



香港城市大學  
City University of Hong Kong

專業 創新 胸懷全球  
Professional · Creative  
For The World

## CityU Scholars

### Editorial: Rethinking Green Energy Development: Cognitive Biases

Qin, Quande; Zhang, Lin; Shi, Xunpeng; Zhu, Bangzhu

**Published in:**

Frontiers in Energy Research

**Published:** 01/04/2022

**Document Version:**

Final Published version, also known as Publisher's PDF, Publisher's Final version or Version of Record

**License:**

CC BY

**Publication record in CityU Scholars:**

[Go to record](#)

**Published version (DOI):**

[10.3389/fenrg.2022.895127](https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2022.895127)

**Publication details:**

Qin, Q., Zhang, L., Shi, X., & Zhu, B. (2022). Editorial: Rethinking Green Energy Development: Cognitive Biases. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 10, [895127]. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2022.895127>

**Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on CityU Scholars is the Post-print version (also known as Accepted Author Manuscript, Peer-reviewed or Author Final version), it may differ from the Final Published version. When citing, ensure that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination and other details.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the CityU Scholars portal is retained by the author(s) and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. Users may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.

**Publisher permission**

Permission for previously published items are in accordance with publisher's copyright policies sourced from the SHERPA RoMEO database. Links to full text versions (either Published or Post-print) are only available if corresponding publishers allow open access.

**Take down policy**

Contact [lbscholars@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:lbscholars@cityu.edu.hk) if you believe that this document breaches copyright and provide us with details. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Editorial: Rethinking Green Energy Development: Cognitive Biases

Quande Qin<sup>1\*</sup>, Lin Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Xunpeng Shi<sup>3</sup> and Bangzhu Zhu<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China, <sup>2</sup>City University of Hongkong, Hongkong, China, <sup>3</sup>University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia, <sup>4</sup>Guangxi University, Nanning, China

**Keywords:** cognitive bias, energy system, green energy, energy transition, energy policy

## Editorial on the Research Topic

### Rethinking Green Energy Development: Cognitive Biases

Green energy development is a key strategy during the energy transition which is a process of large-scale socio-technological change (Geels, 2014). Due to the technical complexity and social reflexivity of the energy system (Geels, 2002; Loorbach, 2010), cognitive biases towards the green energy system is inevitable. Cognitive biases pose great challenges to achieve consensus for contemporary policy making. One effective step for addressing this challenge, as the socio-technological theorists have suggested, is to explore and exhibit the multiplicity of value, the complexity of the socio-technological system, and the reflexivity of such system as well (Rip and Kemp, 1998; Coglianese et al., 1999; Rotmans et al., 2001; Kemp et al., 2007). Motivated by this, this special issue includes a collection of nine studies from researchers with distinctive backgrounds on the issue of green energy.

Four papers in this issue have shed important light on the multiplicity of values. Specifically, Hu et al. suggest how difficult it is to simultaneously account and balance the economic value and the environmental impacts of shale gas extraction. Shale gas has been recognized as a type of unconventional energy that somehow can enlarge the possibility of relying on fossil fuels. Similarly, Lin et al. address the challenges on integrating both economic value and green trust during the transition from an existing product to a disruptive green product. Fan et al. highlight that the public evaluation on China's energy storage projects have multiple dimensions. Li et al. have developed an acceptance model by capturing various aspects of an individual's belief. They used this model to reveal the public attitude toward the commercial fleet of methanol vehicles in China.

The energy system is complex that any analysis on the performance of a specific technical tool in the green energy domain could be. As such, researchers should expand the analytic scope when approaching problems related to green energy. However, it could also be in vain to conduct an analysis that covers the entire energy system. In other words, the analysis on energy system should find a "midway" between specificity and abstraction. In this regard, Xue et al., Zhang and Gu, Guo et al. and Chen et al. are good examples. The analytic scopes of these studies are energy consuming sectors, social capital, digital finance, and information technology investment, respectively. Those terms refer to either a manageable sub-sector (Xue et al.) or a controllable "fluid" that runs throughout the energy system (Zhang and Gu, Guo et al. and Chen et al.). To overcome cognitive biases also means to have more attention paid to the invisible depth. Social capital, digital finance and information technology investment are invisible relative to engineering projects. Each of these invisible elements, however, has profound impact on the landscape of the entire energy system. The above studies also have methodological implications on how to quantitatively approach a complex social-technological system. Xue et al. have applied a novel slack-based data envelopment analysis,

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited and reviewed by:

Simone Bastianoni,  
University of Siena, Italy

### \*Correspondence:

Quande Qin  
qinquande@gmail.com

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Sustainable Energy Systems and  
Policies,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Energy Research

**Received:** 13 March 2022

**Accepted:** 21 March 2022

**Published:** 08 April 2022

### Citation:

Qin Q, Zhang L, Shi X and Zhu B (2022)  
Editorial: Rethinking Green Energy  
Development: Cognitive Biases.  
Front. Energy Res. 10:895127.  
doi: 10.3389/fenrg.2022.895127

which is insightful to other sub-systems of energy. Zhang and Gu have conducted a panel data regression model to account for environment governance efficiency. They also set an example for how to quantify social capital with official data.

The energy system is reflexive, with both top-down and bottom-up cognitive influences in the energy system. Reflexivity runs through the supply chains of the energy industry, through the decision loops of energy policy, and through the multiple levels of the entire energy system. As such, the consumer acceptance and the public attitude play a key role in green energy development. On one hand, consumer acceptance and public attitude are affected by the knowhow of experts and policy makers. On the other hand, experts' and policy makers' knowledge should be adjusted according to the feedbacks from consumers and the public. However, there exists a so called "knowledge deficit" which has too overwhelmingly emphasized on the knowledge of experts and policy makers. Now it is the time to increase the cumulation of consumer knowledge and public opinions. This is why five manuscripts (Fan et al., Hu et al., Li et al., Lin et al., and Jiang et al.) from this collection have focused on either the consumer cognition or the public attitude. Notably, Fan et al. find that the public attitude toward energy storage projects presents a cognitive bias: the

public opinions of energy storage are usually not the same even for the same issue. Representation distortion could happen during a survey, as the survey hosts and the survey respondents are associated in reflexive chains. Fan et al. demonstrate on how to dig undistorted information from the corpus of natural language, which can provide more real and credible information than survey data.

The journal *Frontiers in Energy Research* has provided an international platform for green energy communications. This collection reveals how cognitive biases can arise from monotony of value, from oversimplification in the analysis of green energy development and from ignoring the voice of consumer and the public. Therefore, this special issue points out that the existence of cognitive bias could slow down the transition towards green energy. Future green investment and policy making shall address the cognitive bias to overcome the limits of consensus and regime resistance against green energy transition.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors listed have made a substantial, direct, and intellectual contribution to the work and approved it for publication.

Rotmans, J., Kemp, R., and Van Asselt, M. (2001). More Evolution Than Revolution: Transition Management in Public Policy. *foresight* 3 (1), 15–31. doi:10.1108/14636680110803003

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Qin, Zhang, Shi and Zhu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

## REFERENCES

- Coglianesi, C. (1999). The Limits of Consensus: The Environmental protection System in Transition: Toward a More Desirable Future. *Environ. Sci. Pol. Sustain. Develop.* 41 (3), 28–33. doi:10.1080/00139159909604620
- Geels, F. W. (2014). Regime Resistance against Low-Carbon Transitions: Introducing Politics and Power into the Multi-Level Perspective. *Theor. Cult. Soc.* 31 (5), 21–40. doi:10.1177/0263276414531627
- Geels, F. W. (2002). Technological Transitions as Evolutionary Reconfiguration Processes: a Multi-Level Perspective and a Case-Study. *Res. Pol.* 31 (8-9), 1257–1274. doi:10.1016/s0048-7333(02)00062-8
- Kemp, R., Rotmans, J., and Loorbach, D. (2007). Assessing the Dutch Energy Transition Policy: How Does it deal with Dilemmas of Managing Transitions? *J. Environ. Pol. Plann.* 9 (3-4), 315–331. doi:10.1080/15239080701622816
- Loorbach, D. (2010). Transition Management for Sustainable Development: A Prescriptive, Complexity-Based Governance Framework. *Governance* 23 (1), 161–183. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01471.x
- Rip, A., and Kemp, R. (1998). Technological Change. *Hum. choice Clim. Change* 2 (2), 327–399.