on Information, Intelligence, Systems and Applications (IISA)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [43] F.C. McBride, E.E. Ballantyne, and D.A. Stone. 2023. Combining Urban Fleet Vehicle Operation with Reducing Energy Wastage in Light Rail Systems. *Transportation Research Procedia* 70 (2023), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.11.009>
- [44] Christoforos Menos-Aikateriniadis, Stavros Sykiotis, and Pavlos S Georgilakis. 2024. Unlocking the potential of smart EV charging: A user-oriented control system based on Deep Reinforcement Learning. *Electric Power Systems Research* 230 (2024), 110255.
- [45] Johanna Meurer, Dennis Lawo, Christina Pakusch, Peter Tolmie, and Volker Wulf. 2019. Opportunities for Sustainable Mobility: Re-thinking Eco-feedback from a Citizen’s Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies-Transforming Communities*. 102–113.
- [46] Martijn Millecamp, Sidra Naveed, Katrien Verbert, and Jürgen Ziegler. 2019. To explain or not to explain: The effects of personal characteristics when explaining feature-based recommendations in different domains. In *Proceedings of the 6th Joint Workshop on Interfaces and Human Decision Making for Recommender Systems*, Vol. 2450. CEUR; <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2450/paper2.pdf>, 10–18.
- [47] Abdallah Mohammed, Omar Saif, Maged Abo-Adma, Ashraf Fahmy, and Rasha Elazab. 2024. Strategies and sustainability in fast charging station deployment for electric vehicles. *Nature Scientific Reports* 14, 1 (2024), 283.
- [48] FM Mulder. 2014. Implications of diurnal and seasonal variations in renewable energy generation for large scale energy storage. *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy* 6, 3 (2014).
- [49] National Grid ESO. 2023. Carbon Intensity API. Retrieved May 1, 2023 from <https://carbonintensity.org.uk>
- [50] Sidra Naveed. 2021. *An Interactive Hybrid Approach to Generate Explainable and Controllable Recommendations*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Duisburg, Essen, 2021.
- [51] Sidra Naveed, Tim Donkers, and Jürgen Ziegler. 2018. Argumentation-based explanations in recommender systems: Conceptual framework and empirical results. In *Adjunct Publication of the 26th Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*. 293–298.
- [52] Sidra Naveed, Benedikt Loepp, and Jürgen Ziegler. 2020. On the use of feature-based collaborative explanations: An empirical comparison of explanation styles. In *Adjunct Publication of the 28th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*. 226–232.
- [53] Sidra Naveed and Jürgen Ziegler. 2019. Feature-Driven Interactive Recommendations and Explanations with Collaborative Filtering Approach.. In *ComplexRec@ RecSys*. 10–15.
- [54] Sidra Naveed and Jürgen Ziegler. 2020. Featuristic: An interactive hybrid system for generating explainable recommendations-beyond system accuracy.. In *IntRS@ RecSys*. 14–25.
- [55] Jakob Nielsen and Don Norman. 2023. Between-Subjects vs. Within-Subjects Study Design. <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/between-within-subjects/> Last Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- [56] Ian Andrew Nienhueser and Yueming Qiu. 2016. Economic and environmental impacts of providing renewable energy for electric vehicle charging—A choice experiment study. *Applied energy* 180 (2016), 256–268.
- [57] California Office of the Governor. 2018. Governor Brown Takes Action to Increase Zero-Emission Vehicles, Fund New Climate Investments. <https://archive.gov.ca.gov/archive/gov39/2018/01/26/governor-brown-takes-action-to-increase-zero-emission-vehicles-fund-new-climate-investments/index.html> Last Accessed: 2024-06-23.
- [58] Christina Pakusch and Paul Bossauer. 2017. User Acceptance of Fully Autonomous Public Transport.. In *ICE-B*. 52–60.
- [59] European Parliament. 2022. EU Ban on Sale of New Petrol and Diesel Cars from 2035 Explained. *European Parliament* (October 2022). www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/economy/20221019STO44572/eu-ban-on-sale-of-new-petrol-and-diesel-cars-from-2035-explained Last Accessed: 2024-01-18.
- [60] Dimitris Potoglou, Rongqiu Song, and Georgina Santos. 2023. Public charging choices of electric vehicle users: A review and conceptual framework. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 121 (2023), 103824.
- [61] Shadan Sadeghian, Philipp Wintersberger, Matthias Laschke, and Marc Hasenzahl. 2022. Designing Sustainable Mobility: Understanding Users’ Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications* (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (*AutomotiveUI ’22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543174.3546833>
- [62] George F Savari, Vijayakumar Krishnasamy, Jagabar Sathik, Ziad M Ali, and Shady HE Abdel Aleem. 2020. Internet of Things based real-time electric vehicle load forecasting and charging station recommendation. *ISA transactions* 97 (2020), 431–447.
- [63] Steffen Schlömer, Thomas Bruckner, Lew Fulton, Edgar Hertwich, Alan McKinnon, Daniel Perczyk, Joyashree Roy, Roberto Schaeffer, Ralph Sims, Pete Smith, et al. 2014. Annex III: Technology-specific cost and performance parameters. In *Climate change 2014: Mitigation of climate change: Contribution of working group III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, 1329–1356.
- [64] Sven Schoenberg and Falko Dressler. 2019. Planning ahead for EV: Total travel time optimization for electric vehicles. In *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 3068–3075.

- [65] M. Schröder, Z. Abdin, and W. Mérida. 2020. Optimization of distributed energy resources for electric vehicle charging and fuel cell vehicle refueling. *Applied Energy* 277 (2020), 115562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115562>
- [66] Tobias Schwartz, Sebastian Deneff, Gunnar Stevens, Leonardo Ramirez, and Volker Wulf. 2013. Cultivating energy literacy: results from a longitudinal living lab study of a home energy management system. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1193–1202.
- [67] Tobias Schwartz, Gunnar Stevens, Timo Jakobi, Sebastian Deneff, Leonardo Ramirez, Volker Wulf, and Dave Randall. 2015. What people do with consumption feedback: a long-term living lab study of a home energy management system. *Interacting with Computers* 27, 6 (2015), 551–576.
- [68] Tobias Schwartz, Gunnar Stevens, Leonardo Ramirez, and Volker Wulf. 2013. Uncovering practices of making energy consumption accountable: A phenomenological inquiry. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 20, 2 (2013), 1–30.
- [69] Md Shajalal, Alexander Boden, Gunnar Stevens, Delong Du, and Dean-Robin Kern. 2024. Explaining AI Decisions: Towards Achieving Human-Centered Explainability in Smart Home Environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16074* (2024).
- [70] Elizabeth Shove, Mika Pantzar, and Matt Watson. 2012. *The dynamics of social practice: Everyday life and how it changes*. Sage.
- [71] Valério Souza-Neto, Osiris Marques, Verónica Feder Mayer, and Gui Lohmann. 2023. Lowering the harm of tourist activities: A systematic literature review on nudges. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 31, 9 (2023), 2173–2194.
- [72] Anna Spagnoli, Nicola Corradi, Luciano Gamberini, Eve Hoggan, Giulio Jacucci, Cecilia Katzeff, Loove Broms, and Li Jonsson. 2011. Eco-feedback on the go: Motivating energy awareness. *Computer* 44, 5 (2011), 38–45.
- [73] P. Sreedharan, J. Farbes, E. Cutter, C.K. Woo, and J. Wang. 2016. Microgrid and renewable generation integration: University of California, San Diego. *Applied Energy* 169 (2016), 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.053>
- [74] SSE. 2023. Coire Glas Helping Scotland and the UK deliver net zero. Retrieved Dec 30, 2023 from https://www.sserenewables.com/media/4qjijvej/coire-glas_stakeholder-briefing-doc_may-v1-5-1.pdf
- [75] Gunnar Stevens, Paul Bossauer, Thomas Neifer, and Stefan Hanschke. 2017. Using shopping data to design sustainable consumer apps. In *2017 Sustainable Internet and ICT for Sustainability (SustainIT)*. IEEE, 1–3.
- [76] Gunnar Stevens, Paul Bossauer, Stephanie Vonholdt, and Christina Pakusch. 2019. Using time and space efficiently in driverless cars: findings of a co-design study. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–14.
- [77] Junyan Su, Qiulin Lin, and Minghua Chen. 2023. Follow the Sun and Go with the Wind: Carbon Footprint Optimized Timely E-Truck Transportation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Future Energy Systems (Orlando, FL, USA) (e-Energy '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3575813.3595193>
- [78] Kantamon Sukkrajang, Rakkrit Duangsoithong, and Kusumal Chalermyanont. 2021. Trade distance and price model for electric vehicle charging using blockchain-based technology. In *2021 18th International Conference on Electrical Engineering/Electronics, Computer, Telecommunications and Information Technology (ECTI-CON)*. IEEE, 964–967.
- [79] John Sweller. 1988. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive science* 12, 2 (1988), 257–285.
- [80] Stavros Sykiotis, Christoforos Menos-Aikateriniadis, Anastasios Doulamis, Nikolaos Doulamis, and Pavlos S Georgilakis. 2023. A self-sustained EV charging framework with N-step deep reinforcement learning. *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks* 35 (2023), 101124.
- [81] Wen-Shan Tan, Mohammad Yusri Hassan, Md Shah Majid, and Hasimah Abdul Rahman. 2013. Optimal distributed renewable generation planning: A review of different approaches. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 18 (2013), 626–645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.10.039>
- [82] Xiaoying Tang, Suzhi Bi, and Ying-Jun Angela Zhang. 2018. Distributed routing and charging scheduling optimization for internet of electric vehicles. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 1 (2018), 136–148.
- [83] Alireza Attarhay Tehrani, Omid Veisi, Bahereh Vojdani Fakhr, and Delong Du. 2024. Predicting solar radiation in the urban area: A data-driven analysis for sustainable city planning using artificial neural networking. *Sustainable Cities and Society* 100 (2024), 105042.
- [84] Chiara Tellarini and Kirsten Gram-Hanssen. 2024. “If something breaks, who comes here to fix it?”: Island narratives on the energy transition in light of the concept of practice architectures. *Energy Research & Social Science* 114 (2024), 103617.
- [85] Richard Thaler. 1980. Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of economic behavior & organization* 1, 1 (1980), 39–60.
- [86] Richard H Thaler and Cass R Sunstein. 2009. *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Penguin.
- [87] U.S. Energy Information Administration. 2023. Monthly Energy Review (September 2023). Retrieved January 10, 2023 from <https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/flow-graphs/electricity.php>
- [88] Apostolos Vavouris, Fernanda Guasselli, Lina Stankovic, Vladimir Stankovic, Kirsten Gram-Hanssen, and Sébastien Didierjean. 2024. A complex mixed-methods data-driven energy-centric evaluation of net-positive households. *Applied Energy* 367 (2024), 123404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2024.123404>
- [89] Apostolos Vavouris, Lina Stankovic, and Vladimir Stankovic. 2023. Integration of Drivers’ Routines into Lifecycle Assessment of Electric Vehicles. *Transportation Research Procedia* 70 (2023), 322–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.11.036>
- [90] Omid Veisi, Delong Du, Mohammad Amin Moradi, Fernanda Caroline Guasselli, Sotiris Athanasoulas, Hussain Abid Syed, Claudia Müller, and Gunnar Stevens. 2023. Designing SafeMap Based on City Infrastructure and Empirical Approach: Modified A-Star Algorithm for Earthquake Navigation Application. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGSPATIAL International Workshop on Advances in Urban-AI*. 61–70.
- [91] Anant Atul Visaria, Anders Fjendbo Jensen, Mikkel Thorhauge, and Stefan Eriksen Mabit. 2022. User preferences for EV charging, pricing schemes, and charging infrastructure. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 165 (2022), 120–143.
- [92] John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. 2007. *Theory of games and economic behavior (60th Anniversary Commemorative Edition)*. Princeton University Press.
- [93] Steffen P Walz and Sebastian Deterding. 2015. *The gameful world: Approaches, issues, applications*. Mit Press.
- [94] Yue Wang, Enjian Yao, and Long Pan. 2021. Electric vehicle drivers’ charging behavior analysis considering heterogeneity and satisfaction. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 286 (2021), 124982.
- [95] Philipp Wintersberger, Ambika Shahu, Johanna Reisinger, Fatemeh Alizadeh, and Florian Michahelles. 2022. Self-Balancing Bicycles: Qualitative Assessment and Gaze Behavior Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia*. 189–199.
- [96] Guoyuan Wu, Kanok Boriboonsomsin, and Matthew J Barth. 2020. Eco-routing navigation system for electric vehicles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.09674* (2020).
- [97] Bolin Yu, Debin Fang, and Jingxuan Meng. 2021. Analysis of the generation efficiency of disaggregated renewable energy and its spatial heterogeneity influencing factors: A case study of China. *Energy* 234 (2021), 121295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121295>
- [98] Bolin Yu, Debin Fang, Hongwei Yu, and Chaoyang Zhao. 2021. Temporal-spatial determinants of renewable energy penetration in electricity production: Evidence from EU countries. *Renewable Energy* 180 (2021), 438–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.08.079>
- [99] Jiahai Yuan, Jiakun Shen, Li Pan, Changhong Zhao, and Junjie Kang. 2014. Smart grids in China. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 37 (2014), 896–906.
- [100] Xingpeng Zhang, Yanni Liang, Enhai Yu, Rao Rao, and Jian Xie. 2017. Review of electric vehicle policies in China: Content summary and effect analysis. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 70 (2017), 698–714.
- [101] Yimin Zhou. 2018. The Overview of the EV Charging Station Regulation. In *2018 37th Chinese Control Conference (CCC)*. IEEE, 8969–8974.
- [102] Gabe Zichermann and Christopher Cunningham. 2011. *Gamification by design: Implementing game mechanics in web and mobile apps*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- [103] John Zimmerman, Jodi Forlizzi, and Shelley Evenson. 2007. Research through design as a method for interaction design research in HCI. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 493–502.