

Prompting sustainable action may depend on asking the right question

Most of us agree that more needs to be done to protect the environment. New technologies are being continually developed to make our lifestyles and our homes more sustainable. But if push came to shove, would you pay to install solar panels? Ian Bright, Jessica Exton and Jay Shamji help explain how your answer would probably depend on how you were asked



The way a message is framed can influence how it is perceived. Tailoring a message to appeal to our nature or to emphasise one aspect of an argument over others, are examples of how framing can be applied to influence responses. For example, beef advertised as 95% lean mince, instead of 5% fat will appear more attractive.

The effects of framing when communicating to people about sustainability are particularly interesting. If a simple change of wording prompts more people to make their homes more sustainable, which would subsequently impact long-term energy consumption and deliver a variety of benefits, for example, people would want to know about it.

Solar tools

Solar panels available to households have the potential to significantly reduce the environmental impact homes have. [Deloitte analysis](#) suggests that if solar panels were placed on every suitable roof surface in the Netherlands, half of the country's electricity demand could be generated by the sun.

The cost savings solar panels provide are making them increasingly popular. In the year leading up to July 2019, [solar power use in the UK almost doubled](#). US 'fact tank', Pew Research Centre, further found that more than two in five US homeowners have given serious thought to installing solar panels. Additionally, the sustainable impact of solar panels is being recognised in sunny California, where a new set of environmental standards will require most new homes built after 2020 to include solar panels.

Wording matters

Despite significantly reducing household energy bills, the initial high cost of installing solar panels will deter some prospective users. This type of challenge is consistent across many environmental decisions, with many sustainable products incurring a large initial outlay as well as a long payback period. Whether an offer to install solar panels focuses on the immediate impact or the longer-term returns will likely influence responses.

To test this, a single question about attitudes to installing solar panels was asked to all 13,000 European respondents involved in 2019's Homes and Mortgages ING International Survey. In each of the 13 countries, respondents were split into two equal groups. Each were given estimates of average energy bills for households in their country and the average cost of installing solar panels. Half were asked how much money they would need to save each year to install solar panels. The other half were asked how many years of savings they would need to justify the initial instalment costs. The questions were asked in a way that the savings each year and number of years to pay off could be compared directly.

When asked the question in different ways, Europeans on average gave different answers. A third of people (32%) said investing in solar panels wasn't worth the highest return option we provided, when the return was expressed as a monetary saving. But a much larger group (47%) said this investment wasn't worth it when they considered the number of years it would take to recoup the initial cost. People were more likely to invest in solar panels when they considered how much could be saved each year, compared to how many years of saving it would take to recoup the initial costs.

The questions

Q: What annual saving on your energy bills would make this investment worth it?

A: On average, 32% said they would need to save more than 70% of their energy bill each year (equivalent to less than 15 years repayment time) to make the investment worth it.

Respondents selected a percentage of their annual energy bill that would need to be saved between 70% (which would take approx. 15 years to repay) and 20% (which would take approx. 43 years to repay) or said 'I would need to save more than this each year'.

Q: How quickly would you need to make the total cost of solar panels bank, to make this investment worth it?

A: On average, 47% said they would need to recoup costs in less than 15 years (equivalent to more than 70% annual energy bill saving) to make the investment worth it.

Respondents selected a number of years on a range between 43 years (approx. equivalent to saving 20% of each annual energy bill) and 15 years (approx. equivalent to saving 70% of each annual energy bill) or said 'I would need to recoup my costs faster than this'.

The findings

Almost half (47%) of Europeans said that a repayment period of 15 years was too long. They did not feel that it was worth installing solar panels if it would take this long to make a full return on their investment.

Comparatively, only a third (32%) of Europeans gave the equivalent response, saying that 15 years was too long to make up their investment, when we framed this return as an annual saving on their energy bill. This was the equivalent of wanting to save more than 70% of each annual energy bill.

Driving framing

With this single question, we can't know what assumptions and calculations respondents may have made when deciding if the investment was worth it for them. Therefore, while we can see differences in the answers, we can't say exactly why they have occurred. We can however, hypothesise.

It may be that respondents who were shown the question that phrased returns on their solar panel investment in terms of annual energy savings were focusing on short-term gains. Each year they would incur a saving on their annual energy bill that would continue into the foreseeable future. This would happen immediately after installation. While this saving would be used to account for the high initial installation cost, the fact that energy bills would be reduced may have felt like a win, and therefore considered attractive.

Respondents who were shown the question that phrased returns in terms of how many years it would take to repay their investment, were however led to focus on something very different. Rather than an immediate saving, they considered the total repayment period. This may have made this option less attractive. Respondents would have had to work out the immediate financial benefits themselves as these weren't made obvious.

Time vs Money

Another reason for the different responses may be that one group viewed costs in terms of money, the other in terms of time.

'Time is money'. It's a common saying that suggests interchangeability. We *spend* money on activities, we *spend* time on others. In some cases, we can think of periods of time as 'worth' a

certain amount of money. One can be translated to the other.

But research suggests that it's normal to think about time and money differently, even if with a quick calculation we can translate one into another. And not everyone will make this translation the same way. There are many factors that impact how we think about translating the value of time into a monetary amount. While each of us has an identical number of hours in a day, admittedly with different amounts of 'free' time, not everyone has the same amount of money. While we might be able to go out and earn more money, there is arguably no way to go out and simply find more time.

One way to try and quantify the value of an hour may be to assess how much someone else is willing to pay for it, i.e. one's hourly earnings. But this will vary across individuals. The 19th century American writer and philosopher, Henry David Thoreau said: "The cost of a thing is the amount of life which is to be exchanged for it". This is also something unique to each person.

People also tend to approach decisions that involve time differently to those that involve money. For example, they can apply heuristics to simplify the process of estimating time to one that requires little cognitive analysis. [Heuristics](#) are "strategies of simplifying judgments that allow individuals to make decisions under suboptimal circumstances" and may lead to responses based on a gut reaction rather than a reasoned and calculated assessment. We are [more likely to apply heuristics](#) when thinking in terms of time, rather than money.

Context specific

These questions were asked in the context of a broader survey about the environmental impact of spending and consumption. Given this, it's worth noting that a desire to be seen as socially responsible may have influenced responses. Some may have said they would have invested in solar panels in either the monetary or time state to appear more contentious. The differences between how the questions were phrased are however interesting.

Previous research suggests that opinions and cognitive processes can be shaped, to some extent, by the wording of a question. Even if the values in a question are equivalent to one another, or lead to the same results. In this scenario, both groups had equivalent options to choose from, yet when we asked whether people would invest in solar panels with a return on investment described as an annual percentage of their energy bill saved, they were more likely to make the investment than when the return on investment was described in terms of the length of time it would take.

Author

Olivia Grace

Editor

olivia.grace@ing.com

Julian Geib

Junior Economist, Global Trade

julian.geib@ing.de

Zoltán Homolya

Economic research trainee

zoltan.homolya@ing.com

Amrita Naik Nimbalkar

Economist, Global Macro

amrita.naik.nimbalkar@ing.com

Mateusz Sutowicz

Senior Economist, Poland

mateusz.sutowicz@ing.pl

Alissa Lefebre

Economist

alissa.lefebvre@ing.com

Deepali Bhargava

Regional Head of Research, Asia-Pacific

Deepali.Bhargava@ing.com

Ruben Dewitte

Economist

+32495364780

ruben.dewitte@ing.com

Kinga Havasi

Economic research trainee

kinga.havasi@ing.com

Marten van Garderen

Consumer Economist, Netherlands

marten.van.garderen@ing.com

David Havrlant

Chief Economist, Czech Republic

420 770 321 486

david.havrlant@ing.com

Sander Burgers

Senior Economist, Dutch Housing

sander.burgers@ing.com

Lynn Song

Chief Economist, Greater China

lynn.song@ing.com

Michiel Tukker

Senior UK & Eurozone Rates Strategist

michiel.tukker@ing.com

Michal Rubaszek

Senior Economist, Poland

michal.rubaszek@ing.pl

This is a test author

Stefan Posea

Economist, Romania

tiberiu-stefan.posea@ing.com

Marine Leleux

Sector Strategist, Financials

marine.leleux2@ing.com

Jesse Norcross

Senior Sector Strategist, Real Estate

jesse.norcross@ing.com

Teise Stellema

Research Assistant, Energy Transition

teise.stellema@ing.com

Diederik Stadig

Senior Economist, Healthcare & Technology

diederik.stadig@ing.com

Diogo Gouveia

Sector Economist

diogo.duarte.vieira.de.gouveia@ing.com

Marine Leleux

Sector Strategist, Financials

marine.leleux2@ing.com

Ewa Manthey

Commodities Strategist

ewa.manthey@ing.com

ING Analysts

James Wilson

EM Sovereign Strategist

James.wilson@ing.com

Sophie Smith

Digital Editor

sophie.smith@ing.com

Frantisek Taborsky

EMEA FX & FI Strategist

frantisek.taborsky@ing.com

Adam Antoniak

Senior Economist, Poland

adam.antoniak@ing.pl

Min Joo Kang

Senior Economist, South Korea and Japan

min.joo.kang@ing.com

Coco Zhang

ESG Research

coco.zhang@ing.com

Jan Frederik Slijkerman

Senior Sector Strategist, TMT

jan.frederik.slijkerman@ing.com

Katinka Jongkind

Senior Economist, Services and Leisure

Katinka.Jongkind@ing.com

Marina Le Blanc

Sector Strategist, Financials

Marina.Le.Blanc@ing.com

Samuel Abettan

Junior Economist

samuel.abettan@ing.com

Franziska Biehl

Senior Economist, Germany

Franziska.Marie.Biehl@ing.de

Rebecca Byrne

Deputy Global Head of Editorial and Supervisory Analyst

rebecca.byrne@ing.com

Mirjam Bani

Sector Economist, Commercial Real Estate & Public Sector (Netherlands)

mirjam.bani@ing.com

Timothy Rahill

Credit Strategist

timothy.rahill@ing.com

Leszek Kasek

Senior Economist, Poland

leszek.kasek@ing.pl

Antoine Bouvet

Head of European Rates Strategy

antoine.bouvet@ing.com

Jeroen van den Broek

Global Head of Sector Research

jeroen.van.den.broek@ing.com

Edse Dantuma

Senior Sector Economist, Industry and Healthcare

edse.dantuma@ing.com

Francesco Pesole

FX Strategist

francesco.pesole@ing.com

Rico Luman

Senior Sector Economist, Transport and Logistics

Rico.Luman@ing.com

Jurjen Witteveen

Sector Economist

jurjen.witteveen@ing.com

Dmitry Dolgin

Chief Economist, CIS

dmitry.dolgin@ing.de

Nicholas Mapa

Senior Economist, Philippines

nicholas.antonio.mapa@asia.ing.com

Egor Fedorov

Senior Credit Analyst

egor.fedorov@ing.com

Sebastian Franke

Consumer Economist

sebastian.franke@ing.de

Gerben Hieminga

Senior Sector Economist, Energy

gerben.hieminga@ing.com

Nadège Tillier

Head of Corporate Sector Strategy

nadege.tillier@ing.com

Charlotte de Montpellier

Senior Economist, France and Switzerland

charlotte.de.montpellier@ing.com

Laura Straeter

Behavioural Scientist

+31(0)611172684

laura.Straeter@ing.com

Valentin Tataru

Chief Economist, Romania

valentin.tataru@ing.com

James Smith

Developed Markets Economist, UK

james.smith@ing.com

Suvi Platerink Kosonen

Senior Sector Strategist, Financials

suvi.platerink-kosonen@ing.com

Thijs Geijer

Senior Sector Economist, Food & Agri

thijs.geijer@ing.com

Maurice van Sante

Senior Economist Construction & Team Lead Sectors

maurice.van.sante@ing.com

Marcel Klok

Senior Economist, Netherlands

marcel.klok@ing.com

Paolo Pizzoli

Senior Economist, Italy, Greece

paolo.pizzoli@ing.com

Marieke Blom

Chief Economist and Global Head of Research

marieke.blom@ing.com

Raoul Leering

Senior Macro Economist
raoul.leering@ing.com

Maarten Leen
Head of Global IFRS9 ME Scenarios
maarten.leen@ing.com

Maureen Schuller
Head of Financials Sector Strategy
Maureen.Schuller@ing.com

Warren Patterson
Head of Commodities Strategy
Warren.Patterson@ing.com

Rafal Benecki
Chief Economist, Poland
rafal.benecki@ing.pl

Philippe Ledent
Senior Economist, Belgium, Luxembourg
philippe.ledent@ing.com

Peter Virovacz
Chief Economist, Hungary
peter.virovacz@ing.com

Inga Fechner
Senior Economist, Global Trade
inga.fechner@ing.de

Dimitry Fleming
Senior Data Analyst, Netherlands
Dimitry.Fleming@ing.com

Ciprian Dascalu
Chief Economist, Romania
+40 31 406 8990
ciprian.dascalu@ing.com

Muhammet Mercan
Chief Economist, Turkey
muhammet.mercan@ingbank.com.tr

Iris Pang
Chief Economist, Greater China
iris.pang@asia.ing.com

Sophie Freeman

Writer, Group Research
+44 20 7767 6209

Sophie.Freeman@uk.ing.com

Padhraic Garvey, CFA

Regional Head of Research, Americas

padhraic.garvey@ing.com

James Knightley

Chief International Economist, US

james.knightley@ing.com

Tim Condon

Asia Chief Economist

+65 6232-6020

Martin van Vliet

Senior Interest Rate Strategist

+31 20 563 8801

martin.van.vliet@ing.com

Karol Pogorzelski

Senior Economist, Poland

Karol.Pogorzelski@ing.pl

Carsten Brzeski

Global Head of Macro

carsten.brzeski@ing.de

Viraj Patel

Foreign Exchange Strategist

+44 20 7767 6405

viraj.patel@ing.com

Owen Thomas

Global Head of Editorial Content

+44 (0) 207 767 5331

owen.thomas@ing.com

Bert Colijn

Chief Economist, Netherlands

bert.colijn@ing.com

Peter Vanden Houte

Chief Economist, Belgium, Luxembourg, Eurozone

peter.vandenhoute@ing.com

Benjamin Schroeder

Senior Rates Strategist

benjamin.schroeder@ing.com

Chris Turner

Global Head of Markets and Regional Head of Research for UK & CEE

chris.turner@ing.com

Gustavo Rangel

Chief Economist, LATAM

+1 646 424 6464

gustavo.rangel@ing.com

Carlo Cocuzzo

Economist, Digital Finance

+44 20 7767 5306

carlo.cocuzzo@ing.com