

The effectiveness of financial purchase incentives for battery electric vehicles – A review of the evidence



Scott Hardman^{a,*}, Amrit Chandan^b, Gil Tal^a, Tom Turrentine^a

^a Plug-in Hybrid and Electric Vehicle Research Center, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, United States

^b Blue Vine Consultants, Birmingham, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Electric Vehicles
Policy
Incentives
Review

ABSTRACT

Plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) are in an early stage of market entry. Nevertheless, there are now more than 2 million PEVs in use globally. PEVs result in lower energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and urban air pollution compared to internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs). For these reasons policy makers are eager to see PEVs purchased by consumers in larger numbers. Many policy makers have introduced financial purchase incentives to nurture the growth of PEV markets. These incentives range in value from around US\$2500 to US\$20,000 per vehicle. There are several studies that either directly consider the effectiveness of purchase incentives or at least include analysis of these incentives as part of a larger study. The results of these studies have not been assimilated in one place to gain an understanding of whether purchase incentives are effective in promoting PEV sales. This means that how effective these incentives are in increasing PEV sales is not well understood. This paper systematically reviews the literature with the aim of understanding purchase incentives effectiveness in increasing PEV sales. In doing so this paper builds a deeper understanding of purchase incentives. This in-depth understanding allows recommendations to be made on how to design purchase incentives so that they are most effective in promoting PEV market growth. Incentives should be applied when someone is buying a PEV, not afterwards. Incentives should promote BEVs and PHEV with high electric ranges more than PHEVs with low electric ranges. VAT and purchase tax exemptions for PEVs are most effective. Incentives should not be available on high-end BEVs, education and awareness campaigns should promote incentives to consumers. Finally, the premature removal of incentives could negatively affect PEVs therefore incentives should be designed with longevity in mind.

1. Introduction

Plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) are one solution to creating a transportation system that is more energy efficient, less polluting, and has greater energy security. Compared to the current transportation system which is dominated by gasoline and diesel internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs), PEVs are more efficient, produce zero tailpipe emissions, and have far greater well-to-wheel efficiencies [38,39,46]. Many governments are eager to see PEVs adopted in greater numbers for these reasons. Some governments are using policy measures such as financial purchase incentives to encourage consumers to purchase PEVs over internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs). Research into the impact of these incentives on PEV sales has been ongoing since 2008. However, within the literature there is currently no single study that reviews this research to better understand under what conditions financial purchase incentives are an effective tool to increase PEV market shares. Previous reviews have

covered purchase incentives along with benefits such as free parking, HOV lane access, and infrastructure development along with other issues such as private motivations and the socio-economic profile of PEV buyers. These reviews do not take an in-depth look at financial purchase incentives meaning a thorough understanding of the issue does not yet exist. Furthermore, they do not contain recent studies that are the first to include evidence from the developing PEV markets. The aim of this paper is to review this literature in detail to understand the effectiveness of financial purchase incentives in the promotion of PEVs. The in-depth review considers all studies that investigate the impact of financial purchase incentives on the uptake of PEVs. Previous studies have reviewed literature mostly containing aggregate sales data which is unable to accurately detect reasons behind trends in the data. The early literature contained mostly choice experiments that aim to predict which factors may influence consumers to choose PEVs. These studies are less representative of actual purchase behaviour than questionnaires that survey consumers who have purchased a PEV. This

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: shardman@ucdavis.edu (S. Hardman).

review adds to the literature due to it containing these recently published studies, along with studies that use choice experiments and statistical analysis. This review therefore brings greater clarity to this topic than has previously been possible. The review contains studies that analyse different types of financial incentives in different regions. This review is therefore able to observe differences in the effectiveness of the different types of incentives and to detect common themes relating to incentive schemes which may have been picked up in individual studies but were not highlighted as significant factors. By detecting these nuances this review can make policy recommendations explicitly stating which purchase incentives are the most effective, how they should be administered, and which vehicle types should be targeted.

This review paper covers any literature that conducts empirical research on the impact of purchase incentives on PEV market uptake. This review does not include a financial analysis to discover whether purchase incentives reduce the price of PEVs so that they reach price parity with ICEVs. It also does not review any literature that use these kind of techniques, such as papers that use total cost of ownership (TCO) models to calculate whether PEVs are financially beneficial for consumers. These publications do not offer a full analysis of alternative fuel vehicle (AFV) purchase motivations. They focus on the cost difference and on the cost of technologies only. It has long been understood that consumers in general, and early adopters of technologies particularly, are not entirely economically rational in their decision behaviours. This has also been found to be true for the automotive sector, even for buyers of hybrid or electric vehicles [20,50]. Consumers purchase PEVs for a variety of reasons including technological, performance, environmental and symbolic motivations [2,5,6,19,21,28,40]. Some consumers have been found to purchase PEVs for financial reasons, though consumers do not undertake TCO calculations themselves. The impact of purchase incentives is more closely related to how consumers interact with price discounts or coupons. In the case of consumer products discounts increase interest in products, increase sales and increase perceptions of value [17,18]. Therefore, purchase incentives do not attract consumers to PEVs due to them having calculated the financial savings they may or may not achieve. Consumers have been shown to be unable to make these kinds of forecasts and as a result they often make flawed or biased decisions [48]. However, according to Thaler et al. consumers can be ‘nudged’ to make a decision through changing the choice architecture around a decision. This is how purchase incentives attract car buyers to PEVs. As a result of the financial incentives consumers perceive PEVs as having greater value. Therefore, even though incentives have been designed to lower purchase prices of PEVs so that their TCO is close to an ICEV their impact on the purchase decision is not related to consumers making economic calculations. This paper therefore explores the effectiveness of purchase incentives in encouraging consumer to purchase a PEV or in increasing PEV market shares. It does not consider why these incentives are effective or whether consumers will save money by purchasing a PEV.

1.1. Introduction to PEV markets

PEVs include both battery electric vehicles (BEVs) and Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEVs). Both BEVs and PHEVs are more efficient and less polluting than ICEVs. PHEVs get their motive power from both an internal combustion engine (ICE), and the vehicles batteries and electric motor. They are a hybrid vehicle and their overall efficiency is lower than that of a BEV, but higher than a non-plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (HEV). BEVs are the most efficient vehicle type, their motive power comes only from their on-board batteries and electric motor. They have no ICE and therefore have zero tailpipe emissions. The most recent introduction of BEVs began around 2008 when Tesla introduced the Tesla Roadster. Although this vehicle was a low-volume vehicle, selling 2450 units between 2008–2012, it marked



Fig. 1. Global Battery Electric and Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Markets 2012–2016.

the start of the recent growth of BEV sales. The next significant market introduction was the Nissan Leaf BEV in 2010, after which many automotive original equipment manufacturer (OEMs) released vehicles to the market. More than 225,000 Nissan Leafs have now been sold. In 2011, the Chevrolet Volt PHEV was introduced. To date over 130,000 of these have been sold. In 2012, the Tesla Model S was introduced. Tesla have now delivered over 150,000 Model S BEVs making it the second best-selling PEV. Fig. 1 shows the recent growth in all PEVs from 2012 to 2016. The chart includes BEV and PHEV sales. The chart shows a breakdown of PEV sales in the top 9 markets globally. These are China, USA, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Canada. China is seeing a more rapid growth in PEV sales than the US. During 2015 vehicle sales of PEVs in China overtook vehicle sales in the US making China the largest market for PEVs by volume. According to ICCT in January 2017 the size of the global PEV market surpassed 2 million vehicles [33].

1.2. Introduction to purchase incentives

Purchase incentives take several different forms; they can be grouped into four different types of incentive. All incentives work towards the same common goal which is the reduction of the price consumers pay for a PEV. The incentives are administered in several ways, some at the time of purchase and others after. The four types of incentive are:

- Point of Sale Grant Incentives- Point of sale grants reduce the purchase price of a BEV when a consumer buys the vehicle. These reductions come in the form of government purchase discounts or grants. These types of incentive are applied at the time of purchase. In the United Kingdom for example GBP£4500 (US\$5800) is available off the purchase price of BEVs.
- VAT and Purchase Tax Exemptions- These exemptions allow buyers of BEVs to pay lower or zero VAT or pay no purchase tax that is applied to some vehicles. These types of incentives are applied at the time of purchase. In the Netherlands for example purchase tax is calculated based on the CO₂ emissions of the vehicles, whereas BEVs do not pay any tax. Buyers of ICEVs can pay anywhere between €1000 (US\$1100) (Toyota Aygo) to over €20,000 (US\$22,000) (Audi A8) in purchase taxes. These incentives reduce the upfront purchase price of PEVs in comparison to their ICEV counter parts. Some schemes use the additional revenue generated from high CO₂ emitting ICEVs to reduce the purchase price of BEVs by providing an additional rebate (e.g France). Schemes that use a combination of high VAT or purchase tax for ICEVs and rebates for PEVs are known as feebates.
- Post purchase rebates- Post purchase rebates come in the form of financial incentives being given to consumers after they have purchased the vehicle. This is usually in the form of a cheque. This means consumers receive a monetary payment after they have purchased a BEV. These incentives are used in several US states. In

Table 1
Breakdown of purchase incentives for the top 9 markets for BEVs including the value of the incentives.

	Point of sale Grant	Sales Tax and VAT Exemptions	Post Purchase Rebates	Income Tax Credits	Value of Incentives (Local Currency)	Value of Incentives (US\$)
Canada	✓				CA\$5000–8500 ^a	US\$3850–6850
China	✓	✓			CNY65,000	US\$9800
France	✓	✓			€6300	US\$1000–7000
Germany	✓				€5000	US\$5500
Japan	✓	✓			JPY800,000	US\$7800
Netherlands		✓			€1000–20,000 ^b	US\$1110–22,000
Norway		✓	✓		90,000kr	US\$11,000–20,000 ^c
United Kingdom	✓				£4500	US\$5800
United States			✓	✓	US\$7500–10,000 ^d	US\$7500–10,000 ^d

Note: The value of incentives does not consider other incentives that are available when owning BEVs, for example free parking, or yearly tax exemptions, the table therefore only considers the value of incentives related to the purchase of a BEV.

^bIncentives differ between vehicle sizes, and whether a vehicle older than 13 years old is being scrapped. They also include a 2.4% VAT reduction.

^a Rebates in Canada are administered at the Provincial level and different incentives available between provinces.

^b These estimates are based on the difference in sales tax paid for a BEV and an ICEV.

^c Saving based on 25% Vat Exemption and Purchase Tax.

^d Based on the US\$7500 federal tax credit and US\$2500 that is available in California.

California BEV buyers can apply for a US\$2500 rebate and buyers of PHEVs a US\$1500 rebate.

- Income tax credits- These are the least common financial purchase incentive. These incentives allow buyers of BEVs to pay a reduced income tax bill at the end of the financial year. In the United States for example a US\$7500 credit is available for buyers of BEVs. This means that at the end of the financial year buyers can pay US\$7500 less in tax. If a buyer does not have a tax liability of this amount they can only claim up to the level of their liability, this means that not all buyers will claim back the full amount.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of these incentives by country for the top 9 markets for PEVs (as shown in Fig. 1). The table shows the type of incentive and their total value in the local currency and standardised to US\$. Canada offers point of sale incentives which are administered at the Provincial level. This means that PEVs do not receive incentives in all Canadian Provinces. The incentives are available in British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario. Between CA\$5000–8500 is available. In China BEVs benefit from point of sale incentives and sales tax exemptions with up to US\$9800 being available. In France PEVs are exempt from purchase tax and can receive a total of €6300 in incentives. In 2016, the German government introduced a €5000 incentive for PEVs, this is 4/5 funded by the government and 1/5 funded by automotive OEMs. The incentive is only available on vehicles costing less than €60,000. In the Netherlands PEVs are exempt from sales tax which is calculated based on the cars CO₂ emissions. For an ICEV the sales tax can amount to a sum anywhere between €1000 and to figures over €60,000 for vehicles with high CO₂ emissions. Typically, this figure is between €1000 and €20,000 though. In Norway buyers of electric vehicles do not pay any VAT, which is 25%, or purchase tax which can be 100% of the vehicles purchase price. In the United Kingdom, a GBPE4500 grant is applied to the purchase price of any BEV at the point of sale. PHEVs receive a GBPE2500 grant. PHEVs that cost more than GBPE60,000 (US\$73,500) are not eligible. Finally, in the United States buyers of battery electric vehicles receive a US\$7500 federal tax credit. In some states, for example California, buyers of BEVs also receive a US\$2500 state rebate meaning a total of US\$10,000 is available.

2. Method

The methodology used in this paper is one of a systematic review. A systematic review is a review that aims to answer a specific question. Some review papers work towards understanding an area of research more generally. Systematic reviews build on existing knowledge by

understanding a specific issue. The issue that this paper aims to clarify is whether financial purchase incentives are effective in promoting PEV sales. Once the aim is defined specific search protocol are used to collect papers. The titles and abstracts of these papers are then reviewed to ensure the papers are relevant for this study. Irrelevant papers that are discarded from the study. Papers that are relevant are then reviewed in detail and the relevant information is extracted and recorded.

2.1. Scope

PEVs are the main consideration of this paper. PEVs include both PHEVs and BEVs. Some studies consider just PHEVs or BEVs whilst others consider both vehicles types. This paper also includes studies investigating whether purchase incentives were successful in promoting sales of hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs). Studies that investigate HEVs are included due to the similarities they have with BEVs and PHEVs. The vehicles are all new automotive technologies, with greater efficiencies, lower emissions than ICEVs, and all vehicle types have benefited from financial incentives. The major difference is that HEVs cannot be plugged in. The PHEV, BEV, and HEV papers must investigate financial purchase incentives to be included in the study. They must also use an empirical methodology, therefore studies that present information based on authors opinions or anecdotal data are not included. Some papers explore only this topic whilst others consider financial purchase incentives as part of a wider study. For example, some studies consider all types of incentive, including incentives such as free parking for PEVs. Other studies investigate why people buy new automotive technologies. Studies that only consider financial purchase incentives and studies that explore them as part of a wider study are both included in this study.

2.2. Incentives considered

This paper only includes one type of incentive related to PEVs. These are financial purchase incentives. The incentives are monetary and applied only when purchasing a PEV. The review therefore does not include incentives such as free parking, access to infrastructure, bus lane access, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane access, toll road access or any other benefits PEVs drivers receive when using their vehicles. Some of these incentives may be financial in nature but they are not applied at point of sale and are known as reoccurring or indirect incentives. This paper also does not include incentives offered by private companies. For example, some companies in the United States have incentivised employees to purchase BEVs, PHEVs or BEVs.

Companies such as Google, Bank of America and Timberland have offered employees rebates up to a value of US\$5000 [15]. Some utility companies also offer incentives to consumers who purchase PEVs. These are not considered here. Automotive OEMs have also incentivised consumers to purchase PEVs, often by offering vastly reduced lease deals. The effect these have is not considered here.

3. Literature review

In total 35 different studies that investigate the effect of financial purchase incentives on PEV adoption were identified and are included in this review. These studies mostly use questionnaire surveys or analyse PEV market data to understand the relationship between PEV sales and financial purchase incentives. There are 12 studies that use questionnaire survey or interview data and 13 studies that analyse PEV market data. There are 10 studies that use other methodologies including qualitative analyses, or literature or policy reviews, most of which are white papers. Some of these studies consider only the impact of the financial purchase incentives. Most studies though include the importance of purchase incentives only as part of their analysis. These studies consider other aspects related to PEV adoption which are not considered in this review. Table 2 shows the literature that are included in this review. The table shows; the authors of each study, the methods they use, the vehicle types they cover (HEV, PHEV, or BEV), the region they are investigating, the type of incentive they are analysing, and the value of the incentives considered. Finally, the table shows a brief summation of the conclusions of each paper and whether the studies find purchase incentives to be effective in increasing PEV sales or not. Some cells are blank because the papers do not specify the region they are analysing, the incentives they are considering, or the value of them. The studies in Table 2 are explored in detail in Sections 3.1–3.3.

3.1. PEV market analysis

A number of studies conduct analysis of PEV markets in order to assess the effectiveness of financial purchase incentives [3,8,12,15,24,25,32,34,35,43]. These studies combine electric vehicle sales data with data showing the availability and value of purchase incentives with the aim of finding any relationships. Table 3 shows that most studies use aggregated sales data. Only one study uses disaggregated sales data, this study included the sale of every single BEV in Norway in the data set. This includes the location of sale, make and vehicle model, and information about the car buyer [34]. Most studies investigate data that records annual trends, with two studies analysing quarterly trends, and two studies analysing monthly trends. The study using disaggregate data could observe the exact date of the BEV sale.

[43] conducted a global analysis of financial incentives and PEV market share. They use multiple linear regression to compare PEV market shares with several independent variables. The variables they use were identified in their literature review. These were; financial incentives, charging infrastructure, urban density, level of education, environmentalism, fuel price, PEV purchase price, the presence of PEV production facilities, vehicles per capita, and electricity price amongst other variables. To make their data uniform they standardized the data in US dollars and calculated the value of financial incentives based on a 'standard ICEV' and a 'standard PEV'. Their analysis found that financial incentives, the presence of charging infrastructure and the presence of local electric vehicle manufacturing were all significantly correlated to electric vehicle market shares. Fig. 2 is taken from their paper. It shows the relationship between incentive value and percentage market share of electric vehicles in the 30 nations that were part of their study. The data is correlated at a < 0.1 level of significance. The authors suggest that model was not significant to a higher level due to there being a number of anomalies in their data. For example some nations having high electric vehicle market shares but low incentive values. Conversely some nations have low electric vehicle market

shares but high incentive values. The data presented in Fig. 2 is from 2012. [23] present more recent data in their 2016 Global EV Outlook. This data is presented in Figs. 3 and 4. Fig. 3 shows the relationship between incentive value and PHEV and BEV market share by percentage of yearly sales. Fig. 4 shows the relationship between incentive value and PHEV and BEV stock.

Several studies have analysed the relationship between electric vehicle market shares and the importance of incentives in the United States. Three of these studies concentrate only on HEV sales [3,12,15], whilst another two concentrate on PEV sales [8,32]. The HEV studies by [3,12,15] came to similar conclusions. [3] investigated HEV sales in 22 metropolitan areas in the US between 1999 and 2006. From their analysis it emerged that both purchase incentives and the price of vehicle fuel are important factors for HEV market shares. [12] investigated HEV sales across US states. They found that there is a strong relationship between HEV sales and gasoline prices. The relationship between HEV sales and financial purchase incentives was weak, though there was a positive trend. The 2011 study by [15] conducted analysis of HEV sales data between 2000 and 2006. They examined quarterly sales data on a state level in the United States. Between 2000 and 2006 income tax credits and sales tax waivers were available when purchasing a HEV. The authors found that the federal tax credit was less effective in promoting HEV sales than the sales tax waivers. Sales tax waivers were found to be three times more effective than the tax credit. Further to this the sales tax waiver was around half the value of the tax credit. They conclude that sales tax waivers are a more effective tool in increasing HEV market shares than tax credits. They also found that the price of fuel is correlated to HEV sales with higher fuel prices being positively correlated.

[8] used regression analysis to investigate incentives and the adoption of PEVs in the United States. The authors assessed both the state and federal incentives, and other variables such as HOV lane access and the presence of charging infrastructure. They found that the growth in PEV sales can be attributed to both the federal tax credit and the availability of recharging infrastructure. The authors could not find a statistically significant relationship between state level rebates and PEV market shares. They acknowledge there is a positive trend and that the state rebate will have an impact despite the lack of significance. Further analysis of their data revealed that for non-Tesla BEVs (e.g Nissan Leaf) the incentive is important. For the purchase of a Tesla BEV they found that purchase incentives were not important. [51] conducted analysis of state wide incentives for PHEVs and BEVs. The results of their analysis revealed that BEV markets are related to multiple variables. Education and awareness were found to be correlated. BEVs were also found to be more numerous in population dense areas and areas that do not have low winter temperatures. Low cost electricity, high cost gas, and the presence of PEV recharging infrastructure was also significantly related. The authors did not find any correlation between the availability of incentives for BEVs. They did find statistically significant trends for PHEV markets and the availability of financial purchase incentives. They concluded that incentives may support PHEVs more preferentially than BEVs.

A Norwegian study by [34] investigated the impact of numerous variables on the sales of BEVs. The study used regression analysis to analyse data that recorded individual vehicle sales. They discovered that charging infrastructure is the strongest predictor of BEV sales. The study also found that being located close to a major city and high incomes were significantly related to BEV sales. In Norway BEVs are exempt from VAT and sales tax, the study did not take this variable into account due to it being available across the country. A second study in Norway came to similar conclusions [1]. This study did consider VAT and sales tax exemptions. The authors suggest that the presence of multiple incentives is related to PEV market growth. Particularly they cite VAT and purchase tax exemptions, free use of toll roads, free parking and the use of bus lanes as being effective.

Table 2
Breakdown of literature that investigates the relationship between PEV or HEV adoption and financial incentives.

Authors	Methods	Vehicle Type	Region	Incentive Type	Total Incentive Value	Conclusions	Are incentives effective?
[1]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV	Norway	VAT Exemption, Registration Tax Exemption		VAT and registration tax exemptions are effective in increasing PEV sales. Toll fee waivers, free parking and bus lane access are also a factor.	Yes
[3]	PEV Market Analysis	HEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit	US\$3400	Financial incentives did increase rates of adoption for HEVs. Petrol prices are also an important factor.	Yes
[4]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	Norway	Vehicle Registration Tax Exemption and VAT Exemption	US\$6000–70,000	VAT and purchase price reductions are the strongest incentives for encouraging BEV adoption. Bus lane access and toll exemptions are also important factors.	Yes
[7]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	California	Federal Tax Credit and California State Rebate	US\$10,000	The federal tax credit and the state rebate have been effective in promoting PEV market development.	Yes
[8]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and State Rebates	US\$10,000	Financial incentives and the presence of recharging infrastructure both correlated to BEV market uptake.	Yes
[9]	Review	BEV & PHEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and State Rebates	US\$10,000	Financial incentives are effective in supporting the early market, however they need to be properly designed and communicated to consumers.	Yes
[11]	Review	BEV, PHEV & HEV	California	Federal Tax Credit and California State Rebate	US\$10,000	Incentives are effective, but inefficient. Incentives should be applied at point of sale, rather than as a rebate or tax credit. Incentives should be higher for BEVs than PHEVs.	Yes
[10]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	California	California State Rebate	US\$2500	Current incentives are inefficient. It is possible to design more efficient incentives that reduce budget costs but maintain the size of the BEV market. It is also possible to maintain budget size but develop more effective incentives to increase rates of adoption.	Yes
[12]	PEV Market Analysis	HEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and State Rebates	US\$2000–6000	No relationship between incentives and HEV adoption. Adoption is related to vehicle mileage, petrol prices and income. Incentives that provide money upfront may be more effective.	No
[13]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	Norway and Austria	VAT Exemption, Registration Tax Exemption		Incentives are effective in increasing electric vehicle markets Bus lane access is also effective and low cost but can have a negative impact on bus journey times.	Yes
[14]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	Norway	VAT Exemption, Registration Tax Exemption		Incentives have played a large role in the diffusion of BEVs in Norway. Free parking, bus lane use, free toll road use and reduced rates on ferries have also had an impact.	Yes
[15]	PEV Market Analysis	HEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and State Rebates	US\$2000–6500	Financial incentives did increase rates of adoption for HEVs. Petrol prices are also an important factor.	Yes
[16]	Communication Interviews	BEV & PHEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and California State Rebate	US\$10,000	Incentives are inefficient and costly at present. They need to be more targeted.	Yes
[20]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA & China	Hypothetical Subsidies	US\$0–20,000	Incentives not important for purchases or high end BEVs. They are effective for low-end BEVs though.	Yes
[22]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA & China	Hypothetical Subsidies	US\$0–20,000	Subsidies increase rates of adoption for PHEVs and BEVs. BEVs may need larger subsidies than PHEVs.	Yes
[23]	Review	BEV & PHEV	Global			The presence of financial purchase incentives is correlated to high BEV market shares. The presence of charging infrastructure is also an important factor.	Yes
[24]	PEV Market Analysis	HEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit	US\$7500	Financial incentives have increased rates of adoption for HEVs. Incentives are only effective if they are larger than US\$1000.	Yes
[25]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	USA	State Rebates	US\$2000–6000	Financial incentives increase rates of adoption of BEVs. However, some regions have high incentives but low market shares of BEVs.	Yes
[27]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit	US\$7500	Purchase incentives increase likelihood of purchase only for consumers who are aware of PEVs.	Yes
[26]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit and State Rebates	US\$10,000	Most consumers are not aware of the current policies and incentives that are available. This means policies have a negligible impact on mainstream vehicle buyers.	No
[29]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	Sweden	Various hypothetical incentives	US\$4340 (40,000 SEK)	Financial Incentives do increase rates of adoption. Free parking and bus lane access also has an impact.	Yes
[30]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV	Canada			Financial incentives are important in reducing purchase prices for consumers.	Yes
[32]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	USA	State Rebates	US\$2000–6000	Financial incentives do increase rates of adoption. Automotive OEM marketing activities may also be a factor.	Yes
[34]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV	Norway	Vehicle Registration Tax Exemption and VAT Exemption	US\$6000–70,000	Access to charging infrastructure, being near to major cities and household income are related to the adoption of BEVs.	No
[35]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	Global			Incentives are a powerful tool to entice people to purchase a BEV or PHEV. They	Yes

(continued on next page)

Table 2 (continued)

Authors	Methods	Vehicle Type	Region	Incentive Type	Total Incentive Value	Conclusions	Are incentives effective?
[37]	Modelling	BEV				are effective for both private car buyers and company car buyers.	Yes
[42]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA			Incentives, experience and familiarisation are all key factors in driving the transition to BEVs. Incentives enable the gap between willingness to pay for a PHEV or BEV and their actual purchase price to be reduced. Existing incentives may encourage more PHEV adoption rather than BEV adoption.	Yes
[43]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	Global			Financial Incentives do increase rates of adoption. Access to infrastructure is also related to adoption rates.	Yes
[44]	Modelling	BEV & PHEV	USA			Financial incentives have increased rates of adoption of BEVs by 300%.	Yes
[45]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	Global			Incentives have been successful in increasing early market growth. Incentives should be phased out over time as vehicle costs fall. Feebate or polluter pays schemes may be preferential.	Yes
[47]	Questionnaire Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA	Federal Tax Credit	US\$7500	More than 30% of PHEV and BEV sales can be attributed to the federal tax credit. Some vehicles not reliant on tax credit though, especially Tesla BEVs and some PHEVs.	Yes
[49]	Review	BEV, PHEV & HEV	Not specified			Financial incentives are important are effective policy interventions. Fuel prices may be more important though.	Yes
[51]	PEV Market Analysis	BEV & PHEV	USA	State Rebates	US\$2000–6000	Incentives are more important for buyers of PHEVs than BEVs. BEV market is related to education and awareness of BEVs, the presence of recharging infrastructure and gas and electricity costs.	Yes
[53]	Review of Policies	HEV, BEV & PHEV	Global			Countries with higher BEV adoption rates have higher purchase incentives. Non-financial incentives are also important though.	Yes
[54]	Review	BEV & PHEV	Global			Financial incentives are effective in increasing PEV markets. They should be paired with other incentives. Developing charging infrastructure is critical for PEV market development.	Yes

Table 3

Summary of literature that conducts analyses of PEV markets and incentives. The table shows whether the data is aggregated or disaggregated, the time frequency of the data, year of data collection and the share of PEVs in the year and location of sample (¹HEV Market Share).

Authors	Data Aggregation	Data Frequency	Vehicle Type	Region	Sample Year	Market Share of PEVs at sample year and location
[1]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV	Norway	2013	5.8%
[3]	Aggregate Data	Annual	HEV	USA	2006	1.77% ¹
[8]	Aggregate Data	Quarterly	BEV	USA	2013	0.6%
[12]	Aggregate Data	Monthly	HEV	USA	2007	2.55% ¹
[15]	Aggregate Data	Quarterly	HEV	USA	2006	1.77% ¹
[24]	Aggregate Data	Monthly	HEV	USA	2000–2010	0.06–2.37% ¹
[25]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	USA	2013	0.6%
[32]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	USA	2014	0.7%
[34]	Disaggregate Data	Daily	BEV	Norway	2013	5.8%
[35]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	Global	2013	
[43]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	Global	2013	
[45]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	Global	2015	
[51]	Aggregate Data	Annual	BEV & PHEV	USA	2013	0.6%




Fig. 2. Comparison between electric vehicle market share and the value of purchase incentives [43].




Fig. 3. Comparison between incentive value for BEVs and PHEVs and the market share of new car sales for BEVs and PHEVs. (Data extracted from [23]).

3.2. Questionnaire surveys and interviews

There are multiple studies that use questionnaire surveys and interviews to explore the importance of purchase incentives for consumers [4,20,26,29,30,47]. 7 of these studies use data from the United States, 1 from Canada, 1 from Sweden, 2 from Norway, and 1 from China. Table 4 summarises the questionnaire survey and interview studies reviewed here. There are two major types of survey within the literature. The first type are studies that survey consumers who have not purchased a PEV and use choice experiments to understand consumer preferences towards PEVs. These studies include stated choice experiments, design games, discrete choice modelling, or stated




Fig. 4. Comparison between incentives for PHEVs and BEVs and the size of BEV and PHEV vehicle stocks. (Data extracted from [23]).

preference studies. The second type of literature includes studies that conduct post purchase surveys with consumers who own a PEV. These studies use surveys to understand the reasons behind consumer behaviour and ultimately aim to establish what influenced consumers' decisions to purchase a PEV. There is one additional survey method that has been used. The study by [26] used a survey to understand consumers' knowledge of PEVs. They did not incorporate a choice experiment in their study and they discovered that only 5.5% of respondents were aware of the purchase incentives available to buyers of PEVs. Choice experiments and post purchase surveys have their own advantages and disadvantages. Choice experiments are used to predict the behaviour of consumers; they therefore are an estimation of how consumers might act. Post purchase surveys record why consumer have made purchase decisions therefore they are more accurate in understanding consumer behaviour, though they can contain sample bias's. The results from each type of study are investigated in detail below.

3.2.1. Post purchase surveys

Two studies in the US by [20,47] gathered data from early adopters of BEVs in order to understand the importance of financial purchase incentives. [47] surveyed 2882 consumers in 11 states in the US to understand the impact of the \$7500 federal tax credit on BEV and PHEV sales. They found that 30% of all PEV sales could be attributed to the federal tax credit. They found differences in the importance of the purchase incentive between vehicle types. Respondents were asked whether they would have still purchased a BEV if the incentive was not available. For the Tesla Model S 86.1% of buyers would still purchase that BEV without the federal tax credit. For the Nissan Leaf 50.9% of buyers would have still purchased that BEV without the federal tax

Table 4

Summary of literature that uses questionnaire surveys or interviews. The table shows authors, vehicle types considered, location of the sample, sample size, sample attributes, year of data collection and the share of PEVs in the year, and location of sample.

Authors	Survey Type	Vehicle Type	Region	Sample Size	Sample Attributes	Sample Year	Market Share of PEVs at sample year and location
[4]	Post Purchase Survey	BEV	Norway	3400	Owners of BEVs in Norway	2014	13.7%
[7]	Post Purchase Survey	BEV	California	19,165	Buyers of PEVs in California	2015	0.7%
[10]	Choice Experiment	BEV & PHEV	California	1261	New car buyers (non-PEV) in California	2013	0.6%
[14]	Post Purchase Survey	BEV	Norway	8156	2065 PHEV, 3011 BEV and 3080 ICEV owners in Norway	2016	29.1%
[22]	Choice Experiment	BEV & PHEV	USA & China	832	General population in USA and China	2013	0.5% (USA) 0.1% (China)
[27]	Choice Experiment	BEV, PHEV & FCV	USA	5654	New Car Buyers in 8 different US States	2015	0.7%
[26]	Knowledge and Awareness Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA	2000	General US population in 21 cities	2011	0.1%
[29]	Choice Experiment	BEV	Sweden	416	294 General Swedish population and 122 Adopters of BEVs in Sweden	2014	1.4%
[30]	Choice Experiment	BEV	Canada	240	38 people who had driven a BEV, 69 Students and 133 General Population	2012	0.1%
[42]	Choice Experiment	BEV & PHEV	USA	1261	New car buyers (non-PEV) in California	2013	0.6%
[47]	Post Purchase Survey	BEV & PHEV	USA	2882	Adopters of BEVs	2014	0.7%
[20]	Post Purchase Interviews	BEV	California	33	Adopters of high-end (Tesla) BEVs	2015	0.7%




Fig. 5. Survey respondents vehicle choice without the US Federal Tax Credit (US\$7500) [47].

credit (Fig. 5). This suggests that the incentive is important for low-end BEVs like the Nissan Leaf but is not important for high-end BEVs such as the Tesla Model S. They also observed differences in the importance of the incentive for buyers of PHEVs. They found that the incentive was less important for buyers of PHEVs with lower electric driving ranges. The incentive was most important for the PHEV with the longest driving range, the Chevrolet Volt. [20] interviewed 33 adopters of high-end Tesla BEVs. Their study asked adopters if they would have purchased their BEV without the federal tax credit (US\$7500) and the California rebate (US\$2500). It therefore assessed the importance of US\$10,000 in incentives. This study found that 70% of adopters of Tesla BEVs would still have purchased their vehicles without these financial incentives. The results suggest that the underlying reason was related to these peoples exceptionally high incomes. This meant adopters perceived US\$10,000 as being not a large percentage of the purchase price and that without this they could still afford the buy the vehicle. Adopters were more interested in technological, environmental and performance attributes of the vehicles.

The Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE), the administrator of the California Clean Vehicle Rebate Program, have conducted questionnaire surveys throughout the state of California. In their survey, they ask respondents about the importance of both the California state rebate (US\$2500) and the federal tax credit (US\$7500). The results from this question can be seen in Fig. 6. This data was collected between 2012 and 2015. The figure shows that adopters of PEVs rank both the federal tax credit and the state rebate as being important




Fig. 6. Importance of the State Rebate and Federal Tax Credit in the State of California (N=19,165) (Data from [7]).

factors in their decision to purchase a PEV. This is despite the vast difference in the value of the incentives. This data is useful in highlighting that the way in which the incentives are delivered can impact how important they are for consumers. Something also noted by [15]. The data shows that consumers marginally favour the California State Rebate over the federal tax credit. 73% of survey respondents indicated that the state rebate was very important or extremely important compared to 71% for the federal tax credit. The rebate is obtained by adopters shortly after the purchase via a postal cheque. The tax credit is obtained when adopters file their tax return meaning it can take a far longer period to receive the incentive.

[4] administered a questionnaire survey to BEV adopters in Norway. They received 3400 responses from owners of BEVs. In their survey, they asked respondents about the importance of various incentives in their decision to adopt a BEV. The results indicate that purchase tax and VAT exemptions are the most significant factors, with 80% of the sample stating that this was a critical factor in their decision to adopt a BEV. For some people though toll exemptions and access to bus lanes were the only factors in their decision. They were unable to offer explanations as to why the incentives were not important for some adopters, and call for more qualitative data investigating this topic. [14] conducted a questionnaire survey of 2065 PHEV, 3011 BEV and 3080 ICEV owners in Norway. The authors found that exemption from registration tax is an important factor in the adoption of PHEVs and BEVs in Norway. They found that VAT exemption, free parking, bus lane access and free use of toll roads are important for BEVs (these incentives are not available for PHEVs in Norway). The authors could report changes in the importance of these incentives over time using

results from their 2014 survey. From this they found that utilisation of bus lanes and toll roads has fallen amongst BEV adopters. They therefore suggest that these incentives are less important in 2016 than they were in 2014. This could be due to congestion of bus lanes and due to consumers who do not use toll roads purchasing BEVs. Financial purchase incentives remain to be an important factor.

3.2.2. Choice experiments

Several studies have conducted choice experiments including stated choice experiments, design games, discrete choice models, or stated preference studies. These studies aim to understand future purchase behaviours of consumer given a specific set of circumstances. The aim of these methodologies is to understand which vehicle types consumers prefer and will ultimately purchase. This first study of this kind to be identified was conducted in 2014 [10]. That study used a survey of 1261 new car buyers in California to understand whether consumers might choose PEVs in future vehicle choices. The study offered consumers vehicle choices based on vehicle type, brand, and vehicle model. The study also offered consumers choices of vehicle with electric drivetrains and considered purchase prices and running costs per mile. The authors found that in the absence of purchase incentives consumers are more likely to purchase a PHEV. Their results indicate that incentives are effective in promoting PEV sales however incentives should be higher for BEVs than they are for PHEVs. A second study in 2014 investigated consumer attitudes towards electric vehicle in Manitoba, Canada [30]. The study recorded the socio-economic status of respondents, awareness, familiarity, and knowledge of PEVs along with factors important to consumers when purchasing a vehicle. The study went on to ask consumers about what attributes of PEVs would be important in their purchase decision and any barriers to the adoption of a PEV. The study found that high purchase prices were a barrier to adoption and that consumers tend to ignore the potential for long term running cost savings. The authors found that consumers tended to fixate on up front vehicle price and therefore incentives are needed to reduce purchase prices. [22] conducted a discrete choice study on consumers in the US and China. This study found that BEV adoption in China was less dependent upon financial purchase incentives. The BEV market in the United States was more dependent on incentives. The reason behind this is due to differences in perceptions of vehicle range between the USA and China. A large proportion of car buyers in China are first time buyers. These consumers therefore do not have any preconceived ideas about what range a vehicle should have. This means that range is not a barrier to these people purchasing a BEV. These consumers also have experience with electric bicycles. A result of this is that plugging in a BEV is compatible with previous experiences. The final reason is due to the well-established public transportation networks in China. This allows for mode shift if BEV owners need to travel further than the range of their vehicle. This is contrary to car buyers in the USA who have preconceived ideas about vehicle range, which leads them to believe that the range of a BEV is too short. Because of this and because of the lack of public transit, they require purchase incentives to help overcome negative perceptions of vehicle range.

A study in Sweden used a stated choice experiment in order to understand the impact of incentives on vehicle purchase behaviour [29]. The authors found that financial incentives have a positive effect on rates of adoption. They state that financial incentives increase the likelihood of consumers purchasing a BEV due to lowering of purchase prices. [42] received 1261 responses to their survey which used a stated preference methodology to analyse vehicle choices amongst new car buyers in California. The study considered the choice between a PHEV and a BEV. They found that the gap between the willingness of consumers to pay for a BEV and the price of a BEV was US\$23,000. The difference in willingness to pay and the purchase price for PHEVs was US\$4000. These results led the authors to conclude that the current incentives in place for BEVs and PHEVs would lead to

consumers preferentially selecting PHEVs and not BEVs. [27] used a questionnaire survey and interviews that included design games where respondents could design their preferred vehicle types. Their survey was sent out to new car buyers in California, Oregon, Washington, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Maryland. From this they found that awareness of knowledge of PEVs and the purchase incentives they can receive was low. The design games lead to four clusters of consumers being identified. Only one of these group, 'Thrifty Environmentalists' valued purchase incentives highly, the other three groups did not value incentives highly. The study found that consumers who showed interest in PEVs had prior knowledge of them and that for this group purchase incentives could help to convince them to purchase a PEV. For consumers with low knowledge of PEVs the incentives did not contribute towards increasing their interest in PEVs. This was due to them knowing so little about PEVs and their low level of knowledge becoming a purchase barrier.

3.3. Other

A number of studies have used methodologies other than PEV market analysis or questionnaire surveys. [37] investigated BEVs using a multi-layer perspective [31]. The method used by [37] is qualitative and combines empirical observations made by the authors with theoretical literature. The study concluded that incentives can drive the adoption of BEVs. They however suggest that familiarity and experience with the technology will also increase rates of adoption. [44] use an agent based model to simulate BEV purchase behaviour. Their model considers the following variables; whether a person is in the market for a new vehicle, if the person can afford a BEV, whether their driving habits match the range of a BEV, if the household has a second vehicle, whether the household would benefit financially from purchasing a BEV, if the person values the environment, if the agent is an innovator, and finally if the agent is familiar with BEV technology. Based on the assumptions of their model they find that adopting a BEV does not lead to any private benefits for adopters. They therefore suggest that purchase incentives are needed so that adopters will be willing to purchase a BEV. The authors also suggest that public fleets could begin adopting BEVs. Doing this would increase the observability of BEVs for consumers and increase consumer familiarity with the technology. This they suggest would lead to increased rates of adoption.

Several publications have undertaken literature reviews [9,11,49,54] or reviewed policies [53]. A 2014 study by TRL in the UK reviewed literature to understand several issues related to BEV adoption [49]. The authors of this review were unable to conclusively state whether financial incentives have been effective in promoting the adoption BEVs. They state that this is due to the lack of maturity of the market at that time and because most the literature investigated HEVs not BEVs. They do still suggest incentives are effective. A study by [9] concludes that financial incentives are effective if they are properly designed. Their conclusions were based on findings from studies of HEVs. A more recent review by DeShazo found that incentives do lead to increased sales of BEVs. They state that whilst they do this they could be better designed to be more effective. One of their suggestions is that incentives should be applied at point of sale in the US. This would be more effective than the rebate or tax credits currently used [11]. [53] conducted a global review of BEV policies and BEV market growth to understand the effectiveness of policy interventions. They state that nations with high BEV market shares also have introduced generous financial purchase incentives. This suggests that the two are related however they find that non-financial incentives are also important.

4. Discussion

The literature is consistent in finding that incentives are effective in promoting market growth of HEVs, PHEVs, and BEVs. There are only 3

studies that do not find incentives to be effective in promoting PEVs, HEVs, or PHEVs (Fig. 7). There are reasons why these studies found this not to be true. Two of the studies analysed PEV market data to understand which variables have the strongest correlation to PEV market growth and were unable to find any correlations in the data. Another study gathered data from people who had not purchased a HEV or PEV and found that incentives are not effective because people are not aware of them. 32 studies found that purchase incentives are an effective method in increasing HEV and PEV market shares.

Studies investigating HEVs found that purchase incentives did increase rates of adoption. A caveat to this is that for incentives to be effective they should be sufficiently large. Jenn et al. suggest that incentives for HEVs need to be a minimum of US\$1000 to influence the market. HEV market growth was also related to high petrol prices and high household incomes. One study found that incentives for HEVs were not effective [12]. This study used statistical analysis of market data to reveal that HEV market growth was better correlated to high petrol prices and high income. The authors were unable to find any statistically significant relationships between HEV market growth and the presence of purchase incentives.

Studies investigating the market introduction of PHEVs and BEVs have found that incentives have been effective in increasing the market for these vehicle types. Whilst this is the prevailing sentiment many studies have revealed deficiencies with the incentives or ways in which they could be made more efficient or effective. These issues are discussed below along with how they could be solved. Evidence from [11,15,53] shows that the federal tax credit is inefficient. Data from [7] supports these findings with Fig. 6 showing that consumers rank the US\$2500 California rebate and the US\$7500 tax credit equally. The evidence indicates that rebates are more effective than tax credits. The literature does not suggest an explanation for this but it could be due a phenomenon known to behavioural economists as ‘Hyperbolic Discounting’. This is where consumers are known to value smaller-sooner rewards over larger-later rewards. The rebate is received sooner than the federal tax credit. Point of sale grants and sales tax and VAT exemptions for BEVs have been found to be the most effective. They are especially effective when sales tax and VAT are high for ICEVs. This is the case in Norway and the Netherlands. In the USA, transitioning the federal incentive from a tax credit to a rebate, VAT or tax exemption, or grant has the potential to improve the effectiveness of the US federal incentive. It could also be more cost effective to supply the federal incentive at a lower amount closer to or at the time of vehicle purchase. Overall policy makers should look to introduce purchase incentives that are applied at the point of sale, rather than after the vehicle has been purchased. [52] came to similar conclusions in their analysis of different PEV policies. Of the incentives that are applied at/or close to the point of sale, rebates may be the least preferable. Rebates provide consumers with a cash payment after they have purchased their vehicles. Grants and tax or VAT exemptions assist consumers in the purchase of a BEV at the time of purchase, rather than providing ‘cash back’ after purchase. If rebates are used consumers still need to have the financial ability to initially purchase the vehicle. Rebates therefore may be effective in promoting BEV markets for higher income households, but not for household who could not afford the purchase price of a PEV.

Some incentives may cause consumers to preferentially selected PHEVs over BEVs. [11,42,45,51] state that current incentives promote PHEV sales over BEV sales. This could be detrimental especially when consumers purchase PHEVs with low electric ranges. Households with PHEVs with ranges of 10 miles only use the electric range for 15% of their household’s mileage. PHEVs with ranges of 20 miles only use the electric range for 25% of their household mileage. This is a low share of electric miles. Households with PHEVs with ranges of 36–53 miles drive 45% of their household’s mileage on electric range. This figure is higher than it is for drivers of BEVs with 73–105 miles of range. Drivers of BEVs with 73–105 miles of range drive 43% of their




Fig. 7. Summary of literature that explores the effectiveness of financial purchase incentives in promoting the growth of HEV, PHEV and BEV markets. The expanded portion of the chart shows the reasons why a small number of studies found the incentives to not be effective (n=35).

household mileage using the electric range of their BEV [36]. This data suggests that PHEVs with ranges of more than 36 miles could achieve the same benefits as BEVs. Therefore PHEVs with longer electric ranges should receive similar incentives as BEVs. PHEVs with low ranges, perhaps less than 30 miles, should receive a lower incentive. This is due to them having lower energy efficiency and emissions benefits. Some policies are already in place that incentivise BEVs more than PHEVs, for example in United Kingdom, Norway, California, and France. Some markets offer the same level of incentive for a PHEV or a BEV. Policy makers should adjust these incentive programs so that BEVs receive a higher financial incentive than PHEVs with low driving ranges. For PHEVs, purchase incentives should be offered at different levels depending on the range of the PHEV.

Two studies have found that purchase incentives are important for low-end BEVs, such as the Nissan Leaf but are not important for high-end BEVs such as the Tesla BEVs which cost in the region of US \$68,000–135,000. Studies by [20,47] used different sets of data and methodologies but came to this same conclusion. High-end BEV markets are not dependent upon financial purchase incentives. Adopters of these BEVs have exceptionally high incomes and are motivated for factors beyond financial reasons, such as performance, technological, and environmental preferences. In November 2016, changes to the California clean vehicle rebate came into effect. High income earners¹ are no longer eligible for the rebate. Low-income earners now get an additional US\$2000 on top of the US\$2500 rebate. In the United Kingdom PHEVs costing more than GBP£60,000 are not eligible for the plug-in car grant. BEVs costing more than GBP£60,000 are still eligible though. These exemptions could be expanded so that high-end BEV buyers do not receive the same level of incentive as low-end BEV buyers or high-end BEV adopters could receive a smaller incentive than low-end BEV adopters. A smaller incentive may be preferable than having no incentive as the studies by Hardman & Tal and Tal & Nicholas did detect that the incentives were still slightly important. The presence of the incentive will also give consumers a signal that they are making a socially responsible decision.

Studies have found that consumers are not aware that purchase incentives exist for PHEVs or BEVs [26,27,51]. This can result in incentives having a lower impact on the market. When any new technology is introduced awareness and rates of adoption are positively

¹ US\$150,000 for single filers, US\$204,000 for head of household filers, US\$300,000 for joint filers.

correlated [41]. Low levels of awareness of financial purchase incentives for PEVs will result in lower rates of PEV adoption. When policy makers introduce incentives they should also initiate education and awareness campaigns. These campaigns should raise awareness amongst car buyers that financial incentives are available when purchasing a PEV. They should also raise awareness of PEVs in general.

Several studies demonstrated the importance of purchase incentives for PEV buyers. At present purchase incentives are a significant determining factor in the purchase of a PEV [4,7,14,20,47]. The removal of incentives could have a negative impact on the market for the vehicles. Policy makers should seek to introduce policies that will be able to last. Incentives such as rebates and grants may lack longevity. This is due to budgetary constraints resulting from no direct source of revenue available to fund the schemes. Incentive schemes such as feebates have the potential to last far longer as the incentives for PEVs can be funded from additional revenue generated from high emitting ICEVs. Over time the purchase tax for ICEVs can be increased to dissuade consumers from buying ICEVs. This revenue is used to fund rebates for PEVs. At the beginning of a feebate scheme PEVs should receive larger rebates and as their market share increases this should be gradually reduced over time. Eventually PEVs may receive no rebates, but will pay zero tax. ICEVs will pay high tax meaning a price differential still exists which will continue to incentivise consumers to adopt PEVs.

5. Conclusion

Studies conducting statistical analysis of market data using both aggregate and disaggregate data have found that purchase incentives are correlated to PEV market shares. Further to this studies that use choice experiments have found that consumers are more likely to purchase a PEV if purchase incentives are available. None of these types of study actually ask consumers who have purchased a PEV whether the incentives were an important factor in their purchase decision. Fortunately, there are studies that use post PEV purchase surveys to understand actual consumer purchase behaviours and have found that purchase incentives are important for buyers of PEVs. Due to the abundance of literature using diverse methodologies this literature review can confidently state that PEV incentives are an effective policy measure in increasing PEV sales. Policy makers wishing to reduce transportation related emissions can use purchase incentives to increase PEV sales.

5.1. Policy recommendations

By reviewing research that assesses different types of purchase incentive this paper can make recommendations on the most effective ones. Purchase incentives should be applied upfront as a grant or as a VAT or purchase tax exemption. Tax credits have lower affectivity; these are the least effective incentives in changing the purchase decisions. However, they do still have an impact and should not be removed without an alternative subsidy being introduced. VAT or purchase tax exemptions should be employed in combination with high VAT or purchase tax for ICEVs. This system is already employed in some nations, for example Norway, Netherlands, and France. The benefit of this type of system is that increased revenue from high taxation on ICEVs can be used to fund PEV incentive schemes. This system may be able to last far longer than a rebate, grant, or federal tax program. Nevertheless, this system could be unfavourable due to political reasons, in which case PEV grants applied at the point of sale should be used. Such a system currently operated in the United Kingdom. Incentive schemes should distinguish between low-end BEVs, high-end BEVs, short range PHEVs, and long range PHEVs. Low-end BEVs should receive a higher incentive than high-end BEVs which should receive a small incentive. Long range PHEVs should receive an incentive similar to that of low-end BEVs due to them having

similar environmental and energy benefits. Short range PHEVs should receive a far smaller incentive due to them only having low environmental and energy benefits due to their small batteries which result in low electric driving ranges. The removal of grants too early in the introduction of PEVs would have a negative impact, ideally purchase incentives will be able to support early adopters and the early majority of PEV buyers. Once market penetration has reached the late majority of consumers it may be possible to begin reducing incentives whilst not effecting PEV market development. When incentive schemes are introduced education and awareness schemes should promote both BEVs and the nature of the purchase incentives. This will ensure incentives have a significant impact and do not go unnoticed by new car buyers. Finally, this review did not include other incentives such as HOV lane access, free parking, infrastructure etc. these incentives are still important considerations for policy makers. For incentive schemes to have the greatest impact of PEV sales they should be introduced alongside non-monetary and non-purchase incentives. The effectiveness of each of these incentives is not currently known and this is the topic of a future review.

5.2. Future research

In this review the effectiveness of incentives other than purchase incentives was not included. The review did not explore other reasons for PEV adoption, such as personal motivations. The benefit of this specific approach is an in-depth understanding of financial purchase incentives. Other incentive types may also help promote PEV sales. A future review will take an in-depth look at literature that studies the impact of non-financial incentives (e.g HOV lane access), reoccurring incentives (e.g yearly taxes), and other incentives (e.g free parking, toll road use). This review will develop an understanding of what additional incentives policy makers can introduce to nurture PEV market growth. The value of purchase incentives is usually between US\$2500 and US\$20,000. No research has been undertaken to understand what value purchase incentives for PEVs should be. Future research should look to calculate what value of incentive will have the greatest cost to benefit ratio. This will allow policy makers to decide what value of incentive they should offer to growth PEV markets most effectively. The existing literature concentrates heavily on the USA and especially California. Future studies should look to investigate regions where PEV incentives have not been investigated as thoroughly, for example the United Kingdom. Finally, some incentives schemes will not be able to last indefinitely, for example, the US federal tax credit has a cap to 200,000 vehicles per OEM, after which the incentives are phased out for that OEM. This means it may expire for high volume manufactures before 2020. In the UK, the plug-in car grant is only scheduled to run until 2018. An important research question is when can incentives be removed without this having a negative impact on PEV market growth. This will help policy makers understand how long they will need to run incentive programs for. This review did not include purchase motivations other than incentives. Consumers will also have private or personal motivations associated with the purchase of a PEV. This is an ongoing research area although no study has summarised this literature in order to understand personal or private motivations that attract consumers to PEVs. A future review should therefore aim to understand why consumer purchase PEVs. Most studies do not make distinctions between PHEVs and BEVs. Both vehicle types are significantly different and the literature has shown that consumers perceive these vehicles differently. They also use different sources of energy to power propulsion. Therefore, the policy implications of each vehicle type will be different. All future studies should make distinctions between PHEVs and BEVs to obtain more relevant results for each vehicle type. Finally future studies should consider the impact of purchase incentives on low-end BEVs with 200 miles of range. This type of vehicle is now in production, is being purchased by consumers, and more OEMs are expected to introduce low cost 200 mile BEVs to the market.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank ClimateWorks Foundation for providing the funding that made this research possible.

References

- [1] Aasness MA, Odeck J. The increase of electric vehicle usage in Norway incentives and adverse effects. *Eur Transp Res Rev* 2015;7:4.
- [2] Axsen J, Kurani KS. Hybrid, plug-in hybrid, or electric-What do car buyers want? *Energy Policy* 2013;61:532–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.05.122>.
- [3] Berestenau A, Li S. Gasonline prices, Government support, and the demand for hybrid vehicles in the United States. *Int Econ Rev* 2008;52(1):161–82.
- [4] Bjerkan KY, Nørbech TE, Nordtømme ME. Incentives for promoting Battery Electric Vehicle (BEV) adoption in Norway. *Transp Res Part D: Transp Environ* 2016;43:169–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2015.12.002>.
- [5] Bühler F, et al. Is EV experience related to EV acceptance? Results from a German field study. *Transp Res Part F: Traffic Psychol Behav* 2014;25:34–49. (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1369847814000606>), [accessed 6 October 2014].
- [6] Caperello N, Tyreehageman J, Davies J. I am not an environmental wacko! Getting from early plug-in vehicle owners to potential later buyers. *Transportation Research Board 2015 Annual Meeting*; 2015.
- [7] Center for Sustainable Energy. California Air Resources Board Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, EV Consumer Survey Dataset. Available at: (<http://cleanvehiclerebate.org/eng/survey-dashboard/ev>) [accessed 12 August 2016]; 2016.
- [8] Clinton B et al., Impact of Direct Financial Incentives in the Emerging Battery Electric Vehicle Market: A Preliminary Analysis., (February).2015.
- [9] Collantes BG, Eggert A. The Effect of Monetary incentives on sales of advanced clean cars in the United States: summary of the Evidence. *Inst Transp Stud* 2014:1–8.
- [10] DeShazo JR et al. Designing Policy Incentives for Cleaner Technologies : Lessons from California ' s Plug-in Electric Vehicle Rebate Program; 2014. pp.1–38.
- [11] DeShazo JR. Improving incentives for clean vehicle purchases in the United States: challenges and opportunities. *Rev Environ Econ Policy* 2016;10(1):149–65.
- [12] Diamond D. The impact of government incentives for hybrid-electric vehicles: evidence from US states. *Energy Policy* 2009;37(3):972–83.
- [13] Fearnley N, Pfaffenbichler P, Figenbaum E, Jellinek R. E-vehicle policies and incentives - assessment and recommendations; 2015.
- [14] Figenbaum E, Kolbenstvedt M. Learning from Norwegian Battery Electric and Plug-in Hybrid Vehicle Users; 2016.
- [15] Gallagher KS, Muehlegger E. Giving green to get green? Incentives and consumer adoption of hybrid vehicle technology. *J Environ Econ Manag* 2011;61(1):1–15, (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0095069610000768>), [accessed 27 August 2014].
- [16] Green EH, Skerlos SJ, Winebrake JJ. Increasing electric vehicle policy efficiency and effectiveness by reducing mainstream market bias. *Energy Policy* 2014;65:562–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.024>.
- [17] Grewal D, et al. The effect of store name, brand name and price discounts on consumers' evaluations and purchase intentions. *J Retail* 1998;74(3):331–52.
- [18] Gupta S, Cooper LG. The discounting of discounts and promotion thresholds. *J Consum Res* 1992;19(April):401–11, [Available at] (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24098748_The_Discounting_of_Discounts_and_Promotion_Thresholds).
- [19] Hardman S, Shiu E, Steinberger-Wilckens R. Comparing High-End and Low-End Early Adopters of Battery Electric Vehicles. *Transp Res Part A: Policy Pract, Rev* 2016.
- [20] Hardman S, Tal G. Exploring the decision to adopt a high-end battery electric vehicle: the role of financial and non-financial motivations. *Transp Res Rec J Transp Res Board* 2016:16–1783.
- [21] Heffner R, Turrentine T, Kurani K. A Primer on Automobile Semiotics. *Institute of Transportation Studies*; 2006.
- [22] Helveston JP, et al. Will subsidies drive electric vehicle adoption? Measuring consumer preferences in the U.S. and China. *Transp Res Part A: Policy Pract* 2015;73:96–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2015.01.002>.
- [23] International Energy Agency. *Global EV Outlook*, (April); 2016.
- [24] Jenn A, Azevedo IL, Ferreira P. The impact of federal incentives on the adoption of hybrid electric vehicles in the United States. *Energy Econ* 2013;40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.07.025>.
- [25] Jin L, Searle S, Lutsey N. Evaluation of state-level u. s. electric vehicle incentives; 2014.
- [26] Krause RM, et al. Perception and reality: Public knowledge of plug-in electric vehicles in 21 U.S. cities. *Energy Policy* 2013;63(2013):433–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.09.018>.
- [27] Kurani KS, Caperello N, Tyreehageman J. New car buyers' valuation of zero-emission vehicles: California., (March); 2016.
- [28] Lane B et al., Beyond Early Adopters of Plug-in Electric Vehicles? Evidence from Fleet and Household Users in Indianapolis, *Transportation Research Board 2014 Annual*; 2014.
- [29] Langbroek JHM, Franklin JP, Susilo YO. The effect of policy incentives on electric vehicle adoption. *Energy Policy* 2016;94:94–103, [Available at] (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421516301550>).
- [30] Larson PD, et al. Consumer attitudes about electric cars: pricing analysis and policy implications. *Transp Res Part A* 2014;69:299–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2014.09.002>.
- [31] Loorbach DA. Transition management: new mode of Governance for sustainable development. *North* 2007;193(4):1–328, [Available at] (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20446550>).
- [32] Lutsey N, et al. Assessment of leading electric vehicle promotion activities in United States cities, *International Council on Clean*; 2015.
- [33] Lutsey N. The rise of electric vehicles: The second million. *ICCT - The International Council on Clean Transportation*. Available at: (<http://www.theicct.org/blogs/staff/second-million-electric-vehicles>); 2017.
- [34] Mersky AC, et al. Effectiveness of incentives on electric vehicle adoption in Norway. *Transp Res Part D: Transp Environ* 2016;46:56–68, [Available at] (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1361920916000407>).
- [35] Mock P, Yang Z. Driving Electrification. *ICCT - The International Council on Clean Transportation*, (May); 2014.
- [36] Nicholas MA, Tal G, Turrentine TS. Advanced Plug-in Electric Vehicle Travel and Charging Behavior Interim Report Advanced Plug in Electric Vehicle Travel and Charging Behavior Interim Report; 2016.
- [37] Nilsson M, Nykvist B. Governing the electric vehicle transition - Near term interventions to support a green energy economy. *Appl Energy* 2015;179:1360–71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.03.056>.
- [38] Nordelöf A, et al. Environmental impacts of hybrid, plug-in hybrid, and battery electric vehicles-what can we learn from life cycle assessment?. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 2014:1866–90.
- [39] Offer G, et al. Techno-economic and behavioural analysis of battery electric, hydrogen fuel cell and hybrid vehicles inafuture sustainable road transport system in the UK. *Energy Policy* 2011;39:1939–50.
- [40] Plötz P, et al. Who will buy electric vehicles? Identifying early adopters in Germany. *Transp Res Part A: Policy Practice* 2014;67:96–109, (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0965856414001463>), [accessed 24 September 2014].
- [41] Rogers EM. *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th ed. New York: Free Press; 2003.
- [42] Sheldon TL, DeShazo JR, Carson RT. Electric and Plug-in Hybrid Vehicle Demand: lessons for an Emerging Market *Economic Inquiry* 2016; 2016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eicin.12416>.
- [43] Sierczula W, et al. The influence of financial incentives and other socio-economic factors on electric vehicle adoption. *Energy Policy* 2014;68:183–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.01.043>.
- [44] Silvia C, Krause RM. Assessing the impact of policy interventions on the adoption of plug-in electric vehicles: an agent-based model. *Energy Policy* 2016;96:105–18, [Available at] (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0301421516302695>).
- [45] Slowik P, Lutsey N. Evolution of incentives to sustain the transition to a global electric vehicle fleet, *ICCT*; 2016.
- [46] Stimming U, Ramachandran S. Well to wheel analysis of low carbon alternatives for road traffic. *Energy Environ Sci* 2015;8:3313–24, [Available at] (<http://pubs.rsc.org/en/Content/ArticleLanding/2015/EE/C5EE01512J>).
- [47] Tal G, Nicholas M. Exploring the Impact of the Federal Tax Credit on the Plug-in Vehicle Market. *Transp Res Rec J Transp Res Board* 2016:1–21.
- [48] Thaler RH, Sunstein CR, Balz JP, Shafir E, editor. *The Behavioral Foundations of Public Policy- Chapter 25 Choice Architecture*. Princeton University Press; 2012, [Available at] (<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1583509>).
- [49] Trl S. Consumer responses to Electric Vehicles Literature Review., (December); 2014.
- [50] Turrentine TS, Kurani KS. Car buyers and fuel economy?. *Energy Policy* 2007;35:1213–23.
- [51] Vergis S, Chen B. Comparison of plug-in electric vehicle adoption in the United States: a state by state approach. *Res Transp Econ* 2015;52:56–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2015.10.003>.
- [52] Yang Z et al. Principles for effective electric vehicle incentive design., (June).2016.
- [53] Zhou Y, et al. Plug-in electric vehicle market penetration and incentives: a global review *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 2014; 2014. p. 777–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11027-014-9611-2>.
- [54] Zhou Y, Levin T, Plotkin S. Plug-in Electric Vehicle Policy Effectiveness: Literature Review; 2016.